

***STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
September 6, 2006***

The work session of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 6, 2006, was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chamber of the County Administrative Center.

Members Present: Cook, Kirby, Pitzel, Mitchell, Carlone, Rhodes and Di Peppe.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Harvey, Judy, Stepowany, Gregori, and Allen

Declarations of Disqualification

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance - Amendment to Section 22-118, Water and Sewer, of the Subdivision Ordinance, pursuant to O06-02. The proposed amendment establishes minimum area requirements for primary and reserve drain fields. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mr. Stepowany stated Ordinance O06-02 was to amend the Subdivision Ordinance. He stated the Board of Supervisors would like a recommendation from the Planning Commission on all three Ordinances discussed tonight.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the report was the same as was provided at the August 2, 2006 meeting. He stated he was concerned about the required four thousand square feet with one hundred percent reserve drainfield area. He stated section E reads the reserve drainfield shall be no less than twenty-five hundred square feet.

Mr. Stepowany stated the twenty-five hundred square feet in section E referred to alternative systems. He stated the reserve drainfield would have to be one hundred percent of the capacity, but not necessarily the area.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the intent was so you could have a conventional four-thousand square feet but the reserve drainfield could be alternate and require twenty-five hundred square feet.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if area versus capacity had to do with soils.

Tommy Thompson, Virginia Department of Health, stated the slower the soils percolate, more area was required.

Mr. Cook asked if a drainfield of four thousand square feet had the same capacity as an alternative system at twenty-five hundred square feet.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006***

Mr. Judy stated the Ordinance was correct in stating no less than twenty-five hundred square feet.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the Ordinance could be clarified.

Mr. Judy stated instead of the word “and” the Ordinance could read “but”.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the four thousand square feet could be configured in any layout.

Mr. Thompson stated the four thousand square feet area would consist of six, eighty foot trenches, on a standard slope would use a forty-eight by eighty square feet area. He stated this was a small to medium size drainfield for a four bedroom home.

Mr. Pitzel asked why the drainfield size could not be determined by the number of bedrooms in a home.

Mr. Thompson stated soil consultants would reserve hundred by hundred boxes which was ten thousand feet for the drainfield. He stated the area was reserved in case the homeowner wanted to expand.

Mr. Pitzel asked what would happen if a citizen subdivided and created a three acre lot but could not find eight thousand square feet on the property because the area was hilly. He stated the Ordinance stated all newly platted lots, not just major subdivisions.

Mr. Judy asked if Mr. Pitzel would prefer an exemption added to the Ordinance.

Mr. Pitzel stated there should be an exemption for small or minor subdivisions.

Mrs. Carlone asked what happens when a septic system fails. She asked if pump and haul would be the resolution.

Mr. Thompson stated the county used permanent pump and haul.

Mrs. Carlone asked what happened if you did not have a reserve drainfield.

Mr. Pitzel stated he did not object to the one hundred percent reserve, but he was unsure about the required four thousand feet for the primary drainfield.

Mr. Cook asked what size drainfield would be required for a two or three bedroom home.

Mr. Thompson stated a three bedroom home would need thirty-one hundred square feet.

Mr. Cook stated there was A-2 zoning in the County which had one acre lots.

Mr. Stepowany stated an acre was forty-three thousand square feet.

Mr. Cook asked what if the lot had slopes or has a lot of trees.

Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006

Mr. Stepowany stated a lot with slopes would need a larger drainfield. He stated the purpose of the Ordinance was to provide the reserve drainfield.

Mrs. Kirby asked what the range of an alternative system was.

Mr. Thompson stated if a treatment unit was added into a septic tank and drainfield the system should last longer.

Mrs. Kirby asked what happened when people do not know how to care for septic systems.

Mr. Thompson stated a major reason for failure was not pumping out the tanks. He stated the required pump out the County enacted would help alleviate this problem.

Dale Allen, Stafford Utilities Department, stated the Board of Supervisors has referred the item of coming up with a maintenance program to the Utilities Commission.

Mrs. Carlone asked what else could be done besides pump and haul.

Mr. Thompson stated they would have to look at what was causing the problem and what the correct solution would be.

Mr. Cook stated section E should read “percent of the primary drainfield capacity and in case of alternative system the reserve shall be no less than twenty-five hundred square feet”.

Mr. Judy stated the word “and” should be replaced with the word “but.” He asked if it was possible to make an exception for someone building a two bedroom home.

Mr. Cook asked if another Public Hearing was required.

Mr. Judy stated another Public Hearing was not required.

Mr. Mitchell asked what the average monthly cost was on a conventional pump and haul.

Mr. Allen stated the cost was three dollars and twenty-nine cents per thousand gallons.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Ordinance O06-02 to the full commission with recommendation for approval. Mrs. Carlone seconded the motion.

Mr. Pitzel suggested a modification to base the size of the drainfield on the number of bedrooms in the home as done in O06-53. He suggested making the drainfield size requirement two thousand square feet instead of four thousand feet.

Mr. Cook asked if it would be feasible to withdrawal the motion and add a sub-paragraph for two bedroom homes.

Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006

Mr. Harvey stated the homeowner could apply for a waiver requests if they needed something less than the standard.

Mrs. Carlone asked what would happen when the home was sold to a new owner.

Mr. Stepowany stated this was the reason the Ordinance required a minimum area not the number of bedrooms. He stated we do not know what they are building until the plans are received.

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

2. Amendment to Utility Ordinance - Amendment to Section 25-165, Type, Capacity, Location, Etc., of the Utility Ordinance, pursuant to O06-23. The proposed amendment establishes minimum standards for private sewage disposal systems on all lots. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mr. Allen stated the Utilities Commission divided the Ordinance into two Ordinances. He stated it required disposal fields installed deeper then sixty inches to receive secondary effluent. He stated all new septic tanks and pump chambers to be fitted with precast cover over the outlet. He stated this would apply to new structures and would only apply to existing structures if the homeowner had to repair or replace the septic tank. He stated they would also be required to provide at grade access. He stated land disturbance would not be permitted once the Health Department has identified the drainfield.

Mr. Pitzel asked if a permit was needed for repair.

Mr. Thompson stated an application was required for repair.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the homeowner was allowed to keep their Occupancy Permit.

Mr. Thompson stated they could suspend the operations permit. He stated many times they will put the citizen on emergency pump and haul.

Mr. Pitzel asked what the cost to the homeowner was to put on an effluent filter.

Mr. Thompson stated it was about three hundred dollars.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the precast riser was concrete.

Mr. Allen stated concrete was durable.

Mr. Pitzel asked what the cost was to install a precast concrete riser.

Mr. Thompson stated he did not know the cost.

Mr. Mitchell stated locking into a precast riser made of concrete was not a good idea.

Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006

Mrs. Kirby stated the Ordinance could be changed at a later date.

Mr. Cook stated at 6:45 the Planning Commission would proceed to Ordinance Committee.

Mr. Harvey stated the Ordinance language applied when new septic tanks were put in or when there was a repair.

Mr. Thompson stated precast can not be added to a septic system.

Mr. Pitzel stated that to add a precast riser you would need a whole new septic tank.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 5-1. (Mr. Mitchell voted no) (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

3. Amendment to Utility Ordinance - Amendment to Section 25-165, Type, Capacity, Location, Etc., of the Utility Ordinance, pursuant to O06-53. The amendment establishes minimum standards for private sewage disposal systems on all existing lots recorded prior to the adoption of this ordinance. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mr. Allen stated the Ordinance would require reserve drainfields for every installation where there are sufficient soils on the sight. He stated the Ordinance says you must provide a reserve area equal in capacity to the primary. He stated if there was not room for the primary and reserve you should save at least what area was left over for repair. He stated you have to size your house so you can have space for a reserve drainfield.

Mr. Cook stated this Ordinance reads "if a reserve drainfield" but the Subdivision Ordinance stated a reserve drainfield was required.

Mr. Allen stated this was for existing lots, created before a reserve drainfield was required.

Mr. Rhodes arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Mr. Pitzel asked if this was for all lots or just occupied lots.

Mr. Harvey stated this was for all lots that were recorded.

Mr. Pitzel asked when a property owner has their septic system repaired, and does not have one hundred percent reserve area, would they lose their Occupancy Permit.

Mrs. Carlone stated the owner would have to provide a reserve to the best extent possible.

Mr. Pitzel stated that needed to be made clear in the Ordinance.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to approve. Mrs. Kirby seconded.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to clarify the language.

Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006

Mr. Harvey stated Utilities Department would have to make sure regulations are met.

Mr. Thompson stated when a repair was required, they would look for an area that could provide a one hundred percent reserve drainfield.

The motion passed 6-1. (Mr. Mitchell was opposed).

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Item 1

Mr. Stepowany stated Item 1 was sent from the Board of Supervisors regarding changes to proffers. He stated to what extent proffers could be changed before a new public hearing was required.

Mr. Judy stated the State Code was changed to provide more authority to the Board concerning changes in proffers. He stated the Board could authorize changes to proffers without another public hearing as long as the proffer changes did not materially affect the overall proposal.

Mr. Mitchell asked what the definition of “materially” was.

Mr. Judy stated he discussed the topic with colleagues and there were varied responses. He stated you know it when you see it.

Mr. Mitchell asked if someone proffered ten thousand dollars, then during the hearing proffered twelve thousand, would that be a material change.

Mr. Judy stated a material example would be the density on the project. He stated in each individual case there may be something that comes up which would need to be evaluated at that time.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to set Item 1 for Public Hearing. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated the Public Hearing would be October 4, 2006.

Item 2

Mr. Stepowany stated the Board of Zoning Appeals recommended clarifying non-conformities. He stated if the home was non-conforming in the front, the owner could request a special exception to expand a house as long as you were not expanding onto the side of the home which was non-conforming.

Mr. Rhodes made a motion to set Item 2 for Public Hearing. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
September 6, 2006***

Mr. Cook stated Item 2 would go to Public Hearing on October 4, 2006.

Item 3

Mr. Stepowany stated the Commissioner of Revenue has requested a Key Map stating 1 inch equals 400 feet. He stated Geographic Information Systems (GIS) would request a new disk if a plat was revised after the first submission. He stated the applicant could no longer pay the fee, but would have to submit the digital data.

Mr. Di Peppe stated this would streamline the process.

Mr. Pitzel stated at submission the digital data could go right into our system.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Item 3 to Public Hearing. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated Item 3 would be set for Public Hearing on October 4, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p. m.

William Cook
Chairman

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 6, 2006

The regular meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 6, 2006, was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chamber of the Stafford County Administration Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cook, Kirby, Pitzel, Mitchell, Carlone, Di Peppe, and Rhodes

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Judy, Gregori, and Baker

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. CUP2600450; Conditional Use Permit; Staybridge Suites - A Conditional Use Permit for an increase to the maximum floor area ratio from 0.40 to 0.89 for a six-story hotel with 76 rooms on Assessor's Parcel 21-51A, consisting of 1.47 acres, located on the east side of Jefferson Davis Highway approximately 700 feet north of Washington Drive within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: December 5, 2006)**

Mrs. Baker presented the staff report. She stated the property would be accessed from the future Coachman Circle and a right-in on Jefferson Davis Highway. She stated section 28-38(I) of the Zoning Ordinance allowed for an increase in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for hotels. She stated there would be no commercial apartments and no lights or signage above thirty-five feet. She stated the lighting would be directed away from residential properties and Jefferson Davis Highway, and the occupancy permit would not be issued until Coachman Circle was constructed. She stated the recommended land use was Urban Commercial and the use fits in with the established commercial development pattern. She stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the parking area would be increased.

Mrs. Baker stated the parking area was based on the number of rooms.

Mr. Cook asked why the applicant did not ask for an increase in the FAR at the time of rezoning.

Mr. Clay Grogan, Parker Design Group, stated the initial plan was to have seventy-five rooms with five stories. He stated the FAR was to make the rooms larger.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the property to be subdivided for 7-Eleven was under contract.

Mr. Grogan stated yes.

Mrs. Carlone stated she would like to see sidewalks in front of the 7-Eleven and the hotel as well as exterior landscaping.

Mr. Grogan stated there were conditions in place to extend the sidewalks across the front of both lots. He stated both buildings would have similar architectural treatments and landscaping.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mrs. Carlone asked when Coachman Circle would be completed.

Mr. Grogan stated Coachman Circle would be completed in three to four months. He stated the hotel was anticipating a spring groundbreaking.

Mrs. Carlone asked why they wanted a gas station next to a hotel.

Mr. Grogan stated that a convenience store next to a hotel worked well together.

Mr. Pitzel asked what the unmarked structure was on the plan.

Mr. Grogan stated that was the Stormwater Management structure for the entire site.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the Stormwater structure was underground.

Mr. Grogan stated yes.

Mrs. Kirby asked if any lights would be movable or neon.

Mr. Grogan stated no.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the hotel was an extended stay hotel.

Mr. Grogan stated he did not know.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the building was brick or what the color scheme would be.

Mr. Grogan stated he could not provide further insight. He stated the building had to match the artist rendition.

Mrs. Kirby asked what style roof would be on the hotel.

Mr. Grogan stated it would be a standing seam roof.

Mrs. Kirby asked what color the roof would be.

Mr. Grogan stated he did not know.

Mr. Di Peppe stated this was the 7-Eleven that was not facing Route 1. He stated he thought the hotel was directly across from 7-Eleven. He stated the higher density was because a piece was subdivided off for the 7-Eleven.

Mr. Grogan stated the FAR changed because of the subdivision for the 7-Eleven lot and to allow an increase in the room size to make them more accommodating.

Mrs. Kirby stated they were told that the 7-Eleven was going to be built at the same time as the hotel.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mr. Grogan stated they would be built at the same time.

Mrs. Kirby stated the Planning Commission was told the 7-Eleven was not going to be a part of the hotel. She stated that was why the hotel wanted the FAR.

Mr. Grogan stated it was possible to get seventy-five rooms within five floors and increase the FAR.

Mr. Cook asked if the deceleration lane was part of the proffers.

Mr. Grogan stated the previous proffers called for a deceleration lane and a right turn lane onto Coachman Circle.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Mitchell stated he was for new business. He stated in his opinion the item should be kept in committee until there were answers concerning the architecture on the building.

Mr. Grogan stated the roof would be a charcoal gray.

Mrs. Baker stated she did include the Ordinance O05-51 which was clear on the architectural standards.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion to put Item 1 in committee.

Mrs. Kirby suggested having an extended hotel in connection with Quantico would be beneficial. She seconded the motion to hold Item 1 in committee.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Planning Commission needed a better rendition of what the rooms and building would look like.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to see the scale between the 7-Eleven and the hotel, as well as the color of the hotel.

Mr. Cook stated Item 1 would be discussed at the September 20, 2006 Planning Commission Work Session.

The motion passed 7-0.

2. CUP2501580; Conditional Use Permit; McDonald's - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a drive-through facility within the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District for McDonald's Restaurant on Assessor's Parcels 19-73A and 19-73B, consisting of 1.7 acres, located on the southeastern corner of Garrisonville Road and Shelton Shop Road within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: December 5, 2006)**

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mrs. Baker presented the staff report. She stated the applicant's proposal was to replace the current McDonald's restaurant and drive-through with a new 4,018 square foot building with a drive-through in the same location. She stated there would be a right of way dedication on Garrisonville Road seventy-two inches from the centerline and a right of way dedication of Shelton Shop Road fifty-six and a half inches from the centerline. She stated there would be two access points, one on Garrisonville Road and one on Wolverine Way. She stated the proposed conditions of the CUP would be limited access points, right of way dedication, drive through location as shown on the Generalized Development Plan and oriented as to not impede traffic circulation, building constructed in general conformance with renderings, dumpster enclosure materials to match the building, and no carnival style flags or banners on the site. She stated the recommended land use was Urban Commercial and the use fits with the established commercial development pattern. She stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Cook stated the original was built before the Highway Corridor Overlay District went in, so the site would be grandfathered.

Mrs. Baker stated McDonald's was expanding; therefore it could not be grandfathered.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about the student traffic on Wolverine Way. She asked if VDOT had any comments.

Mrs. Baker stated the entrances were not going to be changed and would remain in the current locations.

Mrs. Kirby stated the application said the size of the building was 4,284 square feet but the Generalized Development Plan stated the size was 4,018 square feet.

Mrs. Baker stated the size of the building was reduced to 4,018 square feet.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there would be any segregation between the drive-through and parking areas.

Mr. Rhodes asked when the original was built.

Mrs. Baker stated the late 1980's or early 1990's.

Mr. Jay du Von, representing the applicant, stated McDonald's was eighteen years old. He stated the current CUP would provide more seating for customers. He stated the new site would provide more parking and a full drive-through lane around the building.

Mrs. Carlone stated in her opinion Wolverine Way was a bad road.

Mr. du Von stated Wolverine Way carried about thirteen hundred trips a day.

Mrs. Kirby stated there was a lot of traffic in that area. She stated she would like to see the sidewalks go all the way across on Route 610. She stated someone making a right into the McDonald's may not see the person backing out of the parking space.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mr. du Von stated the lower limbs of the trees would be removed so the person backing out of the parking space would be able to see a car turning in.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would like to make sure there was plenty of space for trash.

Mr. du Von stated McDonald's would accommodate that.

Mrs. Kirby stated she did not like the dove white on the building and suggested beige or earth tone would look better.

Mr. du Von stated the white could be eliminated or they could do a two-tone brick.

Mrs. Kirby stated the two-tone yellow sign had to be changed.

Mr. du Von stated the "M's" have to remain yellow. He stated the sign would be monument style.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he liked the ideas Mrs. Kirby had. He stated they have been trying to improve the designs in the area. He stated they wanted to create higher standards for Stafford County. He asked what the corporation could do to make site more community friendly.

Mr. du Von suggested a softer burgundy for the awnings.

Mrs. Kirby stated the landscaping was good.

Mr. Rhodes stated McDonald's did a great job with landscaping and he would like to see it expanded around the property.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

With no one coming forward, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Rhodes stated McDonald's was a great neighbor and supporters of the local schools. He made a motion for approval.

Mr. du Von stated they would agree to the conditions set forth.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the drawings could be given to the Planning Commission by September 20, 2006.

Mr. du Von stated yes.

Mr. Rhodes withdrew his motion and made a motion to put Item 2 in committee to be discussed at the September 20, 2006 Planning Commission Work Session. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

3. RC2600183; Reclassification; Ferry Farm Plaza - A proposed reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to SC, Suburban Commercial Zoning District to allow the construction of commercial uses on Assessor's Parcels 55-61 and 55-63A consisting of 6 acres, located on the southwest corner of White Oak Road and Ferry Road within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: December 5, 2006)**

Mrs. Baker presented the staff report. She stated the development proposal consisted of a thirty-nine thousand square foot commercial retail building and a three thousand seven hundred fifty square foot commercial retail building with a drive-through. She stated the maximum building height would be thirty-five feet. She stated there would be two entrances, a full access on Ferry Road and a right in/right out on White Oak Road. She stated the Traffic Impact Analysis recommended a right of dedication consistent with the Transportation Plan. She stated there would be construction of a northbound left turn lane on Ferry Road at White Oak Road and at the site entrance. She stated there would be construction of an eastbound right-turn lane on White Oak Road at Ferry Road. She stated the proffers included transportation improvements, a sidewalk along White Oak Road and Ferry Road, a two inch median extension at the entrance on White Oak Road, monument signs coordinated with building materials, and fire sprinkler system for all buildings. She stated they would demolish existing structure within 180 days and limit delivery hours. She stated the land use designation was agricultural which was inconsistent with the Land Use Plan. She stated staff does not recommend approval of the reclassification.

Mr. Pitzel asked for clarification from staff concerning the location of the median on White Oak Road.

Mrs. Baker stated the median would extend to prevent vehicles from coming across Meyers Drive and turning in.

Mr. Pitzel stated the extension goes far enough to prevent people from coming out of Meyers Drive. He would like to thank staff for recommending Suburban Commercial zoning.

Debrae Karnes, representing the applicant, stated she was glad to be back in Stafford County. She stated the reclassification would help reduce vehicular trips in the area since the area was currently developed with commercial uses. She stated Suburban Commercial uses were recommended at major intersections and the proposed reclassification would be served by sewer and would need a lateral. She stated in the event there was not a lateral; the application would need a 22-32 review. She stated there would be substantial transportation improvements to the intersection. She stated they would provide dedication of right of way, left turn lane on White Oak Road to Ferry Road and 2 left turn lanes on Ferry Road. She stated the architectural design was proffered.

Mr. Di Peppe stated currently there were problems in the morning and late afternoon at the White Oak Road/Ferry Road intersection. He stated he would like to Ferry Road widened.

Mrs. Kirby asked why they choose the name Ferry Farm Plaza.

Mrs. Karnes stated the applicant would consider other names.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mrs. Kirby stated there was a house built in 1946 on the property. She asked why they were going to destroy the house and stated it needed to be documented.

Mrs. Karnes stated they were going to utilize the land for its maximum value. She stated they would document the house.

Mrs. Kirby stated there was a perennial stream on the property.

Mrs. Karnes stated she did not have any information on that. She stated all requirements would be followed if there was a stream on the property.

Mrs. Kirby stated the staff report stated there was an eight inch sewer line located along White Oak Road and the line currently ends at Cannon Ridge subdivision and would need to be extended to this site.

Mrs. Karnes stated the applicant intended to do a private lateral.

Mrs. Kirby asked what they intended to do with the property. She stated the community would like to see a Department of Motor Vehicles building and a doctor's office. She asked what type of material would be on the building.

Mrs. Karnes stated the building would be white brick or precast masonry.

Mrs. Kirby stated there would be no concrete. She stated she would like to something tied down on concrete.

Mrs. Karnes stated there was no perennial stream on site.

Mr. Pitzel stated he did not like the name. He stated if you look at the traffic counts, you have a lot of traffic making a right turn. He stated the people turning right get backed up from the traffic going straight through the light on White Oak Road. He asked what the development schedule was.

Mrs. Karnes stated she did not know.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to see an elevation view of the entire building. He stated the white was very stark.

Mrs. Carlone asked when the stream study was performed.

Mr. Leming stated there was not a stream on the property.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the stream was intermittent.

Mr. Cook asked what limited delivery hours were.

Mrs. Karnes stated the delivery hours were from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mr. Cook asked how a commercial building could have a private lateral.

Wes Tyree, Dewberry & Davis, stated the property was owned by one person, who would be paying the fee for the lateral that would go from the site to the existing sanitary sewer on the site.

Mr. Pitzel asked what the construction material was.

Mr. Tyree stated it would be brick or precast concrete.

Mr. Pitzel asked about establishing the right turn lane.

Mr. Tyree stated the right turn lane was askew, if you propose to make a right turn lane it would have to be taken from the 7-Eleven side in order to make the alignment proper and make the right turn function properly.

Mr. Leming stated they did not have control of the right of way.

Mr. Pitzel stated he thought the Planning Commission had given permission to extend sewer to the 7-Eleven.

Mr. Leming stated that 7-Eleven had the right to sewer.

Mr. Pitzel stated the sewer ended at Cannon Ridge.

Mr. Tyree stated the sewer crosses Ferry Road and White Oak Road.

Mr. Pitzel stated the line terminates at the 7-Eleven.

Mr. Leming stated the 7-Eleven has not tapped into the line.

Mr. Di Peppe asked the actual, physical pipe was there.

Mr. Leming stated yes.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

Gary Sitzman stated he was not in favor of Ferry Farm Plaza. He stated Woodlawn and Ferry Farm Shopping Centers were not overflowing with activity and the new Giant Shopping Center did not have much activity. He stated if the item was approved, then the developer should pay for the sewer. He stated White Oak Road was scheduled to become four lanes and this would become a problem. He stated in his opinion the current intersection was a fiasco.

Bill Johnson stated he sees this as an opportune time for the County to get some road improvements paid for by a developer. He stated there are three corners of the intersection in business use. He stated the economy would bring more business back to the other shopping centers in the area.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Carlton Beach stated he was not in favor of Ferry Farm Plaza. He stated they are looking for a community friendly commercial building. He stated if you are in the Kendallwood area and looked straight across White Oak Road there was a stream on the proposed property. He stated he would like to know where the storm water run-off would be going and the hours of operation of the businesses in Ferry Farm Plaza. He stated there are cedar trees on the back of the property and they would like the trees to remain on the property line. He stated a fence along the property would help with security.

Louellen Whitefeather Young Silver stated the name was not good. She suggested the name Jett Farm, White Oak Road Center, Stage Coach Shopping Center, or the Two Rivers Shopping Center. She stated the community did not need another nail salon, pizza parlor, or ABC store. She stated they would like to see a Medic One or a pharmacy in the area. She stated the house on the property should not be destroyed and suggested they need to look at the house on the property again.

With no one else coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Karnes stated they would provide a revised a rendering of the building. She stated they would speak with Mr. Beach and contact staff to determine if there was a stream on the property. She stated Wendy Wheatcraft, Historical Preservation Planner, would look at the home on property. She stated they would speak with the engineers concerning the traffic solution.

Mrs. Carlone asked about the fencing.

Mrs. Karnes stated they would consider the fencing.

Mr. Pitzel asked about keeping the cedar trees in place.

Mrs. Karnes stated they would look into that.

Mr. Cook stated Mrs. Kirby suggested many uses they would not like to see and asked if they could proffer out certain uses.

Mr. Di Peppe stated they needed to work with the community. He stated saving the cedar trees was good for the community.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to see a complete list of facing surfaces for the building.

Mrs. Karnes stated they would provide a better rendition of the building and more information on the materials.

Mr. Di Peppe suggested they contact D.P. Newton.

Mrs. Kirby stated there may be some colonial history on the property.

Mrs. Carlone asked if they could proffer a covered bus stop.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to see a bus stop there.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

Mr. Pitzel made a motion to put Item 3 in committee. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated Item 3 would be discussed at the October 18, 2006 Planning Commission Work Session.

4. RC2600334; Reclassification; Yusufi Property - A proposed reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District for office/retail on Assessor's Parcel 19-24 consisting of 0.62 acres, located on the south side of Garrisonville Road approximately 1,100 feet west of Shelton Shop Road within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: December 5, 2006)**

Mrs. Baker presented the staff report. She stated the property would consist of a nine thousand square foot, 2 story commercial retail brick and glass building. She stated there would be access to Soaring Eagle Road if permitted by the owner of the private road. She stated the land was designated Urban Commercial and was consistent with the Land Use Plan. She stated the applicant proffered eight feet of right-of-way dedication, the building materials, limited uses in B-2 district, access to Soaring Eagle if feasible, and demolish the existing structure within 180 days of rezoning. She stated the staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Kirby stated the application read that the building would be used for auto sales.

Mrs. Baker stated the use would be commercial retail.

Mrs. Carlone stated the rezoning was speculative. She asked what would go in the building as retail. She stated she was concerned about the restroom being unisex. She stated she would like to know what was intended for the building.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to know what was specifically planned for the building. He stated no rendering of the building was provided to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mitchell stated there would be one restroom for five hundred people. He stated the square footage of the building was larger than the McDonald's.

Mr. Rhodes asked what the access point would be if not Soaring Eagle. He asked what the eight feet of right of way dedication was for.

Mrs. Baker stated the access would be off of Garrisonville Road. She stated the eight feet of right of way was dedicated when the adjoining property was developed. She stated eight feet was required.

Mr. Rhodes asked if this would provide for a sidewalk or third lane.

Mr. Harvey stated when VDOT did the widening for four lanes; they took some extra right of way.

Mr. Cook asked Mrs. Baker to address the letter received from Tricord Development, an abutting property owner.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006*

Mrs. Baker stated the letter stated the applicant did need to work with Tricord because Soaring Eagle was a private road.

Mrs. Kirby asked why the sidewalk was not shown.

Mrs. Baker stated the sidewalk was required.

Mr. Cook stated Item 4 would need to be put in committee.

Akhtar Yusufi, the applicant, stated he wanted to bring a business to Stafford County. He stated he would like to work in Stafford County. He stated he came to the Planning Department in 2005 to ask what he could do on the property. He stated the master plan designated the property B-2. He stated they went with a low-density use and he wanted to build a nice brick and glass building. He stated he was willing to work with architect.

Mrs. Kirby stated the Planning Commission wanted to know what the building was going to look like. She stated a sidewalk needed to be placed in front of the building and down Soaring Eagle. She stated she would like to know what was going in the building. She stated they would like to see a doctor's office in the area. She stated the applicant should contact Tricord to work with them.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to put Item 4 in committee. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated Item 4 would be discussed at the October 18, 2006 Work Session.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

5. SUB2501328; Ellison Estates Section 2, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 7 single family residential lots, zoned A-2, consisting of 9.97 acres, located at the north end of proposed Ellison Court and approximately 1,100 feet west of Jefferson Davis Highway and 1,300 feet north of American Legion Road on Assessor's Parcel 38-45H, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: May 24, 2006) (Deferred to October 18, 2006 at applicant's request)**

Mr. Cook stated the applicant sent a letter requesting a deferral.

6. Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – A proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan text and map component of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment would redesignate Assessor's Parcel 46-62 from Agricultural to Institutional Use and be included in the Urban Service Area. The proposed amendment would be for the purpose of constructing a public high school. Agricultural use permits single family residential

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

development at a density of one (1) dwelling unit per three (3) acres. Institutional use would permit development which serves a public or social function, including schools. **(Deferred until further documentation is available)**

Mr. Cook stated Item 6 was deferred until further documentation was provided by the Federal Aviation Administration. He stated the Planning Commission had received a memo from VDOT on Land Development Review.

7. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance - Amendment to Section 22-118, Water and Sewer, of the Subdivision Ordinance, pursuant to O06-02. The proposed amendment establishes minimum area requirements for primary and reserve drain fields. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mr. Cook stated Items 7, 8, and 9 were discussed at the Work Session and sent to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Item 7 to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 5-2 (Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Pitzel were opposed).

8. Amendment to Utility Ordinance - Amendment to Section 25-165, Type, Capacity, Location, Etc., of the Utility Ordinance, pursuant to O06-23. The proposed amendment establishes minimum standards for private sewage disposal systems on all lots. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Item 8 to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mr. Mitchell was opposed).

9. Amendment to Utility Ordinance - Amendment to Section 25-165, Type, Capacity, Location, Etc., of the Utility Ordinance, pursuant to O06-53. The amendment establishes minimum standards for private sewage disposal systems on all existing lots recorded prior to the adoption of this ordinance. **(Deferred to September 6, 2006 Work Session)**

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Item 9 to the Board with a recommendation for approval. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mr. Mitchell was opposed).

10. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance - Amendment to Section 22-153, Lots for Water and Sewer Mains, of the Subdivision Ordinance, pursuant to O06-62. The proposed amendment would require all water and sewer easements, in their entirety, serving water and/or sewer mains between lots in a residential subdivision to be located on lots conveyed to and maintained by a homeowners association. The width of the easement shall be in accordance with Chapter 25 and Chapter 26.2 of the Stafford County Code. **(Deferred at staff's request)**

Mr. Cook stated item 10 was deferred.

Planning Commission Minutes

September 6, 2006

NEW BUSINESS:

None

MINUTES

April 19, 2006 Special Meeting

Mr. Pitzel stated Nan Rollison contacted him concerning a presentation she made at the April, 19, 2006 Special Meeting. He stated the presentation was on Page 7, paragraph 3.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval with the corrections requested by Mr. Pitzel. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

April 26, 2006 Work Session

Mr. Rhodes made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

April 26, 2006 Regular Meeting

Mr. Pitzel stated the April 26, 2006 meeting was not a special meeting. He stated on Page 3, after Item 2, "Mr. Cook stated Item 2 was cancelled" should read "the Public Hearing was cancelled."

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval with corrections. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

May 3, 2006 Work Session

Mrs. Kirby stated on Page 3 the statement read "Mr. Gollahon stated he would like to make the fence in this location as part of the record plat with upkeep by the Home Owner's Association, the lot owner or the Finall Family." She stated the Planning Commission would not have let that passed. She stated they would have requested to know who would be responsible for the upkeep of the fence.

Mr. Cook stated they would discuss the May 3, 2006 Work Session Minutes at the September 20, 2006 meeting.

May 3, 2006 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

May 17, 2006 Work Session

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

May 17, 2006 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated a letter was received by the Planning Commission stating that Dogwood Airpark no longer objects to the Forbes Landing project. He stated they also received a letter from residents at Abel Lake.

Mrs. Carlone stated on September 18, 2006 at 10:30 a.m. there would be Reservoir Overlay Committee meeting in the Economic Development Conference Room.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting the Mid-Atlantic Conditional Use Permit was approved with a number of additional conditions regarding buffering, fencing, and modifications of the type of brick that would be used. He stated the Board passed the Rezoning and CUP for the bank and the small commercial property on Route 17 and the Rezoning for Widewater Heights was deferred. He stated Westlake was not taken up at the Board meeting; it was deferred to a later date to clear up some proffers. He stated Brentsmill was deferred to a later date for discussion of proffers.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Judy stated he passed out a study of the secondary effects of Adult Businesses other localities had experienced.

SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

No report.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Pitzel stated a goals and objectives statement was sent to the consultant. He stated Public Input Meetings would be held on October 11, 2006 at Rodney Thompson Middle School and on October 12, 2006 at Ferry Farm Elementary.

Mr. Di Peppe stated they were using print media, public access, and the website to alert people of the upcoming public input meetings. He stated he would like to thank Harry Lee, Shirley Hime, and Bill Lee for all their help.

Mr. Pitzel stated on September 11, 2006 there would be a Green Space TDR environmental meeting and on September 18, 2006 they would have a Historic Resources meeting. He stated on September 25, 2006 there would be an Affordable Housing meeting. He stated on October 2, 2006 there would be a meeting about schools. He stated on October 10, 2006 there would be a Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting with the consultant.

Mr. Rhodes stated there was a great article developed for a Stafford Council for Progress publication. He stated the Board and Planning Commission should receive copies of the Talking Points and the article written by Mr. Di Peppe.

Mr. Pitzel stated the goal was to have the Comprehensive Plan completed by February 2007.

***Planning Commission Minutes
September 6, 2006***

CONSENT AGENDA

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Di Peppe stated he had some Ordinances in the works and would discuss them with Mr. Harvey.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Cook stated they needed to vote on the Ordinance for amending proffers.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to send Ordinance O06-79 to Public Hearing on October 4, 2006. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion send Ordinance O06-80 to Public Hearing on October 4, 2006. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to send Ordinance O06-81 to Public Hearing on October 4, 2006. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated Mrs. Kirby and Mrs. Carlone would like to attend the Towering Concerns meeting on September 7, 2006 from 7:00-9:00.

Mr. Mitchell asked if a copy of the Land Development Review had been sent to the School Board.

Mr. Harvey stated he sent an electronic copy.

Mrs. Kirby stated Route 610 had put up a billboard which was electronic. She stated the billboard changed colors and caught the eye of the driver. She asked Mr. Judy to look into it.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

William Cook
Chairman