

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
November 14, 2012

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, November 14, 2012, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the County Administrative Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rhodes, Hiron, Apicella, Boswell, Hazard, Gibbons, and Schwartz

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Zuraf, Blackburn and Knighting

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Boswell stated two of the items on the agenda were for automobile repair and he was an owner of automobile repair. He stated he could be fair in making his decision.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Rhodes opened the public presentations. With no one coming forward to speak he closed the public presentation and moved on to item 1.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP1200282; Conditional Use Permit – Celebrate VA Merchant’s Tire – A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an Automobile Service Facility in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on Assessor's Parcel 44Y-15B. The property consists of 0.68 acres located on the south side of Warrenton Road, approximately 700 feet east of Celebrate Virginia Parkway within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: February 12, 2013)**

Mike Zuraf gave the presentation and stated this request was for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an Automobile Service Facility in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on Assessor's Parcel 44Y-15B. He stated the property consists of 0.68 acres and the applicant was Pavilion MT-South Stafford, LLC. The site was located on the south side of Warrenton Road, between Celebrate Virginia Parkway and Banks Ford Parkway. The site was zoned B-2, and all surrounding property were also zoned B-2. Other nearby zoning includes M-1, Light Industrial, which was setback from Warrenton Road. He stated no vehicle access shall be permitted directly from Warrenton Road. The Generalized Development Plan submitted with the application proposed a single-story, 6,922 square-foot Merchant’s Tire and Auto Center, with 8 service bays. The service bays and parking were located on the east side. Warrenton Road was previously improved to meet VDOT’s future plans for widening of Route 17. Through the application process, the site would not generate enough traffic to warrant a detailed Traffic Impact Assessment. According to the applicant’s GDP, the site would provide landscaping in accordance with the requirements of the County’s Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening. In addition, the HCOD standards require screening of any service bays from view of the corridor highway. This was being addressed by providing fencing. The service bays facing east would be screened by a 6 foot board on board fence. He stated the fence may be removed should the adjacent parcel develop in a manner that screens the service bays from view of Warrenton Road. He gave a brief overview of the proposed conditions and stated the proposed conditions would help offset any potential impacts the automobile service facility use might have within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. The Land

*Planning Commission Minutes
November 14, 2012*

Use Plan Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan designated the property as a Commercial Corridor within a Suburban Land Use Area. Commercial Corridors were intended to encourage commercial activities where there were adequate transportation facilities to accommodate proposed uses. Infill development and the reuse of underdeveloped commercial sites were encouraged. Her stated staff believed the proposed development was consistent with the recommended future land use. The property lies within the Southern Gateway Redevelopment Area. The RDA Plan included a land use concept for a portion of the area that included a grid street system to optimize pedestrian and vehicle circulation; mixed-use blocks with enclosed parking to foster residential and office uses over first floor commercial, open space, and pedestrian friendly environments. Staff recommended the building be moved forward towards Route 17 and applicant moved the building slightly closer to Warrenton Road although parking spaces were still located in front of the building. He stated staff believed the use was still appropriate for this location and meets most of the recommendations in the redevelopment area plan. Staff recommended approval with conditions as proposed in Resolution R12-354 and found that it was in conformance with the standards of issuance for a Conditional Use Permit, consistent with adjacent urban commercial uses and established development pattern, and the proposed conditions were not intended to mitigate negative impacts.

Mr. Gibbons asked for clarification on the RDA. Mr. Zuraf stated it was an overlay that was part of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gibbons asked Mr. Zuraf if he would send him the hierarchy.

Mrs. Hazard asked if the sign labeled letter "O" would have to be approved under a separate zoning category. Mr. Zuraf stated it would have to be identified on the site plan, but there would be a separate building permit required for the sign itself.

Mr. Apicella asked if the applicant was aware of the proposed conditions and if they were willing to accept them. Mr. Zuraf stated yes, he provided the applicant the proposed conditions and they were acceptable to the applicant.

Dr. Schwartz asked Mr. Zuraf if he could review the plan for the used tire pile. Mr. Zuraf stated towards the back of the site there were 2 areas shown, one consisted of a typical dumpster enclosure and adjacent to that was an area where used tires would be stored. He stated that would also be within the same type of block enclosure. Dr. Schwartz asked if there was a connecting parking lot to the future development. Mr. Zuraf stated yes there was a parking lot.

Mr. Rhodes asked the applicant to come forward and asked him if he had any comments.

Todd Carr stated his only comment was in regards to the fence and landscaping. He stated there was quite a bit of landscaping in the plan and the trees would grow overtime and provide screening as well.

Mr. Gibbons stated when he saw Merchants Tire on television he always saw NTB, but he did not see that in the application. Mr. Carr stated the company was actually TBC, Tire Battery Corporation, which consisted of NTB, Merchant's, Tire Kingdom in Florida, there was a franchise out west called Big O, and have recently bought Midas.

Mr. Rhodes opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward, he closed the public comment portion.

Mrs. Hazard stated since this was in the Hartwood District it was great to hear the applicant responded to staff's comment about moving it a bit and worked with staff. She stated it appears this was in compliance with where they wanted to go in this part of the county. She made a motion to recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit CUP1200282 to allow the automobile service facility with the proposed conditions represented on page 6 of 8 of the staff report. Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7 to 0.

2. CUP1200284; Conditional Use Permit – Celebrate VA Goodyear Tire – A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an Automobile Service Facility in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 44Y-16. The property consists of 1.14 acres located on the south side of Warrenton Road, and east side of Celebrate Virginia Parkway within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: February 12, 2013)**

Mike Zuraf gave the presentation and stated this item was a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an Automobile Service Facility in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 44Y-16. The property consisted of 1.14 acres and the applicant was McNeel Properties, LLC. The subject property was located on the south side of Warrenton Road, east side of Celebrate Virginia Parkway. The site and all surrounding properties were zoned B-2, Urban Commercial. The Generalized Development Plan submitted with the application proposed a single-story, 5,980 square foot Goodyear automobile service facility, with 8 service bays. The service bays were located on both sides of the building with drive aisles allowing for circulation around the building. The site would utilize one entrance from McWhirt Loop. No additional entrances were shown directly onto Warrenton Road or Celebrate Virginia Parkway. Warrenton Road was widened in accordance with VDOT's ultimate plans through the area. He stated the site did not generate enough traffic for a Traffic Impact Assessment. The HCOD standards required screening of any service bays from view of the corridor highway. The service bays facing west to Celebrate Virginia Parkway would be screened by requiring at least 50 percent evergreen trees. He gave a brief overview of the conditions proposed by staff. He stated the Land Use Plan Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan designates the property as a Commercial Corridor within a Suburban Area and the property lies within the Southern Gateway Redevelopment Area. In accordance with the land use concept, staff recommended the building be moved forward on the site with parking located to the rear. The applicant desired to keep parking in the front close to the main entrance to avoid conflicts between pedestrians and cars entering and exiting the service bays. Staff believed the automobile service facility use was a good fit for this area along Warrenton Road due to the proximity to existing highway oriented businesses and the surrounding traffic flow. He stated staff believed, with the recommended conditions, this Conditional Use Permit would help to enhance the site to be more compatible with the goals and standards set forth for the Highway Corridor Overlay District. Staff recommends approval of CUP1200284, with conditions as proposed in Resolution R12-356. Staff found it was in conformance with the standards of issuance for a Conditional Use Permit, consistent with adjacent urban commercial uses and established development pattern in the area, and the conditions would mitigate any negative impacts.

Mr. Apicella asked if the applicant was aware of the proposed conditions and if they agreed to them. Mr. Zuraf stated yes they were aware and were also in agreement with them.

Mr. Rhodes asked the applicant to come forward.

Walter Keenan Jr. stated he had no presentations or comments.

Mr. Rhodes opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward, he closed the public comment portion.

Mrs. Hazard stated she was happy to hear how the applicant worked with staff and she was impressed with the enhanced landscaping and fencing that was offered by the applicant to address some of those issues of where this was located. She made a motion to recommend approval of CUP1200284, Conditional Use Permit for Celebrate Virginia Goodyear Tire with the conditions presented by staff. Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 to 0.

3. CUP1200345; Conditional Use Permit – Carter’s Crossing Panera Bread – A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a restaurant with a drive-through facility within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 45T-2. The property is zoned B-2, Urban Commercial and consists of 0.94 acres, located on the south side of South Gateway Drive and east side of Stanstead Road within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: February 12, 2013)**

Susan Blackburn gave the presentation and stated this item was a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a restaurant with a drive-through facility within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 45T-2. The property was zoned B-2, Urban Commercial and consisted of 0.94 acres, located on the south side of South Gateway Drive and east side of Stanstead Road. The property was zoned B-2, Urban Commercial in 1978 and the surrounding area was zoned B -2 also. The site was currently an undeveloped out-parcel of the Carter’s Crossing Shopping Center development which was anchored by a Target department store. The property was accessed from Warrenton Road via South Gateway Drive and Stanstead Road. The GDP showed the parcel would be subdivided. The Generalized Development Plan submitted with the application proposes a single-story, 4,093 square foot restaurant with outside dining and a drive-through window. The plan also proposed an access drive running perpendicular between South Gateway Drive and Stanstead Road. The loading area was changed via staff’s comments, to become located at the northern part of the site to help screen the loading space from the highway corridor. It was decided that traffic would be directed via directional signage. She stated the applicant submitted building elevations for the proposed restaurant, which were the standard elevations for Panera Bread restaurants. She gave a brief overview of the proposed conditions and stated the Comprehensive Plan designates this property within the Southern Gateway Urban Development Area. The RDA Plan includes a land use concept for a portion of the area that included a grid street system to optimize pedestrian and vehicle circulation; mixed-use blocks with enclosed parking to foster residential and office uses over first floor commercial; open space, and pedestrian-friendly environments. In accordance with the land use concept, this design did include such features as an outdoor dining space for its patrons and a sidewalk along the perimeter of the property to promote a pedestrian-friendly environment. Although the proposed site layout did not conform to all the recommended site design elements of the Southern Gateway Urban Development Area and Redevelopment Plan, staff supports approval of CUP1200266 with the proposed conditions.

Mr. Gibbons stated he had concerns about the trucks not being allowed to deliver during operation hours. Mrs. Blackburn stated that suggestion was for a tractor trailer to make deliveries when during closed hours. The loading side was 25 feet long and staff was concerned that the trucks would block travel way during busy hours.

Mr. Apicella asked to what extent had the applicant reviewed the proposed conditions and did they agree with the conditions. Mrs. Blackburn stated the applicant read all of the conditions that were proposed and they were not in agreement with the tractor trailer loading during closed hours. Mr. Apicella asked if the applicant had indicated compromise. Mrs. Blackburn stated they had not gotten that far.

Mr. Rhodes asked the applicant to come forward.

Scott Little of Silver Companies stated they were thrilled that Panera Bread was interested in this site. They had a sense of urgency on this project. His only concern was the proposed condition for truck deliveries during closed hours. He stated that would unfairly burden and sort of cloud the operation. All deliveries were scheduled before operating hours open to the public. The amount of times that a truck would be on property during open to the public operating hours would be very limited, but it

*Planning Commission Minutes
November 14, 2012*

would be a little bit out of their control as to when a driver could show up a little late, so they schedule their deliveries before operating hours. He could not image a scenario where there would be a tractor trailer; they were typically 22 foot stake bed trucks. A tractor trailer truck was not their typical delivery truck. The facility did not accommodate that much goods and storage.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the applicant would be willing to make that a limitation. Mr. Little stated he was unsure that they would be able to control that forever because those were purveyors they were dealing with. Mr. Rhodes stated if a semi-truck came through, there was no way traffic would be able to come through. Mr. Little stated a compromise might be that they have a policy that they issue to their vendors that those deliveries were made before operating hours, but to have their Conditional Use Permit clouded with that restriction, that would be potentially out of their control and jeopardize their Conditional Use Permit, could be troublesome as an operator. Mr. Rhodes asked if he would typically look for places that would have more ingress and egress, especially with a drive-through option. Mr. Little stated this site could be viewed as a tight site. Chris Hornung stated this was a strange configuration for a road system, it was one that occurred by default. Standstead Road was the primary road into this site and it wrapped around the back of this site. McDonalds was already located on the road and they did not have the ability to relocate their public access. The road was changed from a full movement drive to a right in only, which was allowed by VDOT at the time, but as discussed with the Wawa there were many complicating factors in getting the road in and they were left without parcels that had no ideal access. From the standpoint of the trucks loading, most restaurants that they deal with have tractor trailer deliveries, but very few of them have tractor trailer loading spaces. The vast majority of fast food restaurants up and down Route 17 or any corridor, they would use tractor trailers for loading and unloading and they were not required by code to have tractor trailer loading spaces, but because those take place normally off hours, they drive into the parking lot and unload within 10 minutes. It did not necessarily mess up the operation of their service of patrons and they did not feel that it was a conflict. The applicant felt that the loading space was sufficient.

Mr. Apicella stated he was still concerned that if a tractor trailer arrived during operating hours where would it park and how would it impact the customers in the parking spaces around the facility. Mr. Hornung stated in the worst case a tractor trailer either would pull up into the parking lot and people would have to go around it or if they were along that road the road could be posted no loading or unloading during work hours within that road.

Dr. Schwartz stated there was a slight difference with the sketch that was in front of them tonight and the GPD as far as the existing developmental sign and monument sign that the applicant was proposing to put up and the drive-through sign was hidden behind the two. Mr. Hornung stated the drive-through sign that was shown on that exhibit really was not as important, but they were trying to keep as many people on South Gateway as possible to the second entrance because it was more logical at that point to come in and make a right versus taking Standstead Road and looping around. They could not put that sign in the right of way unless it was a blue sign like they proposed for Wawa and once it was put up they were unsure that VDOT would allow them the to put Panera with an arrow and drive-through. They could put up a sign that stated Panera straight ahead.

Mr. Apicella stated the applicant would still like to allow a tractor trailer deliveries but they would be amenable to establishing a policy strongly encouraging their vendors to do their deliveries after hours. He asked if the applicant would be willing to add to the extent that they deliver during work hours a 20 to 30 minute time limit for loading and unloading. Mr. Hornung stated they would be willing to include a policy and inform Panera of the deliver time limit requirements to be enforced. Mr. Apicella stated it would just be a policy not a condition in the CUP. Mr. Hornung stated he did not have concern about stressing the policy.

Mr. Rhodes opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward,

he closed the public comment portion. He stated he heard some commentary about modification to condition number 7, which might take it from being a restriction on deliveries with tractor trailers for before and after operating hours to a policy to encourage the time limit for delivery. A possible condition to make the drive-through signs consistent with the sign exhibit handed out dated November 14, 2012. Mr. Gibbons reminded him of the modifications of the turn in. Mr. Rhodes stated there was a modification associated with the concrete on the south side of the drive-through lane to preclude the ability to come straight in off of Standstead Road and immediately get into the drive-through lanes.

Dr. Schwartz made a motion for approval with modifications. Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion.

Mr. Rhodes gave clarification of the modification to condition number 7, stating the applicant/ operator would establish a policy for deliveries made by a tractor trailer to be scheduled before or after operating hours open to the public with a 30 minute time limit. Add a new condition number 10, which stated the location of the drive thru signs would be consistent with the sign exhibit dated November 14, 2012. A new condition number 11, which stated the concrete barrier at the south end of the drive-through lane would be configured and flared to discourage direct traffic off of Standstead Road immediately into the drive thru lane.

The motion passed 7 to 0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. RC1100261; Reclassification – Celebrate Virginia North Apartments - A proposal to (1) amend proffered conditions on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 52-1, zoned RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District, consisting of 36.79 acres, located on the south side of Scotts Ford Lane, 650 feet west of Celebrate Virginia Parkway and (2) reclassify from M-2, Heavy Industrial to RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District Assessor's Parcels 44-90 (portion), 44W-2 (portion), 44W-2A, 44W-2B, and 44W-5E, consisting of 91.56 acres, located on both sides of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, 1,100 feet south of Banks Ford Parkway. The combined parcels, subject to the proffer amendment and reclassification, consist of 128.35 acres and are within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 18, 2012) (History – October 10, 2012 deferred to October 24, 2012) (Deferred at October 24, 2012 to November 14, 2012)**

Mike Zuraf gave an update to the Commission and stated this item was a reclassification for Celebrate Virginia North Apartments. The reclassification request was to one, amend proffered conditions on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 52-1, zoned RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District, and two, reclassify from M-2, Heavy Industrial to RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District Assessor's Parcels 44-90 (portion), 44W-2 (portion), 44W-2A, 44W-2B, and 44W-5E. A public hearing on the application was conducted on September 19, 2012 and was continued to the next meeting on October 10, 2012, where the Commission closed the public hearing and deferred the request to their October 24, 2012 meeting. At the October 24, 2012 meeting, additional information was provided and the Commission deferred the request to this meeting. The Commission wished to defer making a decision until they found out about the status of the proposed RBC Ordinance amendment to allow multi-family dwellings as a by-right permitted use in the district. After an inquiry by the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors stated they would be reconsidering the request at their November 20, 2012 meeting. Should the Board initiate the amendment, it would be on the Planning Commission's November 28, 2012 agenda as a discussion item.

Mr. Rhodes stated while talking with the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, she indicated they would likely discuss the item and any potential modifications to the Ordinance. That would be

*Planning Commission Minutes
November 14, 2012*

dependent upon the will of the entire Board for determination of referring it to the Planning Commission for modification. If the Commission did receive it, their first opportunity at it would be November 28, 2012 and if they were to work on modifications they would have to hold a public hearing. Before the time limit expired on this item they would have one more meeting on December 12, 2012 they would know a little more, but would not have resolved or disposed of it. That would not be fully resolved by the time the Commission would have to act on this application.

Mr. Gibbons asked what actions the Commission could take and if multiple suggestions were available. Mr. Rhodes stated there was some discussion of the range of the possible but probably in a more practical and deliberate approaches the Commission could defer this item up until the end of the first session in December. The Commission would have a better sense of where the Board may be headed on the RBC but they would not have it resolved. Mr. Gibbons asked if was possible to forward it back to the Board and ask for them to send it back. Mr. Rhodes stated at any point the Commission could refer this item with their recommendations to the Board. Mr. Harvey stated the Commission could make a recommendation to stipulate that the Commission felt they did not have enough information without considering the Ordinance concurrently. Mr. Rhodes stated there were three options whenever they chose to take action within the next three sessions.

Mrs. Hazard stated she would like to hear the discussion at the November 20, 2012 meeting before moving this forward and made a motion to defer this item to the November 29, 2012 meeting. Mr. Apicella seconded the motion.

Mr. Gibbons expressed his concern for the term of extended stay. He could not understand why the County had a hotel complex and then have an extended hotel complex and could not differentiate between the two. Mr. Rhodes stated the difficulty he had was dealing with the noncontiguous parcels. Mrs. Hazard asked if this item would be discussed at the Board's 3 p.m. or 7 p.m. session. Mr. Harvey stated typically items like this that were under unfinished business were typically conducted in the afternoon session versus public hearing which were typically at night, but the Board could adjust their agenda during the meeting.

The motion passed 7 to 0.

5. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance – Proposed Ordinance O12-11 would amend Chapter 22, Section 22-134, “Required Amenities” by allowing the option of posting securities for amenities prior to recording the final plat. Currently, the subdivision ordinance requires that private amenities be constructed prior to recording the final plat. **(Time Limit: January 8, 2013) (History – October 10, 2012 deferred to October 24, 2012)**
(Scheduled for public hearing November 28, 2012)

Mr. Rhodes stated there was nothing to discuss on this item. It would go to public hearing at the next meeting. He gave recognition to Ms. Christine Lynch from Spotsylvania Planning Commission present tonight. Mr. Harvey stated Mr. Rowe from Bowling Green Planning Commission was present also.

6. Urban Development Areas - Discussion of Urban Development Areas to study the future applicability of Urban Development Areas in the County and identify any recommendations that should be considered for amending the Comprehensive Plan. **(Time Limit: January 2, 2013) (History – Scheduled a Committee Meeting at September 19, 2012 for October 10, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.) (Scheduled a Committee Meeting at October 10, 2012 for October 24, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.) (Deferred at October 24, 2012 to November 14, 2012)**

Mike Zuraf gave the presentation and stated at the October 24, 2012 Planning Commission Work

Session, staff provided information in response to questions from the Commission regarding the consequences of changing land use designation terminology, specifically as it related to access, grants, and other funding resources. The Commission had a general discussion about the need to make changes at this point since a lot of effort and public involvement went into the development of the Urban Development Areas. The Commission may not be inclined to recommend any changes at this time but requested some additional information that may be incorporated into their recommendations to the Board. The Commission requested a summary of the Capital facility needs projected to be required to serve all the projected growth. Information was provided on the Public Facilities Plan which quantified the needed facilities and background information for the Public Facilities Plan. The Commission questioned the County's bonding capacity to fund all the needed improvements. Staff met with Maria Perrotte, Chief Financial Officer, and Mr. Gibbons to discuss the issue. Staff noted that the County would not be able to afford all the facilities proposed in the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan overestimated the amount of facilities that would likely be constructed over the time horizon of the Plan. Staff noted that the facility estimates were based on projected levels of population growth that had not occurred. The Commission requested staff provide input from the development community on how they view the County's Urban Development Areas. The analysis was based on analyzing infrastructure capacity. Staff was also requested to look at other areas as part of the analysis. The other areas evaluated by staff include areas inside the USA not within a UDA. This information would allow the Commission to see the readiness of individual areas to develop and which areas may develop prior to others. The Commission noted that this was information the Commission may want to forward to the Board, if they wished to consider amendments. Staff provided an evaluation to the Commission at the meeting. Staff identified the development potential of areas by designating Phase 1 through Phase 3 for each area. Phase 1 represented near term development potential (years 1 to 10 time horizon); Phase 2 represented mid-term development potential (years 5 to 10). Phase 3 represented long term development potential (years 10 to 20). A graphic representation of these phases was provided with a summary of each area. Area A consisted of North Stafford. Phase 1 of this area included the north Urban Services Area. Much of the land had been developed, road and Utility infrastructure was in place and public facilities, schools, parks, and fire and rescue stations, were present. Road and Utility capacity upgrades were planned in the near term and infill development could occur with minimal improvements needed. The area included Courthouse UDA and George Washington Village, North side of Courthouse Road. Area B consisted of Central Stafford, Phase 2 of this area included land within the USA extending from Courthouse Road and the Courthouse UDA, south to approximately Truslow Road. Transportation improvements included the Centreport interchange and Centreport Parkway. Utility improvements existing were adequate to serve the existing development and this area of the County was not in close proximity to public facilities, including schools, parks, and fire and rescue stations. Additional road, utility, and other facility improvements would be needed to allow for large scale development. The area included George Washington Village UDA, south side of Courthouse Road; Eskimo Hill UDA, and Centerport UDA. Area C consisted of South Stafford. Phase 1 of this area included much of the south Urban Services Area, with the exception of the western extents. Much of this area had been developed. Road and Utility infrastructure was in place. Public facilities, schools, parks, and fire and rescue stations, were present. Road and Utility capacity upgrades were planned in the near term, including the widening of Warrenton Road and completion of the Rocky Pen Run Reservoir. Infill development could occur with minimal improvements needed. The area included South Gateway UDA and Leeland Station UDA. Area D consisted of Brooke Station UDA. Phase 3 of this UDA, located around the Brooke VRE Station, was in an area separated from the main USA. There are no utilities within or in close proximity to this area. Improvements to the existing road network may be needed as well. No near term facility or infrastructure improvements were identified in this area. Although development around a commuter rail station would lessen the impact on roads, the location limits its development potential without significant infrastructure improvements. Area E consisted of Staffordshire. Phase 2 of this area included the planned Staffordshire subdivision, located at the end of Hulls Chapel Road. Although this project was not adjacent to existing utilities or improved road networks, the site was

smaller in scale and could be developed with minor road improvements. Utility improvements would be constructed by the developer. Preliminary development plans were approved for the project. Area F consisted of Warrenton Road West, Northside. Phase 2 of this area was located between Warrenton Road and Truslow Road at the upper end of the Falls Run watershed. Truslow Road was an unimproved 2 lane road. Development could occur in this location by extending the existing gravity sewer line west to this area. Improvements to this sewer line and to Truslow Road were planned. The Rocky Pen Run Reservoir, when complete, would provide adequate water to serve this area. Area G consisted of Warrenton Road West, Southside. Phase 3 of this area was located on the south side of Warrenton Road, and west of Holly Corner Road. Currently there was limited large lot residential development in this area with no public utilities. This area was rezoned for residential, commercial, and industrial development under the Westlake rezoning. A school site was proffered in this area. The University of Mary Washington had significant land holdings in this area but no specific development plans. More significant water and sewer improvements would be needed to serve this area. The Rocky Pen Run Reservoir, when complete, would provide adequate water to serve this area. Road improvements were planned to serve this area which would need to be built as well. Area H consisted of Westlake Residential. Phase 2 of this area was located at the western extent of the Westlake Development and was approved for 700 residential units. This area of Westlake had more near-term development potential than the remainder of the project. A preliminary plan was recently approved and construction plans were in for review and approval. The significant utility and road improvements needed in this area would delay the ultimate build out of the project. Area I consisted of Sherwood Farm. Phase 2 of this area was located at the eastern end of the Urban Services Area along Kings Highway, and included the Sherwood Farm property and Virginia Renaissance Faire property. This area had good development potential with good transportation access and suitable terrain. Utilities would need to be extended to the area and zoning approvals would be needed for development to proceed. Area J consisted of Central Stafford Industrial Area. Phase 1 of this area was located along Jefferson Davis Highway, north of Potomac Creek. The area was comprised of several light industrial uses and there was good transportation access. Utilities generally exist in this area but, extensions of existing facilities may be necessary. The Commission requested an analysis of the UDAs, as it related to the readiness of these locations to develop to identify which UDAs may develop in the near-term and long-term. Staff forwarded the inquiry to the Fredericksburg Area Builders Association for input. Any responses provided prior to the meeting were forwarded to the Commission. Staff also provided an outline that attempted to capture the dialogue of the Commission's discussions from the last meeting. The Commission may wish to use this outline as a starting point, with modifications, for its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gibbons asked where the RDAs were. Mr. Zuraf stated that was not included specifically, but the redevelopment areas were in Boswell Corner, the Courthouse area, Southern Gateway, Route 17 West, and the Falmouth area. Mr. Gibbons asked if there would be conflict between a UDA and RDA. Mr. Zuraf stated yes as it related to Boswell Corner and Falmouth Village because it was intended more of a lower intensity. Mr. Gibbons asked what restrictions they would have in the County if they used UDAs. Mr. Zuraf stated there would be benefits towards infrastructure funding. Mr. Rhodes stated it made it optional and did not specify exactly how much growth it had to accommodate.

Mr. Apicella asked what the number of units for specific areas was. Mr. Rhodes suggested it be listed as a table. Mr. Apicella stated a narrative or table would be good. Mr. Zuraf asked if the Commission was looking for more of the larger scaled projects. Mrs. Hazard suggested the availability of utilities at those particular locations. She asked if that could be a footnote as part of the Commission's comments.

NEW BUSINESS

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated previously the Commission was on schedule to have one more paper copy version of the Planning Commission agenda. Mr. Rhodes asked if the Commission was in agreement with going paperless after November 28, 2012. Mr. Apicella stated the only issue would be the large maps. Mr. Rhodes asked if preliminary plans and GDPs paper copies would still be provided. Mr. Harvey stated yes in full size.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. McClendon stated she had no report at the time.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

7. Proffer Guidelines

Mr. Rhodes stated an email from Mr. Harvey was sent out and the two Supervisor representatives of the Joint Committee indicated to get the email out to them and they would start focusing on a date.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes had no report but wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and safe travels.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. TRC Information – Meeting November 28, 2012 - Cancelled

Mr. Harvey stated staff would see if they had any additional submissions for a December meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 19, 2012

Mr. Gibbons made a motion to approve the September 19, 2012 minutes. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 to 0.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.