

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**March 27, 2013**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 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, Boswell, English, Gibbons, Apicella, and Schwartz

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Zuraf, Hornung, Smith, Hess, Narvaez, Ennis, and Knighting

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any Declarations of Disqualification. Dr. Schwartz stated that on item number 6 he had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Patrick, counsel for that item. Also, item 17, he was a social acquaintance of Mr. Janney. Mr. Hiron stated on item number 2 he had brief conversations with the applicants on the application. Mr. Apicella stated he had a chance to meet with Mr. Patrick as well on item number 6.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Rhodes opened the public presentations. With no one coming forward, Mr. Rhodes closed the public presentations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Impact Fees - Amend the Comprehensive Plan by amending the textual document, "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan, 2010-2030," and the textual document, "Transportation Plan," to: (1) eliminate reference to the current impact fee areas; (2) establish a County-wide Impact Fee Service Area that would encompass all properties within the boundary of the County excluding lands within Quantico Marine Corps Base; (3) establish an Impact Fee project list; (4) provide maps depicting the proposed projects; and (5) amend the appendix of the Comprehensive Plan to eliminate old typical street cross sections for roadway design and establish new typical street cross sections for roadway design.  
**(Time Limit: April 6, 2013)**

Mr. Rhodes stated the first item was a repeat performance, essentially the same almost verbatim other than some dates to what they had passed earlier. He stated it was necessary to come back for public hearing again but that they would go through all the information once again.

Joey Hess gave the staff presentation and stated the presentation was about the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, not just the County-wide impact fees, but it was prompted because of the County-wide impact fees. He stated General Assembly adopted legislation authorizing Impact Fees in 2000, and amended in 2007. With the amendment in 2007, it enabled municipalities to develop a methodology to fund road improvements needed to accommodate growth. He stated the Board approved impact fees for two areas of the County initially (West Central and South East). Since then, the Board has repealed the South East in 2012. Mr. Hess stated that in 2008 the Board retained a

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

consultant to evaluate a County-wide impact fee with zero impact on the application for no commercial impact fees. He stated the Board also established a citizens advisory group, which was required by state statute, to assist the Board, and then moved onto the Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee who reported their findings to the Board in August 2009. The Board then requested staff continue impact fee analysis to include a program which avoided non-residential impact fees. He stated this effort continued, but was delayed until completion and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and the establishment of the UDA locations. He stated that was done in June 2011; that was when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted with the UDAs. Mr. Hess stated the staff involved Keith Dayton, Jeff Harvey, Mike Smith, Maria Perrotte, and himself. He stated the consultants who helped were A. Morton Thomas Associates, William B. Allen, Jr., and TischlerBise. The effort was then pushed forward to the Infrastructure Committee for their input. Mr. Hess then went over the basic methodology for impact fees, stating a Travel Demand Forecasting Model was developed; staff inputted the existing road network; completed a baseline road model using 2010 data to establish existing conditions and went out to 2020. He stated the model used the following: projected residential growth from the Comprehensive Plan; VDOT projects scheduled for completion by 2020; and non-residential growth from staff analysis of current projects combined with some Comprehensive Plan assumptions. Mr. Hess stated from that they compiled a list of roads showing deterioration in Level of Service, and established a road project list from identified priorities. He stated a cost analysis was then applied to those identified road improvements, combined with projected development activity to calculate the estimated impact fee. Mr. Hess presented a list of roads identified as being deteriorated the most from the growth that went from 2010 to 2020. Mr. Hess then moved on to the Comprehensive Plan amendments, along with the impact fee proposed ordinance change. Mr. Hess stated staff recommended support of the amendments to the textual document, entitled "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan, 2010 – 2030," dated January 17, 2012, specifically Chapter 4 – Transportation Plan and Appendix G – Transportation Plan Background Information, as sent from the Board of Supervisors which included the Planning Commission's June 6, 2012 recommendations. He stated staff supported the additional amendments based on information and comments received from the consultant TischlerBise and VDOT.

Mr. Gibbons asked staff to explain the difference in terminology from page 412, section 4.9. Mr. Harvey stated the language was not anticipated to be changed. It was talking about the VDOT Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements and how that may interplay with Stafford County. He stated they had two different areas that were eligible for Stafford, Urban and Suburban, and that had it dictating what street types that they would have in the County. He stated it was his recollection that Stafford had been classified Suburban as an entirety at the present time.

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

Mr. Gibbons made a motion to recommend approval, Mr. English seconded; the motion passed 7-0.

2. CUP1200415 Conditional Use Permit – Brooke Village - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Cluster Subdivision with a maximum density of 2.25 dwelling units per acre on Assessor's Parcels 54C-1-26 and 54C-1-27, zoned R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District. The property consists of 9.54 acres, located on the south side of Little Whim Road, approximately 250 feet west of Brooke Road within the George Washington Election District. **(Time limit: June 25, 2013)**

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

Robert Narvaez gave the staff presentation and stated this was a conditional use permit for Brooke Village proposing 21 single-family lots. Mr. Narvaez showed several aerial photos of the site. He stated that all the lots would have individual access off of Brooke Village Drive and all the lots would be served by public water and sewer. There was a stream that ran through the property going east to west and was protected by the CRPA. He stated none of the lots had the RPA on there.

Mr. Gibbons asked if there was access to the other property from lots 8 and 9. Mr. Narvaez stated it was to provide for future expansion, and the property next to it already had an existing house on it. He stated if the other parcels, the larger lots, were to be developed into another subdivision, that would provide access to them. Mr. Gibbons asked how they would get through lot 27C and how could they put a stub on it. Mr. Narvaez stated the stub was not going onto the property, it was just for any chance that there was expansion as a requirement with VDOT to have an access point.

Mr. Narvaez stated the applicant has agreed to the conditions of no more than 21 lots, and any upgrades to the water and sewer would be provided and paid for by the developer. He stated they would also provide signage for the RPA to make sure that the future owners of the property adjacent to them would not clear any of the natural vegetation. Also, none of the new lots would be located within the RPA. Mr. Narvaez stated the Comprehensive Plan called this area for suburban, typically single-family detached dwellings on one-fourth to one-half acre. He stated the proposed subdivision was consistent with the recommendations in the Land Use Plan and consistent with adjacent residential properties and established development patterns. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Gibbons asked what the square footage of the houses were. Mr. Narvaez stated he did not have that information, but the approximate square lots were around 8,000. He stated the applicant was there to answer those questions. Mr. Apicella asked to be reminded of what the current cluster ordinance required in terms of percentage of open space for this kind of cluster subdivision. Mr. Harvey stated he believed the standard was 30% in the R-1 zone. Mr. Apicella then asked where the open space was, and Mr. Narvaez showed it on the map. There was a short discussion about where the stub-out was located. Mr. Apicella asked about the 'T' portion where the RPA was, what portion of that would not be able to be buildable irrespective of a cluster subdivision. Mr. Narvaez stated typically sometimes they would put RPA on lots, but this applicant decided not to put any of the lots in the RPA. Mr. Harvey asked if Mr. Apicella was asking for a percentage of that open space that was solely comprised of RPA, and Mr. Apicella answered yes. Mr. Harvey stated they could ask the engineer to give a specific on that. Mr. Apicella stated he was also interested in the overall size of the open space. He was curious what percentage and/or how much acreage of the 9.5 acre parcel was going to be left to open space. Mr. Narvaez stated they were only required to provide approximately 2.8 acres of open space; however, they were providing 3.3 acres of approximate open space. Dr. Schwartz asked what the acreage was that fell into the RPA. Mr. Narvaez stated he did not see it on the plan and would ask the applicant. Dr. Schwartz then asked what the lot requirements were as far as RPA. Mr. Harvey stated there was no mandated percentage; a lot of it would be a function of how much of the lot that was outside the RPA that could be buildable for placement of a house, driveway, and other features you would typically see with a residential lot. Basically, the foundation footprint of the home could not be in the RPA, and neither could the area probably within 10 to 12 feet from the house. Dr. Schwartz stated they were using all the RPA and their open land and the whole concept of the open was for recreational purposes and things along this line, common area, and that none of that was really being done. They were following the letter of the law with a shoehorn to get their cluster going. Mr. Apicella asked if, based on the state code and what was talked about in terms of developing the cluster ordinance, was this in line with what they were trying to achieve by fixing the cluster ordinance in the

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

first place. Mr. Narvaez stated he believed it was because in addition to recreation, also being provided was ways for conservation. So by not disturbing the RPA, they were achieving that goal for a cluster, as opposed to going into it and potentially disturbing it. Mr. Apicella asked based on the layout of the parcel could they have come up with a different plan that would have encroached on the RPA. Mr. Narvaez stated by-right they were allowed 14 homes, but with this CUP they were getting 21. Mr. Gibbons asked what the original proffers on the land were. Mr. Harvey stated he believed this property was zoned without proffers.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Narvaez stated the engineer and owner were present. Mr. Rhodes stated there was an open question of how much of the acreage was in RPA. Dan Webb, with Webb and Associates, stated he did not know. He stated they did not calculate the exact number. Mr. Gibbons asked what the average square footage was. Mark Doherty, representing the owner, stated 2100 to 2400 square foot. Mr. Gibbons asked the average cost of the house. Mr. Doherty stated \$299,000. Mr. Gibbons then stated he had never seen before where you could put a stub-out to another platted property and it was acceptable. Mr. Webb stated that was a requirement that the County and VDOT had; it was not something they wanted to do. Mr. Hirons asked if the RPA on the property was a flowing stream or dry. Mr. Webb stated it was a perennial flowing, although in the summer, the last time he went out, there was no water flowing in it. They had DCR out there and they determined it was perennial.

Mr. Rhodes opened up to public comment.

William Poorbaugh stated he felt like the developer crammed it into an as small a spot as possible. He stated he just recently saw the changes from what it had originally been. It was originally being developed on the front half and the back half was going to be open. He stated it looked like now it was going to be extended all the way back. Mr. Poorbaugh stated it had some pretty small setbacks, like 25 feet off the back property. He stated it didn't match at all what the Lansberry development was like. They had probably 70 to 80 feet setbacks from their back property line. He stated they were going to lose all the woods that they assumed would always be there. He didn't have a problem with anything being developed, he said it would just be nice if there was some consideration for the affect of the adjacent properties. The other lots which were mostly wooded they could have easily put houses against those lines and not affected anyone. Mr. Poorbaugh stated that maybe it didn't accommodate their future expansion plans, but it was just not an ideal situation.

With no other speakers coming forward, Mr. Rhodes closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Dr. Schwartz stated he thought they were following the basic guidelines of the cluster ordinance, but that they were squeezing this in with a shoehorn. Basically the whole concept was that the open space would not be space that was basically unbuildable. He stated they were getting a bonus density of seven homes there, and he was not real wild about the whole concept. Dr. Schwartz stated he would be interested to see what the acreage was that was considered RPA. He stated he would recommend that they defer this item until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gibbons. Mr. Rhodes asked for any further comments. Mr. Gibbons stated his biggest concern was they had an unproffered piece of property and they were going to give them a bonus of seven homes. Mr. Rhodes asked if 25 was the minimum setback for the lots. Mr. Harvey stated he would look that up. Mr. Rhodes stated he would like to just confirm what the minimum setbacks were. Mr. Apicella stated he thought it would be helpful if they had the ordinance section specific to the R-1. The motion passed 7-0.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

3. Amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O13-03 would amend Stafford County Code Section 22-254, "Time limit for acting on appeals;" to increase the allowable time from fourteen (14) to sixty (60) days that the Board of Supervisors shall act upon any appeal filed. **(Time Limit: April 6, 2013)**

Andrea Hornung gave the staff presentation and stated this amendment was to increase the allowable time from 14 days to 60 days so that the Board could act on any appeal request that would come forward. It would give them more time for staff to prepare the staff report in time for the next available Board meeting. Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions for staff. He then opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward, Mr. Rhodes closed the public comment portion of the public hearing. Mr. Gibbons made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Ordinance, Dr. Schwartz seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

4. Amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O13-05 would amend Stafford County Code Section 22-67, "Technical changes to approved preliminary plans;" to extend the time to review and render a decision of technical changes from ten (10) to thirty (30) days and clarify the types of technical changes allowed and those not allowed. **(Time Limit: April 6, 2013)**

Andrea Hornung gave the staff presentation and stated this amendment was to extend the time to review and render a decision of technical changes from 10 to 30 days. Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions for staff. Mr. Apicella asked why 30 days and if there was a state requirement that it be 30 days. Mrs. Hornung stated there was nothing in particular that she could research in the State Code that had a minimum or maximum time, but staff found that 10 days was too quick. She said staff thought 30 days was adequate to ask for that timeframe. Mr. Apicella asked if 30 days was enough time and if 45 days would be better. Mrs. Hornung stated she thought 30 days was adequate. In the experience of technical changes that had been submitted in the last six years, there was one that was very extensive. Staff requested from the applicant for a 30 day extension and for that particular one that was adequate. Mr. Harvey stated staff was also trying to address that very issue with this code amendment to make more clear what types of modifications need to go back to the Planning Commission for a revision and what still could be handled at the staff level. Mr. Apicella stated in the case where staff asked for an extension, if the applicant had said no, he asked what would have happened. Mrs. Hornung stated the technical change review would have had to have been completed and the applicant did not want a denial. She stated staff and the applicant were able to work together; they understood the extent of the changes that were requested. Dr. Schwartz asked if there was a denial in that case, what would have been the applicant's appeal options. Mrs. Hornung stated typically when a technical change is not approved, they would have to fix it and the letter would spell out what would need to be completed in order for that technical change to be approved. Mr. Harvey stated if the applicant and staff did not agree, the applicant would have the right to appeal to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. English asked if they got charged for a technical change. Mrs. Hornung stated yes, the current application was \$500 for a technical change request, and there was no limit to how many changes to that preliminary plan that they could request provided it would fall into those items that were allowed under the ordinance. Mr. English asked how many staff had this year. Mrs. Hornung stated she knew of 3 waiting for the signature sets to be submitted. She stated it was adequate to say they have had at least 8 requests this year to date. Mr. Rhodes opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward, Mr. Rhodes closed the public comment portion of the public hearing. Mr. Gibbons made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance, Mr. English seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

***Planning Commission Minutes  
March 27, 2013***

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

5. SUB1200343; Guys Overlook, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 10 single family residential lots on 32.40 acres zoned A-1, Agricultural, located at the corner of Brooke Road and Marlborough Point Road on Assessor's Parcel 41-15, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: May 22, 2013) (History: Deferred at February 27, 2013 to March 13, 2013)(Deferred at March 13, 2013 to March 27, 2013)**

After Mr. Narvaez explained that the owner of the property, George Lockwood, and the engineer John Moran, were present to talk about their findings, Mr. Rhodes asked both to come forward. Mr. Lockwood stated that he had walked the property and hadn't found any indications of any graves whatsoever. He also stated that Mr. Trimmer, a Civil War expert, had been on the property as well as the Smithsonian Institute which had also been on the property numerous times back in the 60s and 70s and had never found any graves. Mr. Apicella stated that he appreciated the applicant's indulgence to walk the property with Mr. Trimmer, however, he pointed out that the issue wasn't the Civil War grave sites but the Revolutionary War artifacts or sites. He also pointed out that there was an applicant whom did exceed to the request of the Stafford County Historical Commission to walk the site. Mr. Apicella explained that there was a requirement that if and when, during the construction process, they became aware that there was a grave site, all work would have to cease and they would have to follow the respective ordinance. With that in mind, Mr. Apicella made a motion to recommend approval which was seconded by Mr. Gibbons. The motion passed 7-0.

**NEW BUSINESS**

17. SUB1200337; Holly Ridge, Section 2, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 18 single family residential lots on 12.03 acres zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, located at end of Phillips Street on south side of Holly Street on Assessor's Parcel 54-112 and 54D-5E-25 (lots 16-25), within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: June 20, 2013)**

Mr. English made a motion to move item 17 up in the agenda. Mr. Gibbons seconded and the motion passed 7-0.

LeAnn Ennis gave the staff presentation. She pointed out that the green area represented 54-112 and showed the lots 16-25. She continued by showing the zoning map, explaining that to the north there was also R-1 zoning. Beside it was a townhouse development "Charlston Commons" and above that, behind Phillips Street, the zoning was B-2 and to the south there was the RPA area. Ms. Ennis explained that the original plat of Holly Ridge Subdivision was created in the 60s and that Holly Street was an unimproved road and no lots had direct access off of it and there was only one house sitting in the back, but it looked like it belonged there. Ms. Ennis further stated that the applicant was working with the Historic Commission who requested a Phase 1 study and were supposed to do a walk-through the following day. She also mentioned that all lots were to be served by public water and sewer and the stormwater management would be achieved by using bio-retention facilities located in the open space. Ms. Ennis advised at this point that staff would recommend approval and added that this was a continuation of Phillips Street.

Dr. Schwartz stated that there would be a lot of traffic since Phillips Street had its only access out on White Oak Road and all the other lots back off of Phillips Street, West View and Holly Street. He

***Planning Commission Minutes  
March 27, 2013***

mentioned that the access to White Oak Road was on an incline and there was poor visibility and unfortunately there was no great way to have an interconnector.

Ms. Ennis stated that staff had already talked to transportation and VDOT to try to find a connection going through the townhouses, but those were private roads.

Dr. Schwartz asked if, when Towering Oaks Drive was approved, if there had been any thoughts of interconnecting that and if anybody had appealed to VDOT to make an improvement on Phillips Street. Ms. Ennis replied by saying that she had asked for a traffic signal but that was not warranted. Dr. Schwartz recommended trying to appeal to VDOT to widen out Phillips Street where it intersected so more than just two cars could get past each other. After a short discussion regarding this issue, Dr. Schwartz stated that he just wanted to make sure that staff had looked at every possibility for improvement. Ms. Ennis replied that in all the meetings she didn't remember anything being mentioned or suggested about a deeper turn lane, but recommended to ask the engineer if they had talked about it in their meetings with VDOT.

Mr. Rhodes asked the applicant, Mr. Justin Franklin from Fairbanks & Franklin, to come forward. Mr. Franklin confirmed that he had met with VDOT and had also looked at connecting through Charleston Commons but that it was not feasible and they were still trying to improve the situation within the parameters that were available to them.

Dr. Schwartz asked again if there had been any talk about widening the intersection in the discussions with VDOT which Mr. Franklin negated. Dr. Schwartz also asked what the VDOT easement was on White Oak Road. Mr. Franklin answered that he did not know about the right-of-way there but he knew that Phillips Street was 40 or 50 feet wide and with a radius between 35 and 50 feet which was the substandard, and if VDOT was able to flare the radius out it might provide some relief. He also mentioned that if you widened the road you would have to widen the shoulder too, which was between 8 and 11 feet plus the ditch section which would put you well inside of somebody's private property.

Dr. Schwartz stated that he appreciated they were not doing a cluster and that the applicant was working with the Historical Commission and was trying to help and therefore he recommended approval. Mr. Boswell seconded and the motion passed 7-0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - continued

6. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain Stafford County Code, Section 28-39, "Special Regulations," to establish processes that allow for waivers to required Master Plan components and deviations or modifications of the development standards in the UD, Urban Development Zoning District. **(Time Limit: June 11, 2013)(History: Deferred at March 13, 2013 to March 27, 2013)**  
**(Authorize for Public Hearing by: April 24, 2013)**  
**(Potential Public Hearing Date: May 22, 2013)**

Mr. Zuraf explained that at the last meeting, the Commission voted to defer the issue to this meeting to allow staff to include some additional modifications to the ordinance and to identify how the ordinance would affect the overall amendments to the Urban Development Areas that had been considered under a separate action. Also, the Commission was to consider in this meeting if a special work session would be needed. He stated that in the latest version of the ordinance that the Commission had

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

received, there were some changes signified in blue for newly or deleted text and green for text that had previously been in the ordinance but had moved to a new location. Mr. Zuraf listed the changes that staff had made, starting with the modification made to U6-A3 to separate the steps required of the Director of Planning from the request for technical modification or adjustment of the UD Master Plan. Next were the revisions to clarify that the deviation or modification of development standards granted by the Board of Supervisors were only permitted at the zoning stage as a part of a rezoning or a proffer amendment. The new language would require property, once it had been zoned to the UD zoning district, to request a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals unless there was a separate proffer amendment requested. Regarding the effect of the ordinance, Mr. Zuraf stated that staff noted that the ordinance was amending the existing UD zoning district which had served to implement the current Urban Development Area recommendation and the Comprehensive Plan and the ordinance amendment would only serve to better allow for the development under the prescribed standards in the ordinance. He also stated that should the Comp Plan amendments maintain the UD areas in some form or fashion at similar intensities, the UD district would be consistent with the type of development envisioned. But if the County should wish to remove UDAs from the Comp Plan, then the UD district would not be consistent which may require a larger amendment to remove the UD district.

According to Mr. Zuraf, staff received, in addition to the information in the memo that the Commission had received, a separate email with a request to explain what the Planning Commission's role was in this amendment before and after the change and they did not believe that this change did not have too much of an effect on what the Planning Commission's role would be. The changes would incorporate a waiver of master plan requirements which the Director of Planning and Zoning would handle. And as far as allowing changes to any of the UD, district standards would be an action that would be made by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Zuraf continued by talking about the why there was a change to the density on page 3 of the ordinance. It had been changed from 4, 6 and 12 units to 3, 5 and 11 units. He explained that this did not change the minimum density allowed in the UD zoning district, but a change to conform with the density modifications that had been made the previous year when the range of zoning density was created. Mr. Zuraf finished by mentioning a letter the Commission had received that evening from Sherman Patrick who was representing the applicant considering a rezoning to the UD district. He explained that the letter basically stated some of their concerns and that he was present if there were any more questions.

Mr. Apicella asked Mr. Zuraf to explain what an urban development master plan was and what it was intended to demonstrate or achieve.

Mr. Zuraf explained that if somebody rezones a property they would typically have to submit a general development plan to identify the general uses and that in other special zoning districts, including this one, one may have to include separate plans that more so highlight how different densities of development might be located on the site. Mr. Zuraf referred to the P-TND zoning district and explained that there was a requirement for a regulating plan that showed different zones that corresponded with different densities of development and identified general areas in this UD zoning district, similar kind of method was approached where one of the requirements was to submit a master plan identifying the main sub-districts that were going to be envisioned within the area that somebody wanted to rezone. Mr. Zuraf proceeded to give some examples of areas that needed to be identified for evaluation.

Mr. English asked Mr. Zuraf about the letter, inquiring which area the letter was talking about.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

Mr. Harvey replied, stating that the reference was to the amendment to the Comp Plan when the County had done the UD plan with VDOT and their consultant and established a master plan for that whole area. He stated that in particular with a specific development project, they would typically have a piece of the master plan and within the UD zone they would have to identify within that piece where the different densities of development would occur. He also mentioned that the requirement to have a master plan was a regulatory requirement so they could identify the percentages of the different areas. He also stated that the percentages would not be able to change very much but the location could within the context of the overall development. Mr. Harvey explained, since Mr. Zuraf had referenced the GDP, that the GDP was something that had to be submitted with the rezoning but was not necessarily always proffered by an applicant and that the GDP was a lot more specific.

Mr. Apicella questioned if 30 days was sufficient especially when talking about something as significant as an urban development plan since there may be a number of technical modifications.

Mr. Zuraf responded by saying that 30 days was acceptable.

Mr. Apicella stated that he thought 45 days might be more reasonable. Mr. Apicella proceeded to ask Mr. Zuraf if it was his professional opinion that the proposed amendment would promote what they were trying to achieve and stimulate potentially more applications for urban development plans.

Mr. Zuraf affirmed and stated that it would allow some flexibility but would not be a blank check for somebody just to simply request a waiver of anything and they would not be required to automatically approve everything.

Mr. Apicella asked if Mr. Zuraf didn't think it would be premature to amend prior to any other changes that will be made to the overall urban development construct.

Mr. Zuraf did not agree.

After Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions for Mr. Patrick since he was present, Mr. Apicella expressed that he did not think it would hurt for Mr. Patrick to elaborate on his letter. Mr. Rhodes agreed and asked Mr. Patrick to come forward.

Mr. Patrick explained that the reason HH Hunt was interested in this area was that they did like the planning that the staff had been working on and they thought there was a lot of opportunity and were excited to move ahead with the UD zone. He also stated that they understood why the Commission was reconsidering the UDA but they were however confident that at the end of the process something would prevail. He also stated that they were just stalled right now and that they waited for the UDA and UD zone to be adopted. He also mentioned that they also had some problems they had to work out because of the contact sensitivity of preparing a UD type zoning.

Mr. Apicella asked what the negative impact would be if they were not to move forward with the amendment change.

Mr. Patrick replied that HH Hunt had properties under contract and that the terms of those contracts would expire periodically and if they didn't move forward there would be a possibility that the contracts expire and would not be renewed by the seller.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

Mr. Rhodes reminded everybody that this issue would have to be considered for public hearing at some point.

Mr. Apicella made a motion to advertise for public hearing which was seconded by Mr. Gibbons. The motion passed 7-0.

7. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain Stafford County Code, Section 28-59, "Highway Corridor Overlay District (HC)," to exclude drive through facilities and hotels/motels from the requirement for a Conditional Use Permit in the HC district; and to update and amend the development standards of the HC district. **(Time Limit: June 11, 2013)(History: Deferred at March 13, 2013 to March 27, 2013)**  
***(Authorize for Public Hearing by: April 24, 2013)***  
***(Potential Public Hearing Date: May 22, 2013)***

Mr. Harvey reminded that at the last Commission meeting the Commissioners had asked staff to provide copies of approved resolutions that had conditions of permits for uses that had drive-through facilities. He explained that staff took the liberty to highlight the conditions for the Commissions information that were not specifically addressed in current code, because the Commission was concerned that if drive-through facilities were made as by-right uses there would be some loss of ability to further regulate the activity on a particular property. Mr. Harvey proceeded to summarize some of the highlighted conditions that would or would not be regulated at this meeting or in the near future. Mr. Harvey stated that some of the conditions were pretty consistent about lighting. He explained that staff had been working on a revision to the lighting standards which had been presented to the Community and Economic Development Committee. Mr. Harvey continued to summarize mentioning flags, banners, as well as building facade types; specifically having to meet the neighborhood design standards for future development within the HC district. He also mentioned some conditions that had gotten into site specific issues like fencing to an adjacent property. Mr. Harvey explained that when the Board referred the ordinance to the Commission, they had authorized them to make adjustments as they deemed necessary which may be one item for consideration. Mr. Harvey stated that one of the things he had been looking at was dealing with the headlights from cars coming through the drive-through and making sure it did not shine out to the highway and that staff was prepared to propose an amendment that could address that issue if so desired by the Commission.

Mr. English inquired if this would address that kind of issue like they had with Chic-fil-A.

Mr. Harvey replied that currently the ordinance stipulated that there was a specific stacking distance from the drive-through window which was a minimum of 150 feet, which would mean 7 or 8 cars.

Mr. Gibbons expressed his concern regarding giving up this tool.

Mr. Apicella agreed with Mr. Gibbons, explaining that in the time he had been there they had had several CUPs with conditions specific to the property to mitigate the impacts and that the CUP process had been the only way to get there if it could not have been done by-right. Mr. Apicella stated that he was wondering how they would tweak the other underlying ordinances to deal with every set of circumstances that might exist specific to a particular parcel. He explained that they had negotiated conditions that made the specific proposal better and that they were basically asking to eliminate the opportunity to fix potential problems that were not contemplated by developer and staff. He expressed his concern and stated that he would have a difficult time supporting it.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

Dr. Schwartz reminded everybody that he had asked staff at the last meeting to come up with some numbers on how many of these had been seen and pushed through in one night in the past three years, as opposed to how many times they had been deferred to additional meetings for further discussion.

Mr. Rhodes asked to make sure if the Board had referred the amendment to the Planning Commission to advertise for public hearing.

Mr. Harvey agreed and explained that there were multiple components to the amendment like drive-throughs, hotels, sidewalks, requirements for development in the HC overlay complying with the design standards, as well as an amendment which would update the ordinance based on state code references. He stated that the CUP was just one of four components.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he agreed that they would have to take something to public hearing and they could certainly recommend disapproval of portions or modify it before taking it to the hearing.

Mr. Gibbons suggested that one of the problems may be the cost of the CUPs which was about \$10,000 depending on the specifics of the application and asked what the deadline was for advertising the amendment for a public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes answered that the public hearing would have to be held by the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Gibbons inquired if Mr. Harvey knew why the Board sent this item down and Mr. Harvey replied that it was something that staff had brought up in the Community and Economic Development meeting and the committee thought there should be a public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes asked Ms. McClendon if the Commission had full flexibility for modification even to the point of not even addressing one of the components, which Ms. McClendon affirmed.

Mr. Gibbons asked Mr. Harvey again what had brought this whole issue to focus in the meeting. Mr. Harvey explained that some of the staff thought that the CUP would be overkill for a drive-through because of the stacking requirements and that there was a time issue with having to go through public hearings. Also, some of the developers felt that it would add nominal value which the committee somewhat agreed with.

Mr. Gibbons pointed out that what Dr. Schwartz had said earlier in that the meeting was very important. He said that it would be nice to know what the average time limit was. He explained that he understood the cost factor since he knew two people whom could not afford the cost.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Harvey if both the examples that had been shown by staff earlier in the meeting were drive-throughs.

Mr. Harvey explained that staff had pulled all the approved CUPs for the last five years, not all of which were drive-throughs.

Mr. Rhodes further inquired if at the end of the process the consensus of PC was to proceed with the public hearing on all the provisions except for CUPs how hard it would be to modify on that.

Mr. Harvey replied that they would simply eliminate subsection E from the advertisement.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 27, 2013*

Mr. Apicella requested to go over the other changes again. Mr. Rhodes agreed.

Mr. Harvey listed the different components once more starting with subsection A which dealt with “amending the code to reflect the current state code cross references”. He stated that subsection E dealt with “permitted uses with conditional use permits” and that the current proposal was that hotels, motels, and drive-through facilities would no longer need CUPs and that they would have a by-right use. Mr. Harvey continued with the reference to subsection 2 which talked about pedestrian circulation and explained that it would allow someone to make a payment in lieu if there was no sidewalk on either side at the property location which would allow the County to take those funds and use them for future sidewalk projects within the same quarter.

Mr. Apicella asked how the amount for the payment in lieu would be determined.

Mr. Harvey explained that this would require an engineer cost estimate that would have to be provided to the County and the County would verify if it was appropriate. Mr. Harvey pointed out that currently if a developer intended to get his plans approved and was not constructing a sidewalk, he would be able to post a security, which had to be at least 110 percent of the cost in bonds or a letter of credit or cash with the County and defer the construction to a later date. He also stated that this agreement could be renewed but the cost may inflate.

Mr. Rhodes added that in the current language this was at the option of the County Administrator.

Mr. Harvey reminded that he explained in the previous meeting there had been a number of cases where someone was developing a site and the County was actively working on a road widening project and decided to put the money towards that project instead of sidewalks.

Mr. Harvey then proceeded to list the different components of the amendment, explaining that subsection 4 dealt with “curb and gutters” which was an issue that they had had quite a bit. He explained that the requirement was to provide curb and gutter and that some developers had asked the County to consider just requiring curb similar to some of the public roads that have gutters only on the outside edge.

Mr. Apicella thanked Mr. Harvey for walking everybody through the proposed ordinance changes and said that he was comfortable with the changes but for the CUP portion. He recommended moving the draft to public hearing without the CUP changes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he was not sure how strongly the Supervisors may have felt about the four elements of the provision and he suggested to defer for two weeks to have an opportunity to contact the Supervisors and explain some logic, but he would also be fine with going forward.

Dr. Schwartz asked again how many times had CUPs been approved in one night. He thought they were already assuming that the vast majority CUPs were being deferred, discussed and negotiated which is why he would agree with Mr. Apicella’s motion but not before hearing what percentage of CUPs were being approved in one night.

Mr. Apicella asked to give his perspective. He stated that he understood where Dr. Schwartz was going with his statement and that that meant they would have to look at each one of those to see what the end result had been. He believed that the staff may have worked on those conditions and

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

negotiated them so they could be one and done, therefore he was not sure what one could make of the percentages. According to Mr. Apicella the bottom line was that it was about the conditions and what conditions had been negotiated that changed the set of circumstances and may not have otherwise been adopted to mitigate the impacts that one wouldn't have gotten by going forward with just a by right development. Mr. Apicella stated that he thought the percentages might be useful information but he didn't think it would change the underlying concern that he had which was that the CUP process would help to work towards a better project than merely doing it by right for these specific sets of uses. He believed that they should just move forward without the CUPs. He also agreed that the cost of CUPs was an issue that they might want to provide additional recommendation on to see if it was appropriate.

Dr. Schwartz agreed that along the lines of the cost it would probably be a very true statement for a small business man if he wanted to put in a used car lot, but when talking about a fast food drive-through restaurant or a hotel, \$10,000 was not a significant portion of the total project.

Mr. Rhodes agreed and made a motion to forward for a public hearing the amendment to the zoning ordinance but striking the portion of the portion of the draft dealing with subparagraph E. The motion passed 6-1.

8. Discussion of Public Notification Requirements (**History: Deferred at February 5, 2013 to February 13, 2013**) (**Deferred at February 13, 2013 until further direction from Planning Commission**)
9. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas - Amend the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for Urban Development Areas and targeted growth areas in the County. (**Deferred at February 27, 2013 until further information from Staff**) (*Scheduled for March 27, 2013 Discussion*)

Mr. Rhodes explained that this was about staff coming back with some ideas and information and that staff was looking for was direction and ideas from the Commission.

Mr. Apicella stated that he thought there was going to be a special meeting on this.

Mr. Rhodes replied that there was going to be one on the first Saturday of June and that they could have another one if deemed necessary, but right now staff was about to present a few things to the Commission.

Mr. Zuraf started the discussion by stating that the Commission felt that the overall state mandated elements of the UD areas should be reviewed and amended if appropriate which got to the whole issue of having to conform to specific mandates regarding density and the amount of growth which was now optional. The second recommendation was to delete the term "urban development area" from the Comp Plan. Even though the concept would still exist it was to be renamed to either "targeted growth area" or "targeted mixed use areas". The third recommendation was to have identified growth areas as a planning concept that must be retained in the Comp Plan. The Commission had also recommended the re-evaluation of targeted growth areas to make them a better tool to promote growth. The fourth recommendation was whether to retain UDAs or pursuit re-evaluation to help identify where the County should be pursuing different funding. The next part of the recommendation prioritized where the Commission had felt the UDAs might be more identified as near term targeted growth areas or future targeted growth areas. Mr. Zuraf explained that Commission prioritized the UDAs as follows:

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

1. Courthouse UDA, 2. Southern Gateway UDA, 3. Northern portion of the George Washington Village UDA, 4. Lower portion of George Washington Village UDA, 5. Centreport UDA, 6. Leeland Station UDA, 7. Eskimo Hill, 8. Brooke Station. Other areas that were not currently UDAs were also included by Commission, for example, Garrisonville Road Corridor and Boswell's Corner.

Mr. Zuraf reminded everyone that staff had handed out questionnaires to the Commission with some general questions as well as specific questions relating to each current UDA and other areas that might be considered. Mr. Zuraf asked the Chairman if he wanted him to go over the questions one by one.

Mr. Gibbons stated that he thought they should have a separate meeting on this particular item.

Mr. Apicella felt that Commission was focusing a lot on the "where" and not as much on the "what" and suggested that this was an opportunity to revisit the whole UD construct and policy and then ultimately go to the "where". He said that this would be a great opportunity to take a step back and reevaluate if what they had would get them what they want and need. Mr. Apicella suggested reaching out to stakeholders, the development community in particular, since they were the ones to make it happen or not. He also suggested reaching out to other communities for direction.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board was there should be some area that they focused development on and then PC had identified three that were currently called UDAs and a couple others that weren't called UDAs but should be concentrated on. Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Apicella if he was looking at shaping that construct and then trying to find opportunities to have a special meeting that would invite certain segments of the community.

Mr. Apicella again suggested reaching out to the appropriate stakeholders now and get some ideas.

Mr. Rhodes wanted to confirm that the request from the Board had been for the Planning Commission to take their recommendations and expand the general logic or to identify what changes would be necessary to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Zuraf answered that he believed it was open ended for the Commission to go ahead and make modifications to the UDAs and go ahead and make proposed amendments to the Comp Plan, conduct public hearings and bring it back.

Mr. Harvey agreed.

Mr. Rhodes reminded that they had to give specific suggestions to staff for them to be able to move forward.

Mr. Zuraf suggested for staff to go out and start the outreach and talk to different stakeholders to have that input for the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Mr. English agreed.

Mr. Rhodes stated that there had been a number of discussions on population projections in the past. He pointed out that at one point they were very locked to having to accommodate a certain population projection.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

Mr. Harvey responded that the State Code still said that for the Comp Plan they would have to include the projections of one or two sources, one being the Virginia Employment Commission or a regional projection for transportation planning purposes. He also pointed out that in the staff report there were two different numbers to work from, one being the state's VEC number from the Weldon-Cooper Center and the FAMPO number. He asked which projection staff should use for the future growth over the next 20 years.

Mr. Apicella replied that the projections based on Weldon-Cooper were very ambitious and that he found it hard to believe that they would grow by 110,000 between now and 2030.

After a short discussion between Mr. Apicella and Mr. Gibbons, it was decided that the FAMPO projection would be the better choice.

Mr. Harvey mentioned that staff has had some discussion with the FAMPO staff about the state projection and one of the issues they had pointed out to staff was that the state projections target certain localities which staff felt were unreasonable as far as future growth, because FAMPO looks at a total projected number for state wide and then would try to fit it into all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Rhodes stated had he thought that the general principal was the county having a few targeted areas that they would focus on as far as directing growth there. He also stated that he did not know that the old rules would have had 50 percent of all future growth, meaning the growth between now and 2020 would have to be accommodated in the UDA if the philosophy did not change.

Mr. Apicella asked if they were pushing towards something that was unrealistic for the stakeholders.

Mr. Harvey responded that from one perspective they had reality and how they anticipated reality to occur and from another perspective they had other requirements they had to meet. He stated that one advantage of using the FAMPO numbers was that they were tied into transportation planning which was tied into federal funding for roads, therefore they would have to be congruent with FAMPO, meaning they would have to use their numbers in the planning.

Mr. Rhodes asked how many housing units there were that already had subdivision plans.

Mr. Zuraf was not certain on that number, but he suggested several thousand.

Mr. Harvey added that there were probably 14,000 to 15,000 that staff had been tracking and some of those had already been built. He estimated about 5,000 to 6,000 that could be built in the future.

Mr. Apicella stated that bottom line was that there needs to be a plan for future growth, but some of the questions that needed to be asked were "how much direction do you need", but also "how much flexibility".

Mr. Harvey stated that this went back to the question of the form of growth. He asked how they wanted their growth to look. He mentioned that staff had people over the years saying that they would like to see a town of Stafford but that there was no such thing, even though the UDAs were heading in that direction. He stated this would be an opportunity to revisit that. There had been some discussion on that but nobody had moved forward with the high density project yet. He also stated that from a

***Planning Commission Minutes  
March 27, 2013***

perspective of having a variety of housing types they would still needed to have areas identified where more dense development would be acceptable.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there very any other thoughts for staff and explained that for the time being staff would go out and gather information and input, as well as ideas on how to best complement and leverage the opportunities to target growth areas.

Mr. Gibbons added that the key element was to be hand in hand with Economic Development and to understand that there were a lot of unknowns like the sequestration, DoD changes, best future employers being medical and FBI not being able to move to Springfield or Dumfries.

Mr. English asked Mr. Gibbons where he heard about some sort of rail from Stafford to Potomac Mills.

Mr. Rhodes replied that Congressman Moran would like a long term study.

Mr. Gibbons added that Mr. Moran and Mr. Connelly want a study going to Centreville.

Mr. Rhodes added that there was no funding or anything and that they just asked for a study.

Mr. English asked how many years they had talked about VRE before that became reality.

Mr. Gibbons stated that the number one commuting quarter on the east coast was from Fredericksburg to Washington, DC, and the only one that could move a lot of people in a short period of time would be Metro who in VRE only got one or two trains an hour.

Mr. Apicella confirmed.

Mr. Gibbons continued by saying that Metro would not be able to move that amount of people that were moving up and down the corridor and if the FBI would put anything down in the Quantico region they would need reverse commute and Stafford did not have that.

Dr. Schwartz stated that the transfer of development rights was a good tool but inquired what more could be done to bait the hook and make people want to come into the UDAs.

Mr. Zuraf explained that they had been establishing the zoning districts that could make it work, that allowed the density and were high enough to get to the form of development desired. He mentioned that a more extreme option would be for the County to actually go and zone the property, but then they would not get any proffers.

Mr. Rhodes added that it was mainly density which was giving them opportunity to get greater volume.

Mr. Zuraf offered to report back at the next meeting with a summary of what kind of questions staff will be asking to make sure everybody is on board.

Mr. Rhodes thanked Mr. Zuraf and asked to move on to the Planning Director's Report.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

10. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain the Stafford County Code, Section 28-35, Table 3.1“ Districts Uses and Standards,” to include the use of home occupations as a permitted by-right use in the RBC Zoning District. **(Time Limit: May 28, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for April 10, 2013 Public Hearing)***
11. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain the Stafford County Code, Section 28-183 “Building Permits” to remove the language granting authority to issue a building permits from the Zoning Administrator and the procedure for such action and clarify the language to ensure review of a building permit for compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. **(Time Limit: April 28, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for April 10, 2013 Public Hearing)***
12. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain Stafford County Code, Section 28-184, “Certificates of Occupancy,” to remove the language granting authority to issue a certificate of occupancy from the Zoning Administrator, and the procedure for such action, and to clarify the language to ensure that reviews of certificates of occupancy are in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. **(Time Limit: April 28, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for April 10, 2013 Public Hearing)***
13. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amend and reordain Stafford County Code, Section 28-39(c)(1). “Lawful Location of Manufactured Homes,” to remove the width requirement of nineteen feet (19’), and the word “conventional” from the Zoning Ordinance. **(Time Limit: April 28, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for April 10, 2013 Public Hearing)***
14. Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Amend the Comprehensive Plan by adopting textual amendment to the Comprehensive Plan regarding the Transfer of Development Rights Program, including the Sending and Receiving Area Map. **(Time Limit: May 12, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for April 24, 2013 Public Hearing)***
15. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O13-07 would amend Stafford County Code to create a definition for public parking lot and modify the definition of public works to include the term public parking lot. Additionally, the proposed ordinance would allow public parking lots as conditional uses in several zoning districts. Public parking lots built by the County or other governmental entity would be a by-right use in most zoning districts. **(Time Limit: May 14, 2013)(Schedule discussion with Economic Development staff on March 13, 2013)**  
***(Scheduled for May 8, 2013 Public Hearing)***
16. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Anne E. Moncure Elementary School Relocation - Consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to include Assessor’s Parcels 20-66B, 20-66C, 21-15, and 21-16 within the Urban Services Area, and change the land use designation from Agricultural to Suburban. The property consists of 23.7 acres and is located on the northeast side of Juggins Road, south of Smith Lake Drive, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: August 31, 2013)**  
***(Authorize for Public Hearing by: July 10, 2013)***  
***(Potential Public Hearing Date: August 28, 2013)***

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

NEW BUSINESS

17. SUB1200337; Holly Ridge, Section 2, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 18 single family residential lots on 12.03 acres zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, located at end of Phillips Street on south side of Holly Street on Assessor's Parcel 54-112 and 54D-5E-25 (lots 16-25), within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: June 20, 2013)**

*Discussed after item 5 above.*

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated that he did not have anything specific listed on the agenda but he wanted to make the Commission aware that, with the Comprehensive Plan being revised in 2010, one of the implementation strategies had been to amend the zoning and subdivision ordinances to reflect the changes to the Comp Plan. He stated that staff had moved forward with a consultant to do an analysis of both documents which was close to being finalized and staff was hoping that this could be added to the June 1<sup>st</sup> agenda. He explained that staff would like to talk to the Commission about what the problems were with the Codes combined and ways to make them more user friendly.

Mr. Gibbons asked Mr. Harvey if they came up with a term called hyperlink.

Mr. Harvey replied that the ordinance would have a number of features like that in it.

Mr. Rhodes asked about any concerns and stated that they would try to fit that in.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. McClendon stated that there was no report at this time.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

18. Proffer Guidelines

Mr. Rhodes stated that there would be a meeting regarding the proffer guidelines and asked when the meeting would take place.

Mr. Hirons replied that the meeting would be on April 17<sup>th</sup> at 7 pm in the County Administrator's Conference Room. He also stated that they definitely wanted to make this a productive meeting and that he had a feeling that there would be quite a bit of discussion. He was not certain when the last time had been and whether the document developed by the committee had been distributed to PC and BOS.

Mr. Harvey said that he believed they did have a briefing before the Commission but he did not believe it went to the full Board.

Mr. Hirons stated that he was wondering if this document could be distributed to the entire Planning Commission and to the members of the Boards of Supervisors to help facilitate any questions that may

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 27, 2013***

come up. He mentioned that the Committee members were Mr. Gibbons, Dr. Schwartz and himself, as well as Mr. Sterling and Mr. Schieber from the Board of Supervisors.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Mr. Rhodes stated that he had nothing else to address.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

19. TRC Information – Meeting April 10, 2013-Cancelled

Mr. Rhodes stated that the vote was 6-1 on Shelton Woods.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There was a motion by Mr. Gibbons to approve the January 9, 2013 minutes, and it was seconded by Mr. English. The motion passed 6-0, with Mr. Apicella abstaining.

There was a motion by Mr. Gibbons to approve the January 23, 2013 minutes, and it was seconded by Mr. Boswell. The motion passed 7-0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.