

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 1, 2013

The Special meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Tuesday, October 1, 2013, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the ABC Conference Room of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rhodes, Hiron, Apicella, Boswell, English, Gibbons, and Coen

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, and Stinnette

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any declarations or disqualifications regarding any item that is on the agenda this evening? Hearing none, we'll move on to Public Presentations. Any member of the public would like to present or speak on any item except for the item that's on the agenda. We'll move on to unfinished business. Mr. Harvey?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

N/A

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Index of Official Road Names - Proposed Ordinance O13-43 would amend the Stafford County Addressing Ordinance by amending the Index of Official Road Names to rename a portion of a road from Rocky Run Road to Roberson Road. **(Time Limit: October 8, 2013) (History: Deferred on September 25, 2013 to October 1, 2013)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The item of unfinished business is a potential amendment to the index of official road names, specifically, dealing with the Rocky Pen Run Reservoir and Rocky Run Road. As the Commission heard at the testimony at the public hearing, the road name is proposed to be changed due to the construction of Rocky Pen Run Reservoir. The Reservoir is going to end up flooding portions of the road which will cut it into two pieces. The public hearing was to consider amending the name of Rocky Run Road to Roberson Road, but the Commission has the ability to recommend other names if possible. There are 4 questions that the Commission asked when the item was last discussed and deferred to this meeting. Number 1 – Can the name Rocky Run Road and existing addresses remain as is? 2 – Can the name be changed to West Rocky Run Road or Old Rocky Run Road and the numerical address remain? Also 3 – Can the road suffix be changed, for example Rocky Run Road to Rocky Run Lane? And 4 – Can staff confirm with emergency management staff whether these changes would compromise emergency response? In particular, there's Ordinance background as to how we got to this point. Specifically, we have a code section that says that we should not duplicate or closely approximate road names that are already assigned. Also, there are requirements in the code that the odd numbers would be on the left side of the road and even numbers on the right side of the road from the perspective of the person travelling down the road from the road's origin. And also, it talks about the origin of the road should be determined as to the area where it has the highest vehicle trip count or is determined by the most current VDOT counts and also where we would expect the highest level of traffic. So again, that kind of gives some background as to staff's initial recommendation for the public hearing. We note that with the road being cut off, the furthest

Planning Commission Minutes
October 1, 2013

west access point would be at Holly Corner Road. That's why staff is noting that the addresses, from our opinion, would start at that location and increase in number range as you head towards your reservoir which is opposite of the current condition. Also, there was discussion about the naming of the road and whether it should be renamed or not. Our Ordinance recommends that typically we do not use directionals or the same road name or same suffixes or just a different suffix, but certainly that would be up to the Board of Supervisors and their discretion. So if the Board and the Planning Commission went with Rocky Run Lane that could be acceptable. From staff perspective we think Old Rocky Run Road has a better distinction as being something different and maybe better in the long term for people who provide services to the residents that live out there such as deliveries and mail and those types of things. The road origin can be determined by the Board of Supervisors by separate Resolution. So if the Board wants to set the origin at the reservoir, they can do that. Then the addresses may be able to stay the same or similar, based on that being the road origin rather than what the Ordinance appears to read on its face, to start on Holly Corner Road. Staff has contacted emergency response, the 9-1-1 dispatchers and talked to their operations specialist and they indicated that they could make adjustments to their system, but they would recommend adding the prefix Old or West as well as retaining the number of addresses. So that can be done.

Mr. Rhodes: Any questions for Mr. Harvey?

Mr. English: What did you say Fire and Rescue told you?

Mr. Harvey: That they can make accommodations in their system.

Mr. English: So they didn't (inaudible).

Mr. Harvey: They didn't give us a specific Yay or Nay, but they said they could work with it.

Mr. Rhodes: And I think all saw the email from Mr. Brito highlighting the preference of the residents in the area and their preferences would be not that the number changes or the name changes. If you had to have something changed, keep the numbers the same, but make it Rocky Run Lane. What I took from the emails that I received was that you couldn't get either one of those, just leave the numbers the same and then Old Rocky Run, if there was going to be something at the front end that wasn't the suffix, but that seemed to be what popped out of there, maybe because it was just listed as an option. Those were the three points I received. I think what's important to me, I would just share, is the perspective, I think we ought to, where appropriate, always try and defer to how we can do things for the residents and the people affected. That should always be a strong consideration of them. Just highlight also that this is not a name change just for now. This is a name change for the next hundred years. I mean, there's not going to be another reservoir going in there, there's not going to be something else cutting it. So we have to think in the long run and the best planning practices as we consider the options here. I know for me personally, I personally would go for recommending that the Board take an exception and modify the numbering sequence. I think that when I read those sections of the Ordinance, I see the numbering, and I see the origin as being inconstancy in a planning construct and they all make sense. I see the naming construct as being a little bit more of a safety issue. All the residents on that street, they know exactly where they're at. Other people on that street don't know that they're on one part of a discontinuous Rocky Run necessarily. So as they're trying to say something, maybe calling on their phone, they may not have a GPS locator activated, those are the concerns I get when I'm looking at the long run. So I would just share from one person's perspective. I'm inclined towards Old Rocky Run. I appreciate all the comments. I think we really ought to look at

Planning Commission Minutes
October 1, 2013

changing the numbering sequence and that's where I would personally be, but certainly I'm at the will of what others are thinking.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if staff gets more time to express any issues or concerns that they have in concert with your concern about the safety issue, about keeping the road name as it is. So again, from a staff perspective, if they can give us one day to discuss with other departments and also if they could rank order from their vantage point what they think would be the best approach here. Again, in the same construct that you talked about, sorry Scott, that this is a long term implication, it's not something for the next 10 or 15 years. It could be a hundred years plus, so we have to think about the long term here. So, those are my two questions for staff.

Mr. Harvey: To get to the overall what would be a rank order, I would say the rank order would be, change it to a more unique name, take a look at where the origin of the road is and address it accordingly, because we do have a concern about uniformity. There are some deviations about in the County but, for the most part, most roads start at their point of origin and the addresses increase from that intersection. It'll be up to the Board to determine whether that's an appropriate practice in this particular situation. If we had any other preferences as far as street names, Old Rocky Run Road would be our sort of second tier preference and then third would be adding Lane to the end of Rocky Run. Can you refresh me on your first question?

Mr. Apicella: I think the question at issue here rests on whether or not it's appropriate to keep the same road as it is, because a significant portion of it is going to be disconnected. So I think you have your own perspective from a planning viewpoint, but also I think you've reached out to other departments and agencies within the County to see what concerns they might have.

Mr. Harvey: I guess the primary concern is that the disconnection in this case is not a small distance and it's not where at one end it's going to be visible from the other. Unlike similar situations you see in other cities and towns where you may have roads disconnected, but there might be a slight disconnect, because they'd been readjusted at some point in time. You can try to work around some of those issues and GPS can navigate a little bit better, but in this case you're going to have a wide area that's going to be in between the two segments of road so your GPS and other measures will have to take you a long way around to get to that other road segment. Also, just on the face of it, the Ordinance says we shouldn't have duplicate names, so there are essentially two different roads with the same name.

Mr. English: We already have a street in Stafford like that, right? Greenspring Drive is like that already, correct? Because Greenspring breaks out at the end of the 610 side and then it picks up again on the Hampton Oaks side. So there's a break already; almost the same situation we have with Rocky Run.

Mr. Harvey: Yes. And in that case the County, on its long range transportation plan for years, had that being connected all the way through and that hasn't ever come to fruition.

Mr. Coen: I know I'm new, but I sort of agree with the Chair when you're saying don't make this as much disruption for the residents as possible. So if we just go with putting the Old in the front, would we have to actually specify that we want the point of origin to be at the reservoir so the numbers don't change which means all those people's checking accounts and all that would have to change. Is that sort of inferred by doing that or do we actually have to say that we recommend to the Supervisors that

*Planning Commission Minutes
October 1, 2013*

they make the point of origin?

Mr. Rhodes: I think it's their authority, so we would have to recommend to the Board that they designate that change, correct?

Mr. Harvey: That would be my suggestion, yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Other comments for staff?

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Chairman, question. I'm curious on, as we move this forward onto the Board, how much flexibility are they going to have to go through this whole process again, about... talking about names and...

Mr. Rhodes: Well, they'll be holding another public hearing, right?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Hirons: Right, but it will be (inaudible) with our recommendation.

Mr. Harvey: Actually, Mr. Hirons, the ad's been sent to the paper already. The first run was today and it has the same ad as appeared in the Planning Commission and it says Roberson. But it does say that there is a public hearing regarding the change in the road name. So, the amount of flexibility in the Planning Commission's recommendation, unless the counsel tells me otherwise, would still be the same with the Board. The Board could adopt a different road name.

Mr. Hirons: And go through this whole exercise again?

Ms. McClendon: That's correct. The Board gives the Planning Commission liberty to change the road name; however, changing the road name is not seen as such a substantial change that the Board couldn't make that change to the Ordinance when it gets it. So the Board will be presented with the Planning Commission's recommendation, but what's being advertised currently in the paper is what was advertised to the Planning Commission. It's not saying the Planning Commission has recommended it.

Mr. Hirons: Okay, thank you.

Mr. English: My question would be, even if you put Lane or Old, whatever, in front of it, they're still going to have to have an address change. So if we just leave it like it is and Fire & Rescue has no heartburn leaving it like it is, you know that's...

Mr. Rhodes: I would just submit, if they keep the origin, if the Board establishes by their authority by resolution that they make the origin the dead end of the road, they also can keep the numbers the same. So you could keep the numbering the same, I think. I mean, I think what I hear here, there's not a statutory or legislative preclusion from it that's not within the Board's power. So they could just about do however they want to at the end of the day, is what I sense. Is that correct, Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
October 1, 2013

Mr. Rhodes: I would just... not to challenge it, but I would just submit that they wouldn't have to change numbers even if they changed the name.

Mr. English: Yes, but I'm not saying they wouldn't have to change the numbers, but if they had to put Lane or Old in front of it, they're still going to have to have (inaudible).

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. English: I see no problem if we just leave it as is and that's what I would like to see us do is just leave it like it is.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, I'll second that motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that a motion Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: So, there's a motion to recommend that the name and numbering stay the same as it currently is, associated with the Rocky Run Road. There's a second from Mr. Gibbons. Is that an acceptable form of a motion?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, I would also recommend adding to that recommendation that the Board sets the origin point as the reservoir so the numbers can (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, and for clarity, as consistent with Section 28-148(c), the Board by resolution established the roads origin to make that (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: I thought we said that, when we didn't have the mic on.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Further comment Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? I will just say that I think this is the name for the next 50 to 100 to 150 to 200 years. I think we ought to look at those long run issues and while I appreciate the concerns and desires not to make the 18 or 22 homes, 18 homes and 22 properties, have any changes associated with this, I don't think it's consistent with (inaudible) practice. There are enough people around that don't know the area, don't know that they are on this side or that side. I think it just adds complications and that's why we they have that provision that's in there and I think it has a sound safety basis on it. For that reason and that reason alone, I won't necessarily support the motion. Okay, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. Hiron: Aye.

***Planning Commission Minutes
October 1, 2013***

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Any opposed? Nay. It passes 6 to 1. So there's the recommendation to the Board, it all stays the same and that they by resolution modify the origin. Very good. That is all the business we have, so I will submit that we are adjourned.

NEW BUSINESS

N/A

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

N/A

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

N/A

COMMITTEE REPORTS

N/A

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

N/A

OTHER BUSINESS

N/A

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

N/A

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.