

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**January 8, 2014**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, January 8, 2014, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Director Jeff Harvey in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Stinnette, and Zuraf

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Harvey: The next order of business on our agenda is Election of Officers. We will take any nominations for election of Chairman.

A. Election of Chairman

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate Mr. Rhodes for Chairman.

Mr. Harvey: Do we hear any other nominations? We need a second for that motion. Or we can do it by acclamation.

Mr. Coen: I move by acclamation.

Mr. Harvey: Okay, so I guess by seeing on the heads nod, it's approved by acclamation. So congratulations Mr. Rhodes on being elected Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. And now we know we have questionable judgment among our fellow Commissioners. Thank you very much for the privilege and opportunity. I think, to be honest, it's extra special because I know this will probably be the last opportunity at this as we go forward and probably make changes in the coming years. But so thank you for that opportunity. Now we'll move onto the next item on the agenda which is the election of a Vice-Chairman. Are there nominations for Vice-Chairman?

B. Election of Vice-Chairman

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, I nominate Steven Apicella.

Mr. Rhodes: A nomination of Mr. Apicella. Is there a second for that nomination?

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mrs. Bailey. Are there other nominations for Vice-Chairman? Okay. With that we'll go ahead and just take a vote then. There's a nomination for Mr. Apicella. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? No opposes; 7-0. Congratulations Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

C. Election of Secretary

Mr. Rhodes: Now nominations for election of a Secretary.

Mr. English: I'd like to nominate Tom Coen as Secretary.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English nominates Mr. Coen. Is there a second?

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Apicella. Are there any other nominations for Secretary? No other nominations; we'll go for the vote. All those in favor of the nomination of Mr. Coen for Secretary signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. Congratulations Mr. Secretary. Very good. Now we'll go into Declarations of Disqualification. Is there any member that needs to disqualify for any item on the agenda this evening? Hearing none, we'll move onto Public Presentations. If there's any member of the public that would like to speak on any item, you may come forward and do so at this time. Profusely shaking their head no so we will move onto the next item on the agenda which is Public Hearings, which are none, and then move onto Unfinished Business. Before we do that I would like to

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 8, 2014*

specifically welcome our new Commissioner this evening, Mrs. Bailey. Mrs. Bailey joins us, we welcome you and look forward to working with you through the year. You've got a great group of folks and you've got an even greater staff here supporting us, and we look forward to working with you. So welcome.

Mrs. Bailey: And I'm glad to be here, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Awesome. Okay, with that we'll move onto the Unfinished Business, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Mr. Harvey?

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas - Amend the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for Urban Development Areas and targeted growth areas in the County. **(History: Deferred on February 27, 2013 until further information from staff)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mike Zuraf will give the Commission an update of our progress.

Mr. Zuraf: Could I have the floor computer please? Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Here tonight to give you an update on the Comp Plan progress. I was able to email to you all yesterday some draft amendments, and this was specifically to Chapter 2 of the Comp Plan, the Goals, Objectives, and Policies. We also provided you some paper copies of those same documents. I think the last page of the first handout I got one of those pesky error messages. But we're going to go through... plan on going through the specific amendments to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies, and you should be able to see those on your screen. As I mentioned in my email to you yesterday, what I hoped to do would be to go over these proposed changes to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies, and get general concurrence from the Commission if this is the right direction and if there are any other policies that need to be amended, we'll go ahead and work on that. But we can hopefully get one of the chapters kind of checked off this evening or close to it as we continue with the drafts. So at this point, I'll go through the... It'd be the other one. Yeah, try the other. You might want to get it off of the S: drive. It might have been saved after...

Mr. Harvey: Oh, it was updated?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. I apologize; it's creating problems in the mode here.

Mr. Zuraf: Can you go through it on this view?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Zuraf: Can you go to slide 2 please, Jeff? Thanks. Okay. So, here are the specific amendments to the policies that we have drafted and provided to you. The first 3 policies... and the whole idea here was to remove and amend any references to the Urban Development Areas and to try to reflect some of the new changes to the Comp Plan that we've been drawing up per your direction. So, the first 3 policies, policy 1.2.4 through 6 had specific references to the design of the Urban Development Areas. The first one, policy 1.2.4, was specific reference to the State Code requirement that we have for Urban Development Areas, so that has been deleted. And Policy 1.2.5, we deleted the Urban Development Area reference and adjusted it to reflect the Courthouse Area and the desire to develop the Courthouse Area as kind of a county center with the area functioning as a town center with shopping and work place opportunities and public facilities, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods in this area, and design standards following the principles of new urbanism and traditional neighborhood development, all consistent with the Courthouse Small Area Plan that we worked on and the desire to kind of maintain that through this amendment. So that's the adjustment to policy 1.2.5

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman? I'm not sure if you want to go through these as we go along, or would you rather speak to it and then have us come back?

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: So, on policy 1.2.4, I realize that it was geared towards the State Code requirement, but I wonder whether some of this language is still not useful in the context of what we're trying to achieve here which is steering growth within the Urban Services Area in general and specifically towards targeted growth areas. And then also I think we were talking about a time horizon of 25 years for this effort.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. And that's for the overall full...

Mr. Apicella: Right, but is that not going to be captured... if we take this policy out wholesale, will we kind of not memorialize the discussion that we've had thus far on this?

Mr. Zuraf: I think it would just require... well, I'll look to see how it...

Mr. Apicella: I just wonder whether this language could be tweaked just to accommodate the changes that we've been talking about without necessarily talking to a State Code requirement or redevelopment areas.

Mr. Zuraf: We may want to just adjust it and, I don't know if it would fit right in this spot or another spot in the Goals, but to just reflect that the overall plan and the growth projected across the entire plan should accommodate 25 years of growth. And we can reference the specific years. I'll just look to see if it fits best in this same spot or another spot of the goals.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: But we can add that in.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just one person so others might feel differently. I just thought it would be worth trying to capture the theme that we're trying to achieve. And on 1.2.5, and I'm sorry for editorializing here but,

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 8, 2014*

I wonder whether we could say, it says right now the County shall establish a mixed-use district and design standards and instead of the word 'for', adding the language which encourage or facilitates this type of development, and continuing on with the language that's there now?

Mr. Rhodes: What would be the, I don't have a strong feeling either way, I'm just wondering what is the driver behind that?

Mr. Apicella: Again, we've talked about the notion that we're being too restrictive, and this is establishing a policy that says we're going to have a mixed-use district and design standards. I think the goal is we're trying to encourage mixed-use development or facilitate mixed-use development. Without encouraging it, it's not going to happen. So, I think the word encouragement or facilitating kind of reinforces the notion that we're going to try to work with folks who might be interested in doing this. But right now, again, I think we're a little bit restrictive in our policies. I mean, I can live with it as is, but...

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I'm rather agnostic either way, not that I objected to the comment, I just was trying to better understand the context. You know, just building on one of the comments Mr. Apicella mentioned, do we, I don't recall, did we use the targeted growth area reference prior to this point in here?

Mr. Zuraf: Not in the Goals and Objectives, no.

Mr. Rhodes: So, Chapter 2 in this area is the first place we're starting to hit the use of that reference?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. Rhodes: So maybe that's part of the intro to this section as well, you know, where you struck out the 1.2.4; maybe somewhere in there we just give a context to our concept of the targeted growth area which I think we can probably list a sentence or two from that paper, the 3 page paper we submitted to the Board, on that concept so that introduces that. That might be where you can introduce, Mike, the timeframe as well and just use all that and that gives a context as we're going forward and using that phrase maybe.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, we can do that.

Mr. Rhodes: Other comments as he moves forward? Please Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just a question. I'm not certain if anywhere it's sort of spelled out, defined, flushed out, but underneath the 1.2.5, it talks about new urbanism, and that might be a term that's not familiar to people. So, is that flushed out somewhere or is it just...?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it was discussed in more detail back when we had the Urban Development Area discussion in Chapter 3 and it may have been something that we deleted in one of the drafts but we can work to kind of maintain that explanation.

Mr. Coen: It just may scream something different to certain people. Thank you sir.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, and then the next slide. Policy 1.2.6, another reference states the County shall encourage within the Urban Development Areas pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods and town centers comprised of a variety of housing types and densities, incorporating shopping and work place

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

opportunities, and public facilities. This language basically was copied over into the previous policy 1.2.5 to move those references there. And the next policy...

Mr. Apicella: I apologize. So, when we talk about neighborhood centers, are we talking about neighborhood centers just near the Courthouse Area or throughout the County? I'm wondering if we need some context there. Because we haven't really defined what neighborhood centers are.

Mr. Zuraf: Well... right. Are you talking about 1.2.7?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: We do have full explanation of it in Chapter 3, but if you'd like more description of it here we can do that. But I think the idea here is to be kind of... or maybe adding in a reference that...

Mr. Apicella: Well, just as defined in Chapter 3. On its own I wouldn't know what it means if I was looking at it for the first time potentially.

Mr. Harvey: We could also reference the Land Use Map as well because they're identified on the Land Use Map.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. And moving onto the next policy and the next slide, policy 1.2.8, here we were requesting some direction from the Commission on how we were looking to modify this. The policy states to the extent possible, feasible and consistent with other goals of the Comp Plan, the County may adopt financial and other incentives to direct development into, and we struck Urban Development Areas and suggested adding here Targeted Growth Areas and/or Neighborhood Centers. So here, I don't know if the Commission would want to keep it focused down to neighborhood centers and go a little broader and identify the whole targeted growth area, or maybe even the entire Urban Service Area. So, that's kind of for your consideration.

Mr. Rhodes: I would just submit, if I were prioritizing my words the first would be Targeted Growth Area, then it would be Neighborhood Centers, and then it would say Urban Service Area. That's where we want growth to be.

Mr. English: Can you keep all 3 of them?

Mr. Rhodes: I think you can have all 3, right? Do you see any weakness with that, Mr. Zuraf or Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: No sir. I guess the question I'd have back to you is, are you intending that as a prioritization or just a listing of all those areas?

Mr. Zuraf: By order of priority maybe?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes. I mean, I think the targeted growth areas, by their definition and by the establishment of that term when we did that with the Board was where we would want to see it go, first and foremost. But certainly we also want whatever tools can help us incentivize into first targeted growth areas but then also into Urban Service Areas versus outside there for development purposes. That seems to be a consistent planning principle with our Comp Plan anyway. Unless there was, again not very thoughtful

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

here but, unless there was a reason not to put them in there; I would think they would be in there and I don't know that we have to specifically say that this is in prioritized order but maybe just leave them listed that way so they at least get the subliminal messaging or something. But I don't know what others think.

Mr. English: I think you should leave all 3 in.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. English: And like he said, targeted growth be your first one and then neighborhood centers and then Urban Development, in that order.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. Without stating in this...

Mr. Apicella: I think we ought to say in the following priority order. I think it makes it clear, again, without us being able to explain it to somebody, it's just like they're all the same.

Mr. English: Yeah, and then you've got it spelled out (inaudible).

Mr. Harvey: And for the Commissions' information, previous discussion was that the neighborhood centers would be the area where we have the highest concentration of development. And the targeted growth areas, which neighborhood centers are a part, would have a little bit less, and then the rest of the Urban Service Area would have suburban type of development densities. So, do you want it in that order?

Mr. Rhodes: Folks, thoughts?

Mr. Harvey: With the highest priority going to the highest density areas?

Mr. English: That's the way it should be.

Mr. Apicella: That makes sense.

Mr. Rhodes: Sold.

Mr. Zuraf: And then maybe include the Courthouse Area then too in this because that is...

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: I'm just taking some notes. I'll just watch the video tape on that. Okay, policy 1.2.9, again this is dealing with where residential density bonuses should be encouraged, and so deleting the Urban Development Areas from that. We added in it should be tied to reductions in residential density outside the Urban Service Area through zoning changes and/or voluntary measures such as Purchase of Development Rights and Transfer of Development Rights. So we recommend the density bonuses as a kind of generally supported in the Urban Service Area and added in specific measures and how it can be accomplished. And I guess the question we have here is should the location be limited to smaller areas within the Urban Service Area?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: I'm wondering if, in the way that it's described, it might give the false impression that participating in TDRs or Purchase of Development Rights you would get more development units than you otherwise get. For example, in TDRs it was just a one for one movement of the development right. You're not getting 1.5 or 2 units because you're moving your development right from a sending area to a receiving area. Do you understand the nuance there? It implies that somehow by participating in these programs, you're going to get an extra benefit. I'm not quite sure that's what we wanted. I think the notion is that we would allow increased density in the, for lack of a better term, in the receiving area than might otherwise be provided, but you're not... it's not an increase in the total number of development units overall. I don't know how to say it any better than that but I think it's a little... it might be a little confusing.

Mr. Coen: And Mike, and it's been a couple years since I was on the AG Commission with PDRs but, if they take part in that, there isn't actually any bonus going to those developments somewhere else. So, it's sort of misleading in that way as well. Does that make sense? I mean, in the queue is a couple more PDRs going through; if those people have it, it's not a bonus to move those somewhere else. And so I think the initial language is probably good because then it also gives us some flexibility if we develop a TDR program or if some other program comes through the State that it can be inputted as well.

Mr. English: What are you saying, take the bonus thing out?

Mr. Coen: I'd just take out the stuff in red and leave it, you know, residential bonuses are going to be there but, you know, through whatever means we can and leave it... I mean, the idea is we're hoping that it's going to go that way but I don't think the PDR fits and we don't have a TDR. So it's sort of...

Mr. English: Moot.

Mr. Coen: ... yes sir.

Mr. Zuraf: Maybe a suggestion to end it at voluntary measures period.

Mr. English: I would.

Mr. Zuraf: And then that kind of leaves it...

Mr. Rhodes: I'd see no problem with that, would you? Just a period after voluntary measures?

Mr. Apicella: Again, I still don't think it gets to the underlying purpose for making the swap. I think the notion is, if you participate in a voluntary program that moves density from one place to another, we would allow an increase in the underlying zoning that might not otherwise occur. Is that kind of what we're saying?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So, that might be a better way to say it, because again it's not a density bonus.

Mr. Zuraf: So, increases in residential density above what would otherwise be permitted in the Urban Service Area should be tied to reductions.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 8, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: That makes me a little bit more comfortable.

Mr. Zuraf: And then just end it outside the Urban Service Area.

Mr. English: You're taking the TDR thing out, right?

Mr. Zuraf: That sounds like it.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, you don't like that language Darrell?

Mr. Zuraf: Delete the additional language in red.

Mr. Coen: Do you still want to keep your voluntary measures (inaudible)?

Mr. Rhodes: I had no strong feelings either way but that was a suggestion so we're going to (inaudible). If nobody feels strongly about that, that's fine too.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright. And then objective 1.3, basically deleting Urban Development Area from this objection that refers to promotion of infill development and redevelopment within the Urban Service Area. Okay, no objections there so we'll keep moving on. Policy 1.4.5, road improvements should be focused on the Urban Service Area to support the areas of targeted growth. Then, the next policy, 1.7.1, development in the Urban Services Area should be phased based on the availability of public services and adequate infrastructure, projected population growth, and projected residential and commercial growth. So, just kind of modifying some of these policies that still I think have some merit and don't necessarily need to be tied to the Urban Development Areas. I do have it applied to a larger area though; that being the Urban Service Area. No objections there, I'll move onto 1.7.2. New development proposals for projects within the Urban Services Area boundary that are dependent upon the future infrastructure improvement should be rejected until the improvements have been implemented, fully funded for construction, or provided as part of a development project. So, this we kind of made some adjustments to this policy. When we were reading it, it just kind of was confusing in its former form.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Apicella: I appreciate what the goal is here. I wonder if just stepping back and taking a look at it in the bigger picture whether it might have broader implications than are intended. And we might have already violated this policy as we've looked at some redevelopment projects. When you say you've got a project within the Urban Service Area, it's dependent upon future infrastructure improvements, well what infrastructure improvements are we talking about? I mean, infrastructure improvements are pretty broad. It could include road improvements. It could include road improvements on 95. I'm just wondering whether, without some boundary, we're just basically saying any and all infrastructure must be in place or paid for or we're not going to approve any development, any new development. I don't think that's the way we've looked at it thus far. I don't know how to fix it but it just seems to be pretty hard-hitting.

Mr. Rhodes: Was the thought behind this related to... dependent upon infrastructure... 100% dependent upon an infrastructure approved being there to even access a property to be able to get through it to do things, or I think as is being alluded to, could it be expanded to be, you know, if we're at a level of service

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

F at an intersection and until we can get it to a level of service C, now would this be the bases to stay consistent with the Comp Plan that we tend to not approve them. What was the thought as we were writing this, because maybe we could think of some other ways to say it to meet the intent. Because I wouldn't think it was the latter; I would think it was more the former. You know, it's dependent upon the County getting access or right-of-way or something to get somewhere or some other stream action.

Mr. Harvey: I think, Mr. Chairman, this could go in two different measures; one could be referring to sort of a defensive posture for the County. If we, like was implying before, had an application where we felt that the infrastructure wasn't in place to be able to handle it and, therefore, we couldn't support it at this point in time. Another issue may be that it speaks to development may occur in parts of the Urban Service Area where not all infrastructure is in place but it could move forward if there was funding available or other development project or that development project was going to build the infrastructure.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Can I ask our attorney? I mean, I know these are goals but say, for example, a project... and you can take it either way you want... either accepted or rejected and somebody wants to sue because they don't like our decision. And we based it on the fact that the infrastructure isn't there by the language in here, say. How much of a standing or how much significance would this have in such an instance? I mean, would it be with language being like this back us up or would it make it easier for the litigants to do what they want to do?

Ms. McClendon: Commissioner Coen, I believe really when it comes down to it, the Comp Plan is really a guide. It's not an ordinance, it's not law; it's a guide for forming decisions. And so if the Planning Commission goes against the Comp Plan or goes with the Comp Plan as other things to support that, but specifically if you're going against the Comp Plan, that probably should be best laid out in the record leading up to it. And it's really because there's policy concerns that shapes the decision and change the guidance that is kind of divergent from what the Comp Plan would guide. And it is a guide. I mean, if you treat it as an ordinance, the Courts have not looked as favorably upon that. If you deny something specific it would be because, only because it doesn't line up with your Comp Plan because it is not an ordinance so it doesn't have the effect of an ordinance.

Mr. Coen: So to a certain degree, I mean, this is a goal. The goal of the County, in theory, that development would be going through with the point that there is an infrastructure to sustain it, that's something that as a community that either we do or we do not want to get to; it's not really going to be prohibitive on certain projects. So, I guess it's sort of just the feeling for whether you want to say we should have it in place before we say yes as a goal for the County or if that's one of the goals that we want to have. I think the changes seem fairly legitimate and if it's not an ordinance, it's not going to be binding in that way. It's just a goal that we're shooting for.

Mr. Rhodes: Other thoughts? I don't have a good idea right now. There's something that still leaves me uncomfortable, personally, as one member. And I'm just going to try and work and think about it and maybe I'll hopefully posit something back to everyone if I can think of anything next time that maybe scratches that itch. There's an itch there that I can't quite reach and I can't quite think of how to reach it. But I've got no other suggestion right now so I'll just have to mull on that a bit. Anyone else on this item?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we can put this in the parking lot if you'd like and come back to it.

Mr. Rhodes: I think most others, maybe not Mr. Apicella, but I think most others were generally okay with it since it is just a guide. That's what I've seen by the silence. So, I guess we'll just leave it as it is, Mr. Harvey. I think it's just myself and Mr. Apicella that may be in the minority, but I am going to try and come back with a counter; I just can't think of what it is right now.

Mr. Zuraf: If I can add, is it the terminology should be rejected where it's saying (inaudible)?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, it's just a little strong. It's just a little strong to me and I'm trying to think, because every one of your staff reports will come forward and anytime the roads can't sustain it or anything in the area, it will be one of the reasons cited in the staff report for not being consistent. You always balance it so it may not be a reason that you'll recommend denial, but you will be citing it as cons. But then we'll be starting to build up our own challenges that may not be as valid. I think... I sense something like this is good to have in place for those very significant differences. When it's just very strongly challenged and complicated, it just further reinforces our position. But our roads are going to be challenged for a long time, so we've got a lot of good development that's probably regularly going to take us from a C to a D or a D to an E. And so I think this one just builds up a case that we might... I don't know... there's just something in there that I think there's a way to make this, to keep this in here and keep it in there because it is a good general planning principle. But I just think there's some wording changes, but it's just not with me right now. At least for me, as one individual, that's kind of the ration I have so I'm making a note to self to try and think of something. Maybe one day I'll have a (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, you've articulated well; it's just that it strikes me again as very broad and it could be applied harshly and maybe unintentionally. So, I think we have to strike the right balance. I mean, I think we all want to see development pay for itself as much as possible. But again, there may be things beyond a particular developer's control when we talk about infrastructure that this would cause a denial unnecessarily.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, and as Mr. Coen says, we have the right to apply judgment and it doesn't have to drive it. We also don't want to constantly be listening... and I'm not trying to avoid obvious stances on things but... I could see us on every single application listening to this as being inconsistent with policy 1.7.2 of our Comprehensive Plan. So, if we have one that's never going to be met... I just think there might be some wording. I'm not necessarily suggesting we take it out and most are generally okay. I think there's probably a different way to phrase it that may better capture it, but I don't have a good suggestion right now. But I know, as one person, I'll take it back as kind of a challenge to myself to try and think of what I'm trying to say here.

Mr. English: Your big concern is the word rejection (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: So we've got the rejected if it's dependent upon future infrastructure improvements. To me there ought to be something that qualifies the scale of infrastructure improvements. You know, if it's dependent upon, so in my own personal interpretation, I think that as a dependency as being a very strong thing. I could see where some could read this and say it's marginally impacted by and so, therefore, it was dependent. There's just a lot of interpretive pieces there that I think there's some nuancing and wording that might better represent this. But I understand the intent and I think the principle and the policy makes sense. I just think there's a different way to say it. I mean, we're going to finish today trying to give Mike some general sensing but that doesn't preclude us from doing further refinements. So,

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

I'm fine moving on at this point. I just know there's something there that I just can't quite put my finger on.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chair, if Mike and staff wants to think of it, I think there's sort of another... there's 3; there's the rejected, there's the dependent upon, and I think Mr. Apicella's point about infrastructure, that being so broad. And so those are the 3 areas that people are sort of wishing some type of clarity. So if you mull, and we mull, then we may get a mullet.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, on to policy 2.6.2 it would read, priority should be given to meeting capital improvement, road, and other infrastructure needs within the Urban Services Area. So, here after you strike UDAs it give the priority across a more broad area, that being the Urban Service Area. Maybe here another question for the Commission is, should that priority maybe be narrowed down maybe similar to the previous policies where we give priority listed by Targeted Growth Area or Neighborhood Center, or is this language okay.

Mr. Rhodes: What's it in context of?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, some of the context of this was in the discussion of the Comprehensive Plan as being developed that there was feeling that road improvements in particular should be prioritized where the greatest population is and where the greatest transportation need is. And if you maybe recall, we got into some discussion about areas outside the Urban Service Area may be eligible for safety improvements but shouldn't be designed for over a corridor improvements. We should do the corridor improvements in the USA. That's some of the context behind this policy. And trying to give some direction as to where we should focus our funding needs.

Mr. Rhodes: The 2.6.1, while talking about public facilities and then this is just trying to say a similar thing for capital improvement, road and other infrastructure, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: It's in a very concise fashion somewhat trying to restate the same concept that's up in 2.6.1. Again, saying it should be in the Urban Service Areas where it has the greatest impact. I don't know that it hurts to say in there to know that it has significant impact either way. Other thoughts? I think everybody's okay with it.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay with the change as is? Okay. Okay, policy 5.3.2 within the housing section. Affordable housing will be encouraged but not limited to Neighborhood Centers as designated on the Land Use Plan Map. So, another question here is that the appropriate location to encourage affordable housing... would there be any other areas? Broaden it to the Urban Service Area or keep it focused in on the... because Neighborhood Centers, those are going to be areas where the plan is recommending townhomes and multi-family dwellings.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: So, again, our three references have been Neighborhood Centers, Targeted Growth Areas, and Urban Service Area. Would you be strongly opposed to any one of those three or strongly supported of from a staff perspective?

Mr. Harvey: From a staff perspective, the majority of your affordable housing is going be at higher density. So, you would want to encourage it where you have higher density. Neighborhood Centers and the Courthouse Center would be the areas with the highest densities based on the way the new Land Use Maps have been laid out.

Mr. Zuraf: And as this is worded, it does say but not limited. So it leaves it open.

Mr. Coen: I sort of like the idea of keeping it with the Neighborhood Centers, and then with the language that, you know, it's not limited to, it could go with others. But if the idea is to try to promote those and have those centrally located, I think it'd be good to articulate it that way; whereas, if we put it as a string of different things it would get lost.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Coen: But that's just my feeling. If we're going to put it in the Courthouse Area as a Neighborhood Center, it would be good to target it that way rather than in a list.

Mr. Rhodes: I'm fine with it.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: A minor editorial, but I think there needs to be the word "in" after encouraged; be encouraged in, but not limited to, Neighborhood Centers. Or something. Any other comments on that one? Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, policy 6.2.2 in the transportation section, in this one policy that's recommending or encouraging expansion and development of efficient transit system inside the Urban Service Area and it would just strike the Urban Development Area. Let's see... one change we have there and on the last policy change, policy 7.1.1 is in the Economic Development section, basically striking Urban Development Areas as it would state, minimum floor area ratios should be established and maximum floor area ratio requirements should be relaxed for commercial development within mixed use redevelopment areas, period. And then no other changes to that policy.

Mr. Apicella: Is that suggesting then that this only be applied to designated redevelopment areas and not elsewhere in the County where we might want mixed use?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. And you may want to add, at a minimum, either Courthouse Area to that and possibly Neighborhood Centers as well.

Mr. Apicella: So, are we then saying then within the context of targeted growth areas that we would not want mixed use within those targeted growth areas?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 8, 2014*

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the targeted growth areas include the Courthouse Area, the Neighborhood Centers, and they also do include Business and Industry Areas which don't support residential, and then you do have some Suburban land use within the targeted growth areas.

Mr. Harvey: This is mainly focused on the relaxation of the maximum floor area requirements for the commercial would permitted in those areas. So you may have the rest of the targeted growth area that has commercial but it would fall under our normal development standards versus these areas you may have a higher floor area.

Mr. Apicella: But in terms of increasing... as an incentive to increase density, but also to find a way to make it sustainable, you might want to encourage additional commercial development. So, if you're increasing the number of housing units, you might want to also increase the potential for a commercial development to help pay for that. To me they could potentially go hand in hand.

Mr. Zuraf: Are you suggesting in other areas beyond what this says then?

Mr. Harvey: But you could reference the targeted growth area which includes the redevelopment areas and the neighborhood centers.

Mr. Apicella: Again, it just seems to me as currently written it's very limited where, again, we might want to open it up to maximize the opportunity. Again, I'm just one voice in the wilderness here so, I wish other folks would chime in.

Mr. Rhodes: No, I think there's merit to that. I'm just wondering how broad is it. Is it all targeted growth areas? Where all could this be applied?

Mr. Zuraf: I think the intent of this original policy was basically really focused mainly on the redevelopment areas, which is Boswell's Corner, Courthouse, Southern Gateway, and Falmouth.

Mr. Apicella: And by themselves they make a lot of sense. But there may be other places where we, again, want to incentivize more density on both sides, both residential and commercial.

Mr. Rhodes: So, could it be applied to the neighborhood centers? Do we have...?

Mr. Zuraf: There's commercial that could go there.

Mr. Rhodes: Enough that would be applicable?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes. And other areas it could go... I mean, it could go in the commercial corridors and nodes in the suburban areas outside of the targeted growth area.

Mr. Harvey: Also, that last sentence almost would be applicable to large development projects rather than small parcels. It may be difficult to have a commercial component and a residential component on a small parcel... even though that small parcel may be in an area where you're targeting higher density development.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, there are no epiphanies on ultimate language that seem to be appearing. But that leaves us with policy 1.7.2 that we might try and work a little bit on. And possibly something in 7.1.1 to

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

figure out in a reasonable manner how we might apply it a little bit more broadly without being just everywhere. Okay?

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: So those are the two, the rest everybody seemed okay with. And we always tend to reserve the right to come back and throw something at you after you think you were done on it.

Mr. Zuraf: Of course!

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, got it.

Mr. Zuraf: There's a lot more to go.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: And so that's what I have for you this evening. And we'll work on making those additional changes and other next things we'll be working on as staff is some of the... working on the build-out scenarios which may take several weeks for us to kind of work through before we have it. That will then move us towards then amended and new traffic modeling based on the new growth patterns. We'll be working over the next few weeks on that.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Yes please.

Mr. Coen: It just occurred to me when you were going through that. I thought we had sort of asked for a blueprint of timeline or something of where this is going over. You know, especially for the newer members, so we have an idea of what we're looking at down the road... no pun intended... you know, how things are going to go. So if we could just so we get a flavor for... I mean, you already articulated a little bit tonight, but just to be helpful say, okay, we're looking at June doing X or something like that. That'd be helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Thanks Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. That resolves Unfinished Business. There is no New Business so we'll move onto Planning Director's Report. Mr. Harvey?

NEW BUSINESS

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have 3 items I'd like to discuss tonight. First of all, I just wanted to point out to the Commission that we do have your meeting schedule at your desk. This meeting

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 8, 2014*

schedule is based on the By-Laws and I will note that there are two meeting dates that specifically have conflicts with the County offices being closed.

Mr. Rhodes: Right; Christmas Eve and Thanksgiving Eve?

Mr. Harvey: Yes. And also traditionally the Commission takes a break in the summertime typically not having your second meeting in July and first meeting in August.

Mr. Rhodes: I think that's how the... is that how the Boards' progressing this year too again?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: The Board of Supervisors, right? And again, just to remind two sides of this; if we modify our calendar to adjust these, we can always vote to add them back should there be business that we need to undertake and address, so just as a noticing requirement. But we can always add meetings on. Secondly, historically, it has worked for everybody. It allows us, but it also allows staff, we have to remember, a block of time that they can plan their leaves, their vacations and some more extended time. So that's what we've done. And so it typically has been the last session in July and the first one in August that we have considered dropping. We've, I know, once or twice added back one of those out of necessity, but again, it gives a planning block. And then we can just choose to modify our meeting schedule based on a motion here, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: So, I know at minimum I do not want to come Christmas Eve nor Thanksgiving Eve. I'll be the party pooper there. But we can entertain a motion to modify the meeting schedule to at least cancel those two and then if folks want to entertain the traditional approach on the last July and the first August, we could do that as well. We need a motion for modification to the meeting schedule.

Mr. English: I make a motion that we drop November the 26<sup>th</sup>, December the 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014, and also the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July and August 13<sup>th</sup> but, if needed, we can add the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July back and August 13<sup>th</sup> if need be.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so there's a motion on the table to modify the 2014 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule, unless needed, to drop for now the July 23<sup>rd</sup>, August 13<sup>th</sup>, November 26<sup>th</sup>, and December 24<sup>th</sup> meetings. Is there a second?

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, second by Mrs. Bailey to allow discussion. Any further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Bailey? Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, on the one hand I love that schedule; it's awesome. On the other hand we had some issues with the way that we scheduled are summer periods off this past year because we had such a long break between one meeting and the next meeting in the summer. So, while I like the idea of being off for several weeks, potentially the Board has forced us to basically reconsider that. Now we

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

could still go along with that now and adjust as necessary, but some people make their plans a long time out. Again, I remember we had to readjust, we had to have a special meeting for, I can't remember what the topic was.

Mr. Rhodes: There are occasionally items that come with a time limit by the Board that are not necessarily extended where we find that we might have to deal with something. And, at minimum, should that be the case, we'd have to entertain probably adding a meeting back on, if that happened. We can also try and remind our... those that appointed us where time limits apply. So, yeah, we would need to be sensitive to that either way. So agreed. Other comments? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: I was just wondering, Mr. Apicella, are you suggesting that instead of August 13<sup>th</sup> we take August 27<sup>th</sup> off? So that's sort of the same... we meet the first meeting of the month and then we have the second one off which is what we're doing in November and December.

Mr. Apicella: That would be my recommendation, just to reduce our risk of that possibility happening again. Again, it doesn't give us as long a block of time to make our arrangements, and staff as well, but it won't put us in a bind as we were in last time.

Mr. Rhodes: And that's certainly an option. We could certainly as the motioner and the seconder to... we could do a substitute motion or we could ask to modify. The one thing on that is... what does that do? Is that leading into the Labor Day weekend?

Mr. English: The 27<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah. It would be wouldn't it? Yeah, it'd be the first. I was thinking when kids go back to school so and people might still be taking off then. Is that a substitute motion which would have to be addressed before we do the main motion?

Mr. English: You going to make it a substitute?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'll make it a substitute.

Mr. Rhodes: So that's a substitute motion, Mr. Apicella, to suggest we modify the 2014 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule to for now cancel the July 23<sup>rd</sup> date, the August 27<sup>th</sup> date, the November 26<sup>th</sup>, and the December 24<sup>th</sup> date. Is there a second?

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen, okay very good. Any further comment Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Okay, we'll call for the vote on the substitute motion which is to modify the meeting schedule to have one meeting in July on the 9<sup>th</sup>, one meeting in August on the 13<sup>th</sup>,

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

one meeting in November on the 12<sup>th</sup>, and one meeting in December on the 12<sup>th</sup>... 10<sup>th</sup>, sorry, thank you very much. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed, so by that passage that negates the first motion; very good. Okay, Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The next item I wanted to ask the Commissions' guidance on was dealing with updates to the Planning Commission Binders. In the past we've given the Commission new binders every year, but now you've gone to electronic format. Do you want, as a Commission or individual Commissioners, slip sheets or new binders or just will totally rely on electronic media?

Mr. Rhodes: Personal preferences?

Mr. English: Can you put that bind on this at all? The whole thing? Can the whole thing be put on this?

Mr. Harvey: Yes. Some of the information can be put onto your bookshelf on your iPad. That was going to be a topic I was going to talk about next, about some of the issues with back staff reports and things of that nature.

Mr. English: That's where I would like to see it, that way we can get it if we need it here and we can access it.

Mr. Rhodes: Is everybody good with that?

Mr. Harvey: And we can help you with that.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I'm great with that. I just would ask, there were some very helpful information that we got at our retreat about policy procedures that hasn't been in past binders. The things, for example, I think it articulated those things that we do collectively with the Board of Supervisors, for example, and those things that we do on our own. I think that list was pretty helpful. Again, there were some other sort of rules of the road that we received at the retreat that I thought...

Mr. Rhodes: So, additional material to put on the bookshelf.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Rhodes: In addition to what's traditionally been in the binder.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Rhodes: Does that make sense Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Some of those other handouts we've had? Okay. There might be one of us that still look for slip sheets.

Mr. English: Do we have to... let me ask you this question; do we have to give you our iPads to do that? How would that work?

Mr. Harvey: That would probably be the most direct way. We can also see if there's some way we can do it remotely. We have to check into that.

Mr. English: Okay. I'm not an iPad person.

Mr. Harvey: And related to that subject, last year there were discussions periodically about, Mr. Gibbons raised this issue, about having a drop-box for all the staff reports and all the materials that we provide the Commission. And I know what we did sort of as an interim step was, on your iPad agendas, provide all the back staff reports for any item that's still active on the agenda. I've heard some concerns about the way that's set up and that it takes forever to scroll through all the information. An alternative, again, would be to use the bookshelf. But that would probably be up to the individual Commissioner to decide which staff reports you want to put on the bookshelf to save for reference and which ones you don't. So I'll throw that out to the Commission. Do you want us to change the iPad agenda to not include all that background information, or you can still have it on there? Or would you rather prefer that you individually choose to slide things to your bookshelf? The one thing that's a little bit different in putting items like that on your bookshelf is the staff report you'd have to bookmark them from the internet agenda rather than your iPad agenda. So you go online to the County website, pull up the Planning Commission agenda, pick up the item and then put it on your bookshelf.

Mr. English: Can you continue to do it like you're doing it and then, you say, each individual can bookshelf if they want? I like the way you're sending it. We can look at it and...

Mr. Harvey: We can continue to do that. But I heard from some members that it was just too much information to have to scroll through while you're in a meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other thoughts? I don't know how to do any of this stuff. I'm still trying.

Mr. English: That's why I say keep it like it is.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't have much I can say on it because I struggle every time. I'm trying to figure this out. My only feedback is, whatever is the most idiot-proof of the processes that have the information I am

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

all for. Whatever loads it up the simplest I am all for. I'm not sure what that is and however we can sub-tab it. But I don't know how to suggest any further than that.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we'll keep it as is with regard to the iPad agendas and continue to look for other alternatives.

Mr. Rhodes: Now, the other related thing, and maybe I'm just not smart enough to understand, the other related thing I thought that I'm not sure is addressed by that is, as we've had late add... you do a great job to get the staff report out, and then you get more information that's sent to you from different applicants or other processes or we update something. How is that updated in the electronic agenda?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, it's updated if we have it in time and then Mrs. Stinnette will send out an email saying we've updated your iPad agenda, you need to go back and refresh.

Mr. Rhodes: And you do that we just reload the agenda, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, that's what I thought.

Mr. Harvey: That's for information we get in time to be able to do that. Sometimes we literally get it right before the meeting and have to give you paper copies still. But we will have that available at the next agenda as it comes up, if it's still an item that's related to business on the agenda.

Mr. Rhodes: And hopefully, as we update proffer guidelines and get things a little stronger, that's where a lot of them come from... maybe we'll get those a few less last minute changes and edits, but we'll have to see.

Mr. Apicella: I just wonder if one alternative might be just to provide a link in the agenda back to previous agendas for that specific topic? So, you're sitting in a meeting, you've got your iPad in front of you, you've got the agenda up, you've pulled up the information for tonight's meeting but you can go back to the agenda itself and click on oh, well 3 meetings ago we talked about this and it was September 19<sup>th</sup>. You click on it and you can pull up that specific package. And you may only need it for 5 minutes; you're just scanning it because I remember something that happened in that meeting and I'm just going to go through the pages real quick.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we'll continue to study that and see what alternatives we can have to help make the process work smoother for everybody, and still have access to all back information.

Mr. Rhodes: What I think I hear you saying, Mr. Apicella, is something, for example, on the first page of the staff report it talks about the history. It always says this was first presented on this date and possibly where those dates are it might be just hyperlinks that are in there that you just kind of click and then it takes you there should you desire to go back and see what the first staff report said.

Mr. Apicella: Exactly, so we don't have a thousand pages associated with that particular item (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: So that's what you all will explore to see. Okay. Did you notice I said hyperlink? Was that applicable in that sentence? Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much Mr. Harvey. County Attorney's Report?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. McClendon: I have no report at this time Mr. Chairman.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

*Appointment to the Architectural Review Board (ARB)*

*Appointment to the Parks and Recreation Commission*

*Appointment to the Joint Shoreline Advisory Committee*

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. We don't have Committee Reports at this point. On the Chairman's Report I would just highlight there are 3 committees that we need to get Planning Commission members for. Just to recap, they are last term Mr. Hirons took care of the Architectural Review Board and Parks and Recreation Commission, from the Planning Commission perspective...

Mr. Boswell: I did Parks and Rec.

Mr. Rhodes: You did Parks and Rec but didn't you do it as Aquia and he did it as Planning Commission representative?

Mr. Boswell: No, I did it (inaudible). He dropped out last year.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. Gotcha, okay correction. So, Architectural Review Board has to meet a minimum of 4 times a year. They meet as they have applications so they don't always meet on a regular basis, but I think historically they meet about 5 to 9 times a year, depending on when they have applications. I think there probably are some going to be coming in the Historic District with Aquia Church, there's usually a couple in the Falmouth Area that have some that are there. Parks and Rec Commission... how often do they meet?

Mr. Boswell: Once a month.

Mr. Rhodes: Once a month, right, every month. So they have a regular meeting advising on policies and programs. And then lastly... so each of those have 1 member and then lastly I would just highlight it was established last year, I don't think they've met yet, but that's the Joint Shoreline Advisory Committee but that one has no limitation. So all those that might be... you know, if there are a couple, 2 or 3, that are interested, there's always the opportunity there. They are yet to really fully define exactly what their scope and perspective will be but it has something to do with the shoreline. And they're going to advise on something on the shoreline. So anyways, we need some representatives there. So I would just ask if there is anyone interested in the Architectural Review Board?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Gibbons: I thought Steven did that last year?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Hiron did it last year. Is anyone interested in the Architectural Review Board? We do, by the Charter, have to have one member that participates with that.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, they meet on the first Monday of the month at 6 p.m.

Mr. Rhodes: The first Monday of the month, if they have a meeting scheduled.

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Again, it might be 5, 6, 7 times a year.

Mr. Harvey: And they do have a pending application currently.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Do you know where that one is?

Mr. Harvey: I don't know the details of it right now.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon in communicating with one of the members of the Board of Supervisors, they deferred and they're still deliberating on that Architectural Review Board, so we may want to just wait and see exactly what they're doing before we move forward. There's several people that they're considering, but they're also considering something else. And so I might suggest that we just hold off till next month to make an appointment on that, or even later in the month.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, in the Zoning Ordinance it specifies by Code that there be a Planning Commissioner on the ARB. And also, it says that the Board should establish its membership within 60 days. So, my recommendation would be that the Commission put forward a name. Ultimately, it's up to the Board to make the appointment.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Overwhelming energy and excitement with the Architectural Review Board. It is exciting; they have very creative and elaborate video displays. They have a twice a month disco. There's a lot of activity going on there...

Mr. Boswell: You're scaring everybody away now.

Mr. Coen: Then I suggest you, Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Rhodes: There's free meals, three-course... Okay. Sleep on it, think about it in your heart of hearts; we have to come up with somebody. That is, again, by Code a requirement. We'll have to find someone to participate in that, but we'll give it to our next meeting to resolve. But the Board has to act on it too, so we're just giving them a name and then they have to make a determination, correct, for the appointment?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: So if we wait till our next one, they won't be able to act to it at the beginning of February so we'll have to get them something.

Mr. Coen: That'll still be within 60 days, right?

Mr. Rhodes: Oh yeah... it'll be within... but they do have an application pending so we really can't put that off any longer. Is there anyone interested in the Parks and Recreation Commission?

Mr. Coen: I'd like to suggest Mr. English for that. I think he'd be very good on that.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that good Mr. English? Alright, so by... is there anyone opposed to that concept? Anyone hate the thought of Mr. English...? Okay, very good. Okay, Mr. English, it's you my friend. And then is there anyone interested in the Joint Shoreline Advisory Committee?

Mr. Apicella: I am Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, Mr. Apicella. Any other member? This one we're not limited.

Mr. Boswell: I am.

Mr. Coen: I am.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Coen. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: The same cast of characters as before.

Mr. Rhodes: Eh, a dangerous cast of characters. Okay. Now, I think... are we limited to, I know we're kind of limited to 3 for subcommittees, right, if I'm not mistaken? Is there any limitation associated with this one?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that there's going to be an open meeting or a public meeting when they have it, so there's going to be additional members from the Board. So you're already over the 3.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Anyone else? Is that good? Okay, so it's Mr. Boswell, Mr. Apicella, and Mr. Coen. And then there's the Architectural Review Board? Anyone interested?

Mr. English: I think Mike Rhodes would be (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: You guys, you're a hard crowd. I thought I'd sneak it in on you.

Mr. Boswell: I feel like we're letting the newest member off easy.

Mr. Coen: I don't think she likes disco.

Mr. Rhodes: Do you like disco?

Mrs. Bailey: No.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Sleep on it. Think about it. We have to have a member for next time. Okay. And we'll close it out next time. Along those lines though, I would just like to highlight a couple things to keep in mind as well. I envision probably we will need to for a targeted period of time possibly also have some other subcommittees, not immediate at this point, but probably as we go forward to further work on what Mike's doing on the Comp Plan, the post-UDA environment. There's one area where we might need to get some concentrated work or we can add a little focus and help staff really move that forward at the right time. Probably we never really got too in-depth but we're getting to a point where we need to probably give some focused effort to Zoning Ordinances and Subdivision Ordinances and some rewrite work. And really the most effective way that works on behalf of the staff and for all is really to get a subcommittee where you kind of work it together, guide it together, and then bring it to the Planning Commission as a whole, because there's some need to do some streamlining to make them a bit more user friendly. There's some updating that's needed. There's some state law requirements we need to put into those. So, there's those couple areas. We've kind of put off the issue of the notice requirement; I don't know if that would a subcommittee. But I think in those two, we might find that during the course of the year we need to participate with a subcommittee perspective to really close out a lot of the work on the Comp Plans and post-UDA and also on the rewrite of those Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. So I just throw that out there to keep in the back of our minds in the process. Okay, that said, we'll move onto Other Business. TRC meeting is the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Does everybody know who's got... you're all good? Everybody good? Do you have your times that you need?

OTHER BUSINESS

2. TRC Information – Meeting January 22, 2014

Mr. English: No, I don't have my times but I'm sure they'll send it to me.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so she'll just email times? Okay, good. Alright, awesome. Okay, then the last item that's on there is the approval of minutes, the December 11<sup>th</sup> minutes of 2013. You're more than welcome to abstain from that one. Unless there's any modifications or edits, entertain a motion for approval of the December 11, 2013 minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*December 11, 2013*

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. English. Is there a second?

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Boswell. Any further comment Mr. English? Mr. Boswell? Any other member? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 8, 2014*

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. Abstention?

Mrs. Bailey: Abstain.

Mr. Rhodes: Abstain. Okay, so 6-0-1... a hockey score. Alright. Let's see, did I miss anything Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Ms. McClendon?

Ms. McClendon: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Welcome back everybody; welcome ma'am, it will be another exciting year. A lot always going on. But I wish you a happy 2014. We're adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.