

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 24, 2013

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 24, 2013, was called to order at 6:31 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, Ennis, Narvaez, and Knighting

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any Declarations of Disqualification for any items on the agenda.

Mr. Gibbons stated he did visit the site for the proposed Murphy Oil Company.

Mr. Apicella stated he had a conversation with the applicant's agent on item 12.

Mr. Rhodes stated item 12 was Poplar Hills Section 4 and 5. He stated not items of disqualification, but items of clarification to insure full transparency. He stated they would now move on to public presentations but wanted to highlight the public hearing for this evening has been postponed. He stated there was a technical error that would have precluded the Commission's ability to address this item and there was action by the Board last night which made this a bit moot and it will have to be reworked. Therefore during the public presentation portion if any individual would like to speak on any item you will have three minutes to do so and you may come forward at this time.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

James Ingram stated he was speaking for the elimination Conifer Way, which was item number 12. He stated he represents the homeowners and they put together a petition to ask the Planning Commission to support the elimination of Conifer Way. He stated 24 homeowners signed the petition. In his subdivision there were 37 total lots and 3 were empty, 1 was the model and 2 were rentals which left 31 homeowners to contact. He stated there were approximately 6 homes that he did not contact. Everyone he did contact supported the waiver and wanted the road to go away, so he just wanted to clarify that. He stated he had other homeowners present tonight that wanted to say a few words and ask for the approval of the waiver that goes to Camp Geary Estates subdivision. On that side there are no homeowners yet, the builder is still building and explained why the number of 76 total platted lots was so high, but almost half of those don't have homes yet.

Stuart Strange stated he also came out to support the elimination of Conifer Way and thanked the Commission for allowing this forum to speak.

Jeff Elliott stated he lives in the same neighborhood as the two gentlemen that spoke before him. He stated he and his wife support the waiver for the elimination of Conifer Way. He stated he knew of four families that could not make the meeting tonight because their children are playing sports at local high schools and they all support the elimination as well. He thanked the Commission for the time to speak on behalf of his neighborhood.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Rhodes thanked everyone for taking the time to come out this evening. With no one else coming forward to speak he closed the public presentation portion. He stated again, the public hearing, item 1, has been postponed. They would move on to unfinished business, which was item 2, CUP1200415, a conditional use permit for Brooke Village.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Transfer of Development Rights Amend the Comprehensive Plan by adopting the following amendments to the Comprehensive Plan regarding the Transfer of Development Rights Program including the Sending and Receiving Area Map. **(Time Limit: May 12, 2013)**

Postponed

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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) (History: Deferred at March 27, 2013 to April 10, 2013) (Deferred at April 10, 2013 to April 24, 2013)**

Robert Narvaez gave the staff update, stating he provided the Commission with an updated Resolution. He stated the applicant had decided to take down a lot, going from 21 to 20 lots. The engineer was also there to answer any questions about the utility upgrade or the right-of-way.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions for staff. Mr. Gibbons asked if all the open space was contiguous.

Mr. Narvaez stated yes.

Mr. Rhodes asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Gibbons asked if the applicant was proffering \$80,000 or a proportionate share.

Dan Webb stated they will contribute a minimum of \$80,000 or a share. The Utility Department wanted them to pay for the entire upgrade. He stated if the cost came in below the \$80,000, they would give the remainder of the money to the Utility Department to fix other items that might be downstream of this.

Mr. Gibbons asked if it went over, would they agree to pay their proportionate share.

Mr. Webb stated yes; and if it came in less than \$80,000, they would contribute the additional \$20,000 to the Utility Department.

Dr. Schwartz and Mr. Gibbons had a short discussion regarding proportionate share. Mr. Gibbons stated he did not like the word proportionate share; it should just say the cost of the project.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

Mr. Rhodes asked if the proportionate share dealing with if they were doing improvements for other areas as well.

Mr. Webb stated he thought that was the thought. He stated if it was just to handle the 20 lots, they were going to pay 100% because their proportionate share would be 100% of the project upgrade.

Mr. Apicella stated it did not say proportionate share of what specific upgrades.

Mr. Rhodes asked counsel the effectiveness of the language that was there.

Ms. McClendon stated she believed it was up to the Commission. She stated if the Commission was not comfortable with the language, it could be amended to make it clearer.

Mr. Rhodes stated proportionate share associated with to accommodate the subdivision as well and \$80,000 or proportionate share associated with whichever was greater.

Mr. Gibbons stated he would say it was a minimum of \$80,000.

Mr. Rhodes stated that was what the last sentence allowed for; should they amount to less than \$80,000, the remainder would be contributed to the County. He stated the applicant was comfortable with, if everyone else was comfortable with, a modification to item number 4, after the sixth word, contribute a minimum of \$80,000 or the proportionate share of the construction costs of the upgrades as determined by the Department of Utilities.

Mr. Webb stated that was fine.

Dr. Schwartz made a motion to recommend approval.

Mr. Gibbons seconded.

Ms. McClendon stated that according to the by-laws, the GDP was submitted tonight to the Planning Commission and they would need two-thirds vote to accept that.

Mr. Rhodes stated they would pull the motion off the table.

Dr. Schwartz made a motion to accept the information in the new GDP.

Mr. Gibbons seconded.

The motion passed 7-0.

Dr. Schwartz made a motion to recommend approval of the CUP.

Mr. Gibbons seconded and said he wanted to thank the Dr. and the applicant for giving the additional land.

Mr. Apicella wanted to thank the applicant also for going beyond the minimum requirements. He stated they needed to further look at R-1 bonus density and recommend that they ask the Board to give

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

them a chance to take another look at this to see if it would be worth continuing on with bonus density for R-1.

Mr. Rhodes wanted to also thank the applicant because minimum requirements as stated helped to reinforce the strength of the approach which was actually more consistent with a conditional use permit to show that it was providing for greater benefit, and they did provide for greater benefit.

The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Rhodes asked staff to package a little communication, that the Commission could review that would be a case to be made to the Board to ask them to consider forwarding some action to the Planning Commission dealing with refining that Ordinance.

Mr. Harvey stated staff would put together some bullet points for the Commission to consider.

3. COM1100211; Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Whitson Woods - A proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030 document, a component of the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Section 15.2-2229 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The proposed amendment would change the land use recommendations for areas designated Suburban on the Land Use Plan, specifically to add the development of townhouse and multi-family residential dwelling units as an allowable use, where compatible with existing development patterns and where visual impacts from lower density residential uses or other incompatible uses are appropriately mitigated. This proposal would apply to multiple areas in the County, but also, is requested to specifically apply to Assessor's Parcel 20-125, located on the south side of Highpointe Boulevard, approximately 2,000 feet west of Mine Road, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: June 9, 2013) (History: Deferred at April 10, 2013 to April 24, 2013)**
4. RC1100212; Reclassification – Whitson Woods Rezoning - A proposed reclassification from R-1, Suburban Residential to R-3, Urban Residential-High Density Zoning District to allow townhouse dwelling units on Assessor's Parcel 20-125, consisting of 17.6 acres, located on the south side of Highpointe Boulevard, approximately 2,000 feet west of Mine Road in the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: July 9, 2013) (History: Deferred at April 10, 2013 to April 24, 2013)**

Mike Zuraf gave a presentation the Commission. He stated items 3 and 4 were an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and a Reclassification. He stated the Comp Plan Amendment was regarding townhomes and multi-family dwellings in the Suburban Land Use Areas of the county and the Reclassification was for Assessor's Parcel 20-125 from R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District to R-3, Urban Residential High Density Zoning District. He stated a public hearing was conducted at the last meeting and the Commission deferred the request to obtain additional information on both items. He stated additional information was provided to the Commission at their desk tonight, based on subsequent requests. He stated the first issue to address was dealing with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. There was a request of staff to evaluate how this Comp Plan Amendment might affect other properties. Basically looking across the county and seeing what other properties might be considered consistent with the proposed Comp Plan Amendment language. He stated maps were provided and highlighted in red were properties that staff identified that could be considered consistent with the new language that was put forward, that would support multi-family or townhouse developments for properties that were adjacent to existing or planned townhouse or multi-family

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

projects. He stated the next issue was concern about the amendment being too far reaching across the county and staff was asked to consider some additional language that might narrow down the issue to this area, and staff has put that forward for the Commission to consider. He stated this would recommend townhouse and apartment projects that were more so located in the proximity of Mine Road and north of Whitsons Run and also the properties would be directly on Mine Road or along a collector road off of Mine Road, and on land that was physically abutting existing townhome or condominium projects. He showed a map and pointed out that there were a few properties in the northern area of the county that could be compliant.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the criteria on the other properties were ones that had multi-family or townhomes on any one side or on multiple sides.

Mr. Zuraf stated they were properties that had a connection on any one side.

Mr. Rhodes asked if any of those had them on two sides, or to what degree that would constrain the applicability. He stated in the situation with the application before the Commission there were actually on three sides. He asked if it was two or more side would that provide a constraining characteristic that might be beneficial.

Mr. Zuraf stated a lot of them were just one side. Maybe 25 percent of them had multiple sides.

Mr. Rhodes stated what stood out to him in the application was given that the project was surrounded, it certainly seemed to be an anomaly that we had it in a different area. He stated he appreciated the attempt of staff to find alternate language that might help to constrain, but that is getting so specific for a comprehensive plan it almost feels like a degree of spot zoning. He stated he thought language that identifies areas that are abutting and adjacent to on two or more sides might be targeting more so what is occurring here and might help to constrain further.

Mr. Zuraf stated looking at the sites on the southern part of the County, there would be very few because they only had one side.

Mr. Rhodes stated defining a side may be difficult, but if it was 50 percent or more of the abutting linear footage or something like that.

Mr. Apicella asked if the Commission could look at it in two pieces, two or more or at least three sides. Then the Commission could see how that might change the overall number.

Mr. Rhodes stated that might be informative. He stated that might be an approach that might help possibility shape this more in the fashion the Commission was heading.

Mr. Apicella stated he thought if part of the purpose was not just looking at this one particular circumstance, but how we deal with or encourage infill development, maybe stepping back from a policy perspective, what are we trying to achieve? What are we trying to make happen that otherwise would not happen? He asked if staff could also give the Commission some goals that this change might try to accomplish. What are we trying to achieve with infill development?

Mr. Zuraf stated this modification would narrow down the focus and the extent of where it would apply. Aside from that the intent of the language was the idea of supporting similar types of uses

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

where they are already established. He said if you have an area where it is generally a townhouse development; it would support the continuation of a similar use on infill projects.

Mr. Apicella asked what defines what the area is, if there are just a couple of townhomes and the rest is single family homes, which is the predominant use. If we say because there are some townhomes next to this one spot you can put more townhomes, but again 70 to 80 percent was single family homes it might be in conflict with what we are ultimately trying to achieve. He stated he was trying to find out what the Commission was trying to reshape.

Mr. Rhodes stated currently infill and redevelopment is emphasized in the redevelopment areas of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Zuraf agreed.

Mr. Rhodes this was adding to that a little, but the Commission wants to be very thoughtful of the logic behind that.

Mr. Zuraf stated another thought to consider might be to just provide it as an option so it doesn't say that this is exactly what we want, but maybe multi-family or townhomes might be considered in areas adjacent to where they are already established. That would leave it open for consideration of all the factors.

Mr. Rhodes stated currently the Comp Plan says infill and redevelopment will focus on... and it talks about areas but it is really the redevelopment areas. So what you are suggesting is another sentence after that... may also consider locations where there are greater density developments on two or more sides of a property, or something along that. He asked Mr. Zuraf if that was his suggestion.

Mr. Zuraf stated yes.

Mr. Gibbons stated he did not have the Comp Plan and asked what infill development was. He asked if it was defined as a category.

Mr. Zuraf stated it was not a specific land use district.

Mr. Rhodes asked what the term infill development means. He asked if there was a definition in the Comp Plan or was it just used as a generalized industry definition.

Mr. Harvey stated to his recollection it was a generalized term that is used. He stated that with this amendment more specificity could be added.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Harvey how he would describe infill development.

Mr. Harvey stated infill development was development that was occurring on a vacant or underutilized piece of property. It is development that fits in with the overall pattern of the existing development in the area.

Mr. Zuraf continued his presentation and stated the next issue was related to the rezoning. He stated there was a request for the applicant to consider increased cash contributions. He stated that has not changed in the latest version of proffers, but the applicant was present and could address that

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

separately. He stated issue 4 dealt with proffer 3-E, improvement funds, the applicant has proffered to contribute construction improvements on the adjacent Liberty Place project. And there was a request for the applicant to consider, should Liberty Place for some reason not agree to those improvement, those funds would be turned over to the county and proffer 3-E would provide that as an addition. Issue 5 was dealing with proffer 9, the tot lot. The applicant amended this proffer upon the Commission's request to remove the restriction on the use of the tot lot so the adjacent residents could have use also. He stated the applicant did include additional specificity to the off-site improvements which clarified they would be providing. He stated the applicant did submit a revised version of the off-site improvement exhibit, which the Commission did receive. Other additional materials were provided by email include a letter from the Liberty Place HOA Community.

Mr. Rhodes stated the letter was well written and made a complex issue quite clear.

Mr. Zuraf stated after the last meeting there was a separate request to provide a proffer comparison chart that compared the proffers being offered by the applicant in comparison to the current proffer guidelines and the proposed proffer guidelines.

Mr. Apicella stated he did his own analysis, under the current guidelines, of the information provided by staff and in reviewing the information it appears the applicant is offering about \$891,000 to build 55 townhomes. That comes to an average of \$16,209 per development unit. He stated \$420,000 would go towards street, sidewalk and slope stabilization improvements. He stated it was about 56 percent below the 2.1 million recommended proffers. If provided in full it would provide \$39,116 per development unit. He stated under the proposed guidelines it was minus \$335,000 or 28 percent under the proposed proffer guidelines for an average of \$22,312 per development unit. He stated those proposed proffer guidelines have not yet formally considered at the Planning Commission level or by the Board of Supervisors. He stated the delta was minus \$23,000 per development unit under the current guidelines and minus \$6,103 per development under the proposed guidelines. He stated to his knowledge no recent approved zonings have been based on or even close to the draft guidelines and his point was there is a big delta between what is being proposed, both under the existing guidelines and the proposed guidelines. He stated he raised the point because when the Commission receives a reclassification, part of their job was to consider whether what was being proposed in the reclassification was as good as or better than what could occur by-right. He stated he was concerned that what was being proposed would off-set the cost of the growth that was being proposed.

Mr. Zuraf stated the Commission did also receive a one page comparison of this project against the most recent residential rezonings that have occurred in the county over the last few years.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Zuraf to go over the comparison to make sure everyone understood.

Mr. Zuraf explained that since 2011 there were three other residential rezonings that occurred. He stated he went through each and tabulated the full amount of proffers and in-kind proffers as well that have a cash value and applied those across the project to get a comparison. He then went into further detail with each project and explained each of the three projects and compared them to the current request. He noted that each project had different features and existing conditions which made them a little different.

Mr. Gibbons stated the concern at the last meeting was the residents across the street and the access road. He asked if any thought had been given on how to mitigate that.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Harvey stated if you look at the diagram that was a second access point within the neighborhood. He stated the subdivision ordinance does require more than one access point when you reach a certain threshold. He stated if the Commission was willing to grant a waiver, they could only have one access point.

Mr. Gibbons asked how many units.

Mr. Zuraf stated 55.

Mr. Gibbons asked what the threshold requirement was for a second entrance.

Mr. Harvey stated he thought it was 50, but asked for a moment to confirm.

Mr. Apicella stated he would like to address the proffer issue. He stated for the last two years the proffers were over \$30,000 per unit.

Mr. Zuraf confirmed.

Mr. Apicella stated he thought he heard the applicant's agent say, at the last meeting, the approach she took was consistent with the proposed proffer guidelines. He stated there was a proffer subcommittee meeting last week and he reviewed the package. He stated for by-right units, the proposed proffer guideline offer only a 25 percent credit which would mean the applicant would provide 75 percent of the proposed proffer for a by-right unit and asked Mr. Zuraf if that was correct.

Mr. Zuraf stated yes, in the current version that was being considered.

Mr. Apicella stated the difference between zero and 75 percent was quite a bit.

Mr. Zuraf agreed.

Mr. Rhodes stated under the proposed guidelines it would be 22 units would be about \$18,000 per unit for 75 percent.

Mr. Apicella stated he was not suggesting the proposed guidelines were the correct amount, he stated zero was not what was recommended under those guidelines.

Mr. English stated Colonial Forge was putting townhomes in.

Mr. Harvey confirmed.

Mr. English asked how many townhomes were going in and what they were paying.

Mr. Zuraf stated he did not know any of the number off the top of his head. He stated he would have to check.

Mr. Harvey stated Section 22-190 of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding street access say that streets shall be arranged to provide access to adjoining parcels where necessary to promote orderly development of the County. Major subdivisions shall provide access to adjoining parcels and subdivisions as required below. It further says basically if you are 36 to 50 lots you can provide one

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

access to an adjacent subdivision. If you are 51 to 100 you have to have 2 access points to adjacent subdivisions. He stated based on the Ordinance there would need to be 2 access points to the adjacent subdivisions; however it says the agent can grant an exception if the required number of access connections where it can be demonstrated topography, flood plain, and impact to wetlands or other sensitive environmental features make the connection impractical. He stated there was no other practical connection because there are no other street connections other than the existing street. He stated he thought in order to not have that connection to the existing street it would require a waiver.

Mr. Rhodes stated he understood the basis for a waiver was for circumstances where the topography or environmental considerations are what would preclude the ability to connect.

Mr. Harvey stated that was the basis for the agent granting an administrative exception.

Mr. Gibbons stated the density could be reduced to 50.

Mr. Harvey stated in that case you would still have one connection required and that would be the connection to the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Gibbons stated he was talking about the one across the street.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was required.

Mr. Gibbons asked Mr. Zuraf to show the map again.

Mr. Zuraf showed the map to the Commission and pointed out the area being discussed but noted under this proposal there were two entrances.

Detailed discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Harvey concerning the need for the connection to an existing neighborhood, the required density and the details of a waiver.

Mr. Zuraf stated the applicant was present and he thought they had additional information for the Commission.

Mr. Gibbons stated he wanted to thank staff for all the information they provided the Commission.

Debrarae Karnes, Leming and Healy, representing the applicant stated she wanted to thank staff for all their help and for their exhaustive summary. She stated she would try to keep her comments brief and really focus in on some of the questions that were asked. She stated one of the questions came from Mr. Gibbons, who was concerned about both the adjoining residents ability to use the proposed park as well as whether there would be safety concerns because of where the current resident play, near the road. She stated as staff reported the proffer has been amended to provide flexibility to allow the relocation of the pocket park. Because of the topography additional looks would be needed and they wanted to consult with the adjacent neighborhood to determine the best option. She stated the proffer removed the commitment for the exact location and it also removed the language which prohibits access to the pocket park by anyone other than a member of the Whitson Woods HOA. She stated when writing this change she worked with Jennifer Blum, representing the Liberty Place HOA, who gave her some clarification. She stated how Ms. Blum perceived the people who came and spoke last time was that some children currently play in the woods where we would be building and they would lose the opportunity to play on vacant land. She stated Ms. Blum always thought the land would be

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

developed and the opportunity to play there would be lost. So she welcomed the opportunity to help us plan and design the location of the pocket park and she would appreciate comments from the Commission. She moved on to say her second comment was about cash proffers and again she did want to reiterate it has been a pleasure to work on this case because it has been an opportunity to resolve an existing problem in an existing neighborhood. She stated they were proffering to pay proffers on the 33 units, which were the new units. And not pay proffers on the 22 existing units. She stated one of the reasons for this justification was the original staff proposal in March 2012, did not call for any payment of proffers for by-right units.

Mr. Apicella stated he was still not clear why you did not take into account the revised subcommittee's proposed proffer guidelines. He stated he cannot speak to the staff's proposal, but he could speak to the subcommittee's proposal. You have two diametrically different proposals, and asked at what point you started to identify proposed proffers for this development.

Ms. Karnes stated they have been working on this project for more than two years. She stated 20/20 hind sight was great, but she wanted the Commission to know they also looked at neighboring jurisdictions. She stated Spotsylvania County, by written policy, does not collect any cash proffers for existing units. She stated the proposed proffer policy has not gone to public hearing, it has not had the opportunity to get any comment or feedback from any citizen, including the development community.

Mr. Apicella stated the same would be true for the original version that had no proffers. He stated he was following Ms. Karnes.

Mr. Hirons stated as a point of clarity, all of the subcommittee meetings where proffers have been discussed have been publicly noted committee meetings, so citizen have had the opportunity to discuss. He asked if that was the case why would you be using the draft proffers, why not go with that was on the books today.

Ms. Karnes stated they believe the proffers on the books today are inaccurate and flawed in part because they are so old and they are procedurally flawed.

Mr. Rhodes stated they were more expensive.

Mrs. Karnes agreed, they were more expensive but stated she was not there to discuss the proffer policy but they believe they are fundamentally flawed because they do not deduct the deficiency, what Stafford County should have paid for, for the current residents. She stated they made a judgment call and believed the proffers they were offering were correct. She stated all she could say to the Commission was you asked last time whether or not any other developments had been allowed not to pay proffers on by-right units and staff answered that question today. She stated last time the question was asked, was your applicant willing to pay any additional money. She went back to the applicant and their response was money was tight and they were really close to the margins on this case, which was one of the reasons for the proffers from the very beginning. She stated the current proffers were \$16,107 for each of the 33 new units but her client was willing to amend the proffers tonight, if the Commission was willing to choose to accept the amendment to pay a total of \$17,272 for each of the 33 units and of course \$420,000 for the Liberty Place improvements. She stated she thought that would close the gap to some extent and would be happy to commit to that if that was the Commission's desire.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Gibbons stated he was confused concerning the \$420,000. He asked Ms. Karnes if the entire amount was for offsite improvements in Liberty Place.

Ms. Karnes stated there was a small portion that was to fix a piece of sidewalk on Highpointe Boulevard, but the remainder of the \$420,000 improves Liberty Place.

Mr. Gibbons asked the amount for the sidewalk repair.

Ms. Karnes stated Denar was the engineer and she asked him to come speak and see if he could give an estimate.

Denar Antelo, with The Engineering Group, stated \$44,000 for sidewalks.

Ms. Karnes asked how much of that was specifically for Highpointe Boulevard.

Mr. Antelo stated all of it was for Highpointe Boulevard.

Mr. Gibbons asked if the remainder was for Liberty Place.

Ms. Karnes stated yes, approximately \$380,000 was for Liberty Place improvements.

Mr. English stated the entrance on Highpointe was on a hill and asked if the hill was going to be taken down any.

Mr. Antelo stated that particular entrance would have the hill graded out. I would require clearing and grading.

Mr. English asked if that would be the second entrance.

Mr. Antelo stated he was not sure. He would have to talk to D. R. Horton, the applicant.

Mr. Gibbons asked where the Highpointe people enter now.

Ms. Karnes stated the lower entrance and showed the location on a map.

Dr. Schwartz stated while we are coming up with draft proposals for new proffer guidelines that we never spoke about a 25 percent credit for by-right.

Ms. Karnes stated she hoped she did not and if she did that was incorrect. What she said was she used the staff presentation dated March 2012, which totally exempted by-right units from payment of cash proffers. She stated she thought it was originally the staff report created to get the presentation initiated by the Board.

Mr. Rhodes stated to start the process.

Ms. Karnes stated yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

Dr. Schwartz stated they were working papers that came out of the subcommittee. He stated what came out of the subcommittee and what was presented was there would be a charge for by-right when a rezoning was being done.

Mr. Gibbons stated to pick up on proffers, there is a great deal of difference when you are putting roads in a subdivision that have to go to State standards verses roads that are for townhomes. The cost per unit was much cheaper.

Mr. Roads asked because they are private roads and don't go into the State system. He stated that was a good point but he thought in both the current and proposed guidelines for proffers there was a lower cost for townhomes. He stated he had notes for further information, with one being from staff specifically dealing with trying to get further clarity on where else this text amendment might apply and what are locations if we get greater refinement into the approach, say locations that have other townhomes on two side or more than 50 percent of linear footage of the property or site and Mr. Apicella refined that a bit to actually make it three sides as well or greater than 50 percent. Trying to do a gradation of that to try and give us a sense of where that would be effective in the county so we would know where that would apply, because this is talking about a text change to the Comp Plan so we want to see what the implications are of that. He stated there was an open question on Colonial Forge's development, how many townhomes were there and what were the proffers associated with that project, just for some context. He stated he heard tonight a willingness to modify the proffers to \$17,272 for 33 units plus the \$420,000.

Mr. Gibbons stated he would like to take the applicant up on the tot lot. He stated when he walked it the other day it concerns him and they came before and they have a voice and he wants to make sure it is addressed.

Mr. Apicella stated by not going to a verbatim transcript something gets lost in translation when our packages move forward to the Board of Supervisors, they are not getting the entire context and all the information we discussed. With that in mind he would ask with the Commission's indulgence that the information he requested, both the emails and the actual data be provided verbatim to the Board, if and when the package moves forward. So the two emails that requested the information as well as the two charts so they can at least understand what my concerns are.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Harvey if that was doable.

Mr. Harvey stated yes.

Mr. Gibbons stated he knew this project was in Mr. Rhodes' district but he was concerned about the other entrance and a couple of issues. He stated he was only asking, but he would like to delay it one more meeting so the Commission could go up and walk the property.

Mr. Rhodes stated there are a couple of open items so he was inclined towards a deferral for one more meeting. If nothing else, how we would best capture the text amendment to insure we don't have too broad an application or an unintended consequence associated with it. So I am going to be inclined to towards that type of a recommendation in a moment. I just want to capture any other open items or issues.

Mr. Hirons stated the only thing he would like was a copy of the presentation or the documentation Ms. Karnes was referencing of the staff recommendation on the initial proffer guidelines.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

Mr. Rhodes stated he thought it was March 2012.

Mr. Apicella stated this was a frustration he would like to register. There was a subcommittee meeting last week, not one single member of the public showed up including the development community or the applicant in this case. It is an important piece of business and no one seemed to have any interest in it other than the few of us who are on the Commission who showed up and were not members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any other items or open questions.

Mr. English asked if it was possible the Commission could have someone from the Home Owners Association from Liberty Place present.

Mr. Rhodes stated we could certainly make them aware and ask if they would be willing, if there were particular questions or comments. He asked Mr. Harvey how that could be done.

Mr. Harvey stated he could contact Ms. Blum and see if she or another member of the Board...

Mr. Rhodes stated have them available for any discussion as part of the staff/applicant discussion.

Mr. Harvey stated yes.

Mr. Rhodes asked again if there were any other items. He stated he would like to make a motion that we defer this to our next session to address to address the specific questions and items of information that we have highlighted here in our discussion.

Mr. English seconded the motion.

Mr. Hirons stated the motion was made by Mr. Rhodes and seconded by Mr. English. He asked if there was any other discussion. Hearing none he called for the vote.

The motion passed 7-0.

5. CUP1200391; Conditional Use Permit – Washington Square Murphy Oil Service Station - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow motor vehicle fuel sales in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 58-9E. The property consists of 1.86 acres, located on the south side of Kings Highway, approximately 200 feet east of the entrance to Washington Square Plaza within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: July 9, 2013) (History: Deferred at April 10, 2013 to April 24, 2013)**

Robert Narvaez gave the staff update, stating there was a question about if a berm was able to be constructed at the site. He visited the site and provided photographs of it. He stated the applicant was willing to provide enhanced landscaping to help mitigate any more issues with headlights shining onto Kings Highway.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions of staff. He asked the applicant to come forward.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Gibbons asked for a follow-up on the enhancement. Hamilton Williams stated instead of trying to raise the site a couple feet to install a berm, they agreed that enhanced or supplemental landscaping, shrubs and additional trees along the entire frontage of the parcel, would be acceptable as long as it was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Rhodes asked how to address that.

Mr. Harvey stated the condition would have to be modified to stipulate the extent of the landscaping that was desired.

Dr. Schwartz stated as far as defining the landscape, they wanted something that would be a visual block throughout the year.

Mr. Rhodes stated this was the only issue and asked how to proceed.

Mr. Harvey stated staff could add some language to the condition. He asked if the Commission desired a hedgerow or did they want to have the condition stipulate that the frontage would be interspersed with the combination of shrubs and understory trees or canopy trees. This was not necessarily focused on as much shielding the headlights as it would be aesthetics.

Dr. Schwartz stated shielding the headlights from the street, and creating a pleasing visual from the street; something to create a visual barrier so that it would not look like a parking lot with pumps in it.

Mr. Rhodes stated he thought this would be a good one to just get addressed tonight. He asked Mr. Harvey if it would be best to defer this and move on to new business and then come back to it.

Mr. Harvey stated it may be helpful if staff could get with the applicant to work on wording while the Commission conducts other business and then come back and see if you are in agreement and it could be brought back to the Commission for final approval.

Mr. Rhodes asked Dr. Schwartz if that was acceptable.

Dr. Schwartz stated that sounded great.

Mr. Rhodes stated this would be deferred for a moment to let staff work with the applicant a few minutes and move ahead. He stated the rest were future public hearing items so he thought the Commission would be on new business.

Mr. Harvey confirmed and stated the next item to be discussed would be item number 12.

Discussion continued after item 12.

6. 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) (History: Deferred at March 27, 2013 to April 10, 2013)**
(Scheduled for June 1, 2013 Retreat)

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

7. 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)**
(Scheduled for May 8, 2013 Public Hearing)
8. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O13-23 would amend Stafford County Code, Section 28-59, "Highway Corridor Overlay District (HC)" to amend the development standards in the HC district to allow a developer to provide a payment in lieu of constructing a sidewalk with permission of the County Administrator and allow the construction of a curb without gutter when appropriate and specify that architectural treatment of building facades be designed to the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan of the Comprehensive Plan. **(Time Limit: June 11, 2013)**
(Scheduled for May 8, 2013 Public Hearing)
9. 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)**
(Scheduled for May 22, 2013 Public Hearing)
10. 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)
11. Discussion of Public Notification Requirements **(History: Deferred at February 5, 2013 to February 13, 2013)**
(Scheduled for June 1, 2013 Retreat)

NEW BUSINESS

12. WAI1300133 – Poplar Hills, Sections 4 & 5 - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, 22-155, Block Length for property, located on the north side of Brooke Road between Camp Geary Lane and Dear Chase Road on Assessor's Parcel 48-1, zoned A-1, Agricultural, and A-2, Rural Residential, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: July 23, 2013)**

LeAnn Ennis presented the staff report and stated item 12 was a waiver for Poplar Hills Sections 4 and 5 for the block length, which was Subdivision Ordinance 22-155. She gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the preliminary plan was approved for 76 single family dwellings for section 4 and 5 and it was located in the Aquia district. She showed an aerial layout and stated the preliminary plan was approved in 2002 by the Planning Commission and it showed two main interior roads coming off of

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Brooke Road. She stated the preliminary plan showed Camp Geary Lane and Deer Chase Drive, and pointed out the locations to the Planning Commission. In 2001, at TRC, she was the original planner and there was a discussion concerning the block length and that was why the Conifer stub was put in to eliminate the block length street segment.

Mr. Rhodes stated in the more developed urban areas the block length is no more than a quarter mile long and in the agricultural/rural they should be no longer than half a mile long.

Mrs. Ennis agreed. She stated the street name, Deer Chase was changed to Sentinel. She showed the location of Conifer Way and noted the two lots of Conifer Way were not platted. For clarification she stated the preliminary plan showed them as two lots, but when Section 5 was platted those two lots were omitted because of the road crossing. She stated they have been working on this project for a few years, knowing there was sever topo issues there.

Mr. Rhodes asked about the road on the bottom of the picture Mrs. Ennis was showing, and asked if it currently went into Brooke.

Mrs. Ennis stated that was Brooke Road.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the other road would go off of Brooke as well.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes. She showed the street on the map and stated it went all the way up into Brooke Ridge subdivision.

Mr. Rhodes stated the road that was not yet developed went all the way into the back.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes. It had a connection so there was another way out.

Mr. Rhodes stated the existing road was an eight-tenths of a mile cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes.

Mr. Apicella asked if the bottom half was also part of Poplar Hills.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes.

Mr. Apicella stated Conifer Way was just to connect the two sections. It was an intra-parcel connection, not an inter-parcel connection.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes. It was a requirement to break up the road segment... the block length. And the block length began at the intersection of Runny Meade and that exceeded twenty-five hundred feet.

Mr. Apicella asked what was below Conifer Way.

Mrs. Ennis stated that was RPA and was on the back of each lot. She stated that was the topo issue that the applicant had.

Mr. Rhodes stated it fundamentally comes down to, should the Commission be willing to accept a very extensive long block length in order to preclude the passage through and disruption of the RPA.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mrs. Ennis agreed. She showed another map and explained to the Commission the road locations and the RPA location.

Mr. Apicella stated other than meeting the requirement was there any benefit to Conifer Way.

Mrs. Ennis stated on the planner's side of it, the benefit would be for emergency purposes there would be another means of in and out, it would be another way out.

Mr. Apicella stated in order to do that you would have to encroach into the RPA along the entire development.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes, which was approximately 400 feet in length.

Mr. Rhodes stated the basic principal with the block length and the inner connectivity was all about emergency response, school buses and other activities. That was just the basic behind the planning principal.

Mrs. Ennis agreed. She stated the road elimination would increase Camp Geary Lane in block length but it does not impact any of the homeowners or lots.

Mr. Rhodes asked about the lot at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Ennis stated that was Brooke Ridge subdivision and it was already platted and it came if before Poplar Hills.

Mr. English asked if they were two different subdivisions.

Mrs. Ennis stated there were six sections to Poplar Hills, it is the same subdivision.

Mr. Apicella stated there were 79 units possible.

Mrs. Ennis stated the preliminary plan the Commission approved in 2002 approved 76 lots for Sections 4 and 5.

Mr. Apicella stated so far only 36 homes have been developed in both of those two sections. He asked how many petitioner's there were.

Mrs. Ennis stated she thought it was 26.

Mr. Apicella stated that would be the majority and asked if the builder was in agreement with the proposed waiver.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they were the applicant.

Mrs. Ennis stated the applicant was actually the engineer representing the developer. She stated the engineer has been meeting with the environmental division, they have been trying to get off bond, they

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

have been working with Public Works and they have had several meeting on this item and the recommendation was to go to the Planning Commission and request a waiver.

Mr. Rhodes asked if these were on well.

Mrs. Ennis stated yes.

Mr. Rhodes stated when you are on public water and sewer there was a greater purpose and need for block length but that was not applicable in this instance.

Mr. Apicella asked if there was any opposition to the waiver.

Mrs. Ennis stated no, staff recommends approval because of topography and the environmental protection.

Mr. Apicella stated the bottom line was negative impacts of building the road outweigh the positives of continuing forward with the block length waiver. He stated he thought he heard something along those lines when something was read from the Code. He asked Mr. Harvey if he could read that again.

Mr. Harvey stated in Section 22-190 of the code it deals with street access to adjacent subdivisions and properties. He stated it says the agent may grant an exception of the required number of access connections where it can be demonstrated that topography, flood plain, impact to wetlands or other sensitive environmental features make the connection impractical.

Mr. Apicella stated that was kind of exactly what was happening here. He asked if the Commission was the final stop on this request or did it have to go forward to the Board.

Mrs. Ennis stated the waiver was only needed for Section 5. She would have to proceed further for the abandonment of Conifer Way on the other side, because that is already platted.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Apicella if his question was if this was a recommendation forward to the Board or if this was an action of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Apicella stated yes.

Mr. Harvey stated this would be a decision made by the Planning Commission. It would only go to the Board if there was an appeal.

Dr. Schwartz stated topography was one of the major issues and part of the lots on Sentinel Way have been sold, could Conifer Way be moved so the topography would be more desirable.

Mrs. Ennis showed the Resource Protection Area on the map and stated to topo was steep all the way down.

Dr. Schwartz stated that was his question. By moving Conifer Way it would not be a better benefit.

Mrs. Ennis stated no sir.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any other questions of staff or the applicant.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mrs. Ennis stated the engineer was present also.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there was anything the applicant would like to present.

Patricia Healy stated she was here with Mr. Schools, who was the engineer, the applicant of record on behalf of the developer. She stated she would like to make one point. She stated as Mr. Apicella disclosed, she had called him to discuss this and see if there were any questions. She stated he raised a question that she did not have an answer to which had to do with the HOAs. She stated she has learned that the sections will have completely independent HOAs. She stated there was an HOA for Section 4, there will be a separate HOA for Section 5. So even though there was a combination of 76 lots, you were only dealing with the 36 or so in Section 4.

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none he brought it back to the Commission.

Mr. Apicella stated he would recommend approval of the requested waiver.

Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion.

Mr. Apicella stated he appreciated the need for the block length requirement there was a reason why it did not work in every single case and this seemed to be a prime case where the benefits of the block length would not outweigh the cost of encroaching on the environmental area. He stated he strongly supports the waiver.

Mr. Rhodes stated there were circumstances where things just don't fit right and he understood the need not to impact the RPA. He stated the other aspect was it not makes it a single entrance for eight tenths of a mile. He stated he thought there was too much of a challenge with the lack of connectivity throughout the county, with only one point in and one point out. He stated he thought if there was ever an instance for it to apply it would be here.

The motion to approve the waiver passed 5 to 2. Mr. Rhodes and Dr. Schwartz voted no.

Mr. Rhodes stated they would now move back to item number 5 and asked if there was an opportunity to work a sentence or two.

5. *CUP1200391; Conditional Use Permit – Washington Square Murphy Oil Service Station - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow motor vehicle fuel sales in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and within the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 58-9E. The property consists of 1.86 acres, located on the south side of Kings Highway, approximately 200 feet east of the entrance to Washington Square Plaza within the George Washington Election District. (Time Limit: July 9, 2013) (History: Deferred at April 10, 2013 to April 24, 2013)*

Mr. Narvaez stated yes, and they would attach it to the proposed condition number 12 which read, currently to the maximum extent practical orient trees and shrubs not to interfere with lighting or site distance. Trees shall be limbed up six to eight feet and shrubs no taller than 36 inches. He stated this was the new language, as part of the required street buffer, landscaping along Kings Highway shall include a continuous row of evergreen shrubs at least two feet in height at planting and four canopy trees.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Rhodes asked if that was written and could be signed.

Mr. Narvaez stated yes.

Dr. Schwartz asked the maximum height of the hedge.

Mr. Narvaez stated 36 inches. It would be two feet at planting but no taller than 36 inches.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they had to vote on accepting the change.

Ms. McClendon stated since it was a condition it would be imposed by the Planning Commission so it was not information being presented to you.

Mr. Rhodes thanked Ms. McClendon.

Dr. Schwartz made a motion to recommend approval of the CUP1200391.

Mr. Apicella seconded.

Mr. Rhodes stated the motion was for approval with the modified condition as was read aloud for the record.

Mr. Gibbons stated he wanted to thank the Doctor or working this out and letting him walk the property.

The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Rhodes stated we are not moving on the Planning Directors Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

13. Quantico Joint Land Use Study

Mr. Harvey stated there was general information included in the mail out with regard to the Quantico Joint Land Use Study. Staff's was asking if any Commissioner would be interested in being interviewed as a stakeholder. If someone was interested, please let him know and he would direct the consultant to contact you.

Mr. Rhodes stated there was an opportunity to participate in the interviews. There are more opportunities if others are interested in participating.

Mr. Harvey stated with regard to the retreat, staff has generated a draft agenda for the Commissions consideration. Currently there are six items identified for discussion. It was originally contemplated the retreat would occur during a four hour time period, from 8 to noon on June 1st. He stated the Activities Room, which is on the ground level of this building, has been secured for the meeting. The six potential items were Revision to the Comprehensive Plan, specifically Targeted Growth Areas. Also information on the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance re-write regarding some consultant help we have had to do a diagnostic review of both documents and to discuss a way forward on how to proceed with the overall update. He stated also the discussion of public hearing notification which was

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

something that was discussed earlier this year and was left on the table for future discussion. We also discussed earlier this year a public hearing scheduling and a desire to flush that out a little bit further. We have a desired discussion about zoning cases and proposed policy and ordinance changes in what the code requirements are as well as what a desired process would be for handling applications that have both a policy change with the Comprehensive Plan and a Rezoning or an Ordinance change and a zoning change as well. He stated then he had monetary proffer guidelines. There was a question about having incentives for desired development, such as reduced proffers for areas we want to focus development in such as the targeted growth areas. Currently those are the six items that staff has picked up on over the last several meetings. We ask for any additions or deletions and please keep in mind we do have a block of four hours to cover these items.

Mr. Rhodes stated there was a lot the Commission wanted to accomplish with the first item. He stated he thought they would be lucky to get through three items but he thought they were all worthy of a consideration of an approach. He suggested that all Commissioners send an email to Mr. Harvey prioritizing the order.

A short discussion ensued concerning the word retreat and how the public perceived the meeting. It was decided the meeting would be called a Planning Commission Work Session.

Mr. Rhodes stated he appreciated the efforts of staff trying to keep working on this and the majority of the effort has to be on the first item because we have to get that addressed, but the other items have merit as well.

Mr. Harvey stated to continue his report, yesterday the Board of Supervisors approved the Jackson Family Rezoning, as you recall that was a rezoning in the Griffis-Widewater District to correct a zoning error. He stated that concludes his report.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Harvey to tell the Commission a little about the motion of the Board dealing with TDR.

Mr. Harvey stated Mr. Milde had a discussion on the Board's agenda yesterday with regard to TDR. The Board made a motion to refer overall changes to the TDR program back down to the Planning Commission and asked that the Commission consider as quickly as possible to generate a new ordinance and also a Comprehensive Plan amendment, specifically looking at the sending areas and looking at the acreage requirement in the area designated for park land, with a minimum of two acres. Also looking at the receiving areas and possibly adjusting the boundary of the receiving area to expand it to accommodate additional units that would likely come out of the sending area and/or potentially add the R-4 and B-3 zones to the receiving area and potentially reducing the A-1 zoning density in the receiving area down to 3 units per acre. Currently it is 3.25. He stated it was specific guidance to the Commission for how to proceed. Also Mr. Sterling raised an issue and it was discussed as adding it to the legislative agenda of the Board and also asked the Planning Commission to consider whether we could tie TDR units to the Neighborhood Design Standards in the Comprehensive Plan and require those new TDR units be built in accordance with those design standards. He stated that was something that would have to be investigated as the ordinance and Comp Plan amendment was drafted.

Mr. Rhodes stated staff would proceed with trying to shape something for the Commission to consider.

Mr. Harvey stated yes, if it was acceptable to the Commission staff would put together a straw man, so to speak, and use that as the beginning of the discussion point.

***Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013***

Mr. Rhodes stated he would appreciate that.

Mr. Hiron asked the current status of the TDR world with Stafford County because the Ordinance was passed but the map was not adopted. He asked what someone would be told currently if they were to come in and wanted to sell their development rights.

Mr. Harvey stated based on the Ordinance, staff could determine how many development rights they have on their property. He stated they would have to work through the situation if they wanted to sever their development rights. He stated he would have to do more research and see what, if any affect there was from not adopting the Comprehensive Plan amendment at this point in time.

Mr. Rhodes thanked Mr. Harvey and moved on to Committee Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

14. Proffer Guidelines

Mr. Hiron stated there was a Committee meeting attended by one of the members of the Board of Supervisors that was on the Committee. The other member was in a meeting in Richmond. He stated the Board member that was present was asked for guidance that he might have from the Board and to provide the Board with kind of a heads up. He stated he did not recall the final result.

Mr. Harvey stated his recollection was that Mr. Schieber would ask that it be placed on a future Board agenda for a presentation to the Board and the Board to give feedback to the Planning Commission so that can be taken into consideration as the Commission drafts the final version of the Proffer Guidelines for your recommendation back to the Board for them to consider adoption. He stated he understood the County Administrator's office had tentatively scheduled it for the May 6th Board meeting. Staff was working towards getting that information prepared for the Board members.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes stated he had nothing for the Chairman's report and moved on to TRC.

OTHER BUSINESS

15. TRC Information – Meeting May 8, 2013

Mr. Harvey stated there was one item for May 8th and he thought it was in Dr. Schwartz's district and he had the information pertaining to that case.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the time was known.

Mr. Harvey stated since it was only one application, it could be flexible as to the start time, but it would probably start at 9 because outside agencies would be attending.

Mr. Rhodes moved on to the approval of minutes.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 24, 2013

Mr. Gibbons stated he had one comment. He stated he wanted to thank the County Attorney for the wonderful document she sent to the Commission on Cluster. He stated the second item was Amy Ansong had left and he thought the Chairman should send a letter up to the Administrator about what an outstanding job she did for the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 13, 2013

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any comments on the February 13th minutes.

Mr. Gibbons made a motion to approve.

Mr. Hiron seconded.

The motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.