

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**February 12, 2014**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, February 12, 2014, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Knighting, Zuraf, Ehly, and Hornung

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any Declarations of Disqualification on any item on the agenda this evening? Okay, we'll now move onto Public Presentations. If there's any member of the public that would like to make a presentation to the Planning Commission, they may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, we'd ask that you state your name and your address. Once you do so, a green light will come on indicating 3 minutes, a yellow light will come on when there's 1 minute remaining, and then a red light will come on indicating that we'd ask that you wrap up your comments. If you come forward, we'd ask that you address your remarks to the Planning Commission as a whole.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I live in the gerrymander Crock Hill District. Well, this is my first time attending a Planning Commission meeting this year. It's amazing how some things just stay the same. I've recommended to the Board of Supervisors that we ought to follow the Virginia statutes and we should have 15 Planning Commissioners instead of 7. We could have 5 to 15; it just seems more logical to me that we need bigger government. So, let me give the citizens an update on what's been going on planning-wise. I came from the commuter parking lot today and I can from the one where there should have been a planned vertical parking garage. And now you can see as far as you want. You've got all that land all paved over. Excellent planning... excellent. I also got the population estimates. Those are always my favorites because I already know that in the last 50 years the County's population has doubled every 20 years since 1960 to 1980. And I love these projections out to 2020 that the Comprehensive Plan is going to show that we have 176,710 people. No way. Remember, there's only 280 square miles in your county. If you didn't know that, 55 of it is Federal land - I guess a place called Quantico. And then we planned that we name this thing called the Quantico Corporate Center instead of the Stafford County Corporate Center. I wonder what we would have named it if we had an Air Force Base there. Now I also went through your annual report because it's always interesting to me because you know how much of a fan I am of the Rocky Park Run Reservoir that only took 22 years. And now I'm waiting on that return on investments so I can get that county water and sewer bill for that property that I own in the Griffis-Whitewater District, you know. I've only been waiting for that one for 25 years. Just so you know, Abraham Lincoln's birthday is today; he's 205 years old. If my grandmother was alive, her birthday she would have been 114. I love that 350 year plan. I think you should all take a picture together, maybe go down to the Rocky Pen Reservoir, and let's stick it in the time capsule. I'm even willing to donate one of my t-shirts... the one I'm wearing today - Sidewalks to Nowhere. Finally, I'll leave you with I am a Buffalonian. Yes I have a generator. I hope that the storm isn't too bad.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you sir. Anyone else who would like to speak? With that, I will close the Public Presentations and, we have no public hearings so prior to moving to Unfinished Business, Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have a change in the agenda. I'd like to move number 3 up first so that people can get out of here.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. So there's a motion to modify the agenda to move item 3 up ahead of item 1. Is there a second?

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that.

Mr. Rhodes: Second. Any further comment Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella? Any other member? 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. Very good. We'll move onto item number 3, New Business, WAI1400016, The Glens, Section 4, 5, and 8A. Mr. Harvey.

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)**

*Discussed after item 3.*

2. Adoption of New Proffer Guideline Policies - Proposed Resolution R14-13 would establish new Proffer Guidelines (Guidelines) for proffer statements submitted as part of a zoning reclassification or proffer amendment application. **(History: Deferred on January 29, 2014 to February 26, 2014)**

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

*Discussed after item 3.*

NEW BUSINESS

3. WAI1400016; Glens, Sections 4, 5, & 8A - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, 22-156, Block Length, to increase the block length by 464.29 feet to a total of 2,964.29 feet on Twinleaf Drive, Assessor's Parcel 28-22B, zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 210.77 acres, located on the west side of Mountain View Road, approximately 2,100 feet south of Stefaniga Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: N/A)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Andrea Hornung for the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mrs. Hornung: Good evening Mr. Chair and members of the Commission. The item you have before you is The Glens, Section 4, 5, and 8A, a subdivision waiver request of Section 22-156 for block length. And that's parcel 27-62. I want to make a correction; there was an error in the staff report and the description for 28-22B but it's actually 27-62. The map that you did have in your packets did have that correct. The location is on the west side of Mountain... it's west of Mountain View Road, about 2,100 feet south of Stefaniga Road. It's zoned A-1, Agricultural. There are 34 single-family residential lots and it's in the Rock Hill Election District. These schematics on the left will show you the parcel because it has not been recorded yet. So this is the entire parcel which encompasses those 3 sections. And then the other one to the right, where the X is, gives you an idea of where the location of this is in relation to 95 which is on the far right in red of the schematic, in case some people aren't familiar. This is the preliminary plan that was approved in 2003 for a number of these lots, and the road in question is in between the two arrows which is Twin Leaf. The preliminary was originally approved July 2, 2003, and was 2,410 feet in length. Then there was another preliminary approved in March of '06 which had added a few more sections. We had a technical change which removed... oops, I was trying to circle it... but anyway it removed a portion of this road to the right of the second arrow as it crosses the RPA which is Sweet William. And the next schematic will show you the result of that, where the road gets longer and it connects to Sweet William.

Mr. Rhodes: Could you go back once again?

Mrs. Hornung: Yes, I have now everything on here for you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mrs. Hornung: The left schematic, because it's easier to see when you're putting them side by side, the left one of the first preliminary and then the right one is the technical change where we removed the crossing to the RPA for the road. And by doing this, we extended the road 464.29 feet. The bottom schematic is a little closer view of that road, the Twin Leaf Drive, where it was increased. The reason for increasing the road was preventing the crossing on the RPA. And this wasn't realized until the construction plan was revised to correct the road, then the tech change came after the construction plan and after all that realized that by approving the technical change, we actually increased the road length beyond the 2,500 linear feet that's required by the Subdivision Ordinance. So in doing this, as we're working through the plats for recording the lots, we're before you with a waiver to allow that length of road for Twin Leaf to exceed the Subdivision Section 22-156 of 464.29 feet. And staff recommends

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

approval of this waiver. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer and of them and I'll leave the schematics up so you can see the comparison.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Mr. Apicella: I'll just ask a question for the sake of pointing out that I think we've done this before, that we've extended the block length for environmental reasons. So I there is precedent here. Is that correct?

Mrs. Hornung: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Other questions for staff? Thank you.

Mrs. Hornung: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Applicant?

Ms. Karnes: Good evening Planning Commissioners and staff. My name is Debrarae Karnes; I work for Leming and Healy and I'm here to present the case for the waiver. Staff did a really good job in explaining the issue. Basically, after a number of approvals from the County, the applicant finds itself about 400/500 linear feet over the maximum block length. And they find themselves in the position because they were trying to avoid disturbance of RPA. There is precedent for approval of a waiver and the test is to find in the Zoning Ordinance... I'm sorry... in the Subdivision Ordinance, my letter outlines the test, but basically one of the factors is no adverse impact to the community. There's no adverse case. There's a benefit, environmental benefit and, by the way, no increase in number of lots. And so the benefit I think is good and I'm here to ask approval at this time. And I'd be willing to answer any questions.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for the applicant.

Mr. English: I think you answered them...

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please, Mr. English.

Mr. English: I'm sorry. You answered about was it going to add any lots but you just answered; thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for the applicant? Okay, thank you ma'am.

Ms. Karnes: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Back into the Commission. This is where?

Mr. English: Rock Hill.

Mr. Rhodes: Rock Hill, yes, okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion for an unusual number here, WAI1400016 for approval.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. English: I'll second.

Mr. Rhodes: So a motion to recommend approval of WAI1400016 and seconded by Mr. English. Further comments Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Further comments Mr. English? Any other member? Please, Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Only a clarifying point here. I think there's the wrong, on the staff package it has a different number.

Mr. Gibbons: It does.

Mr. Apicella: So which is the right number? Is it 14 or 13?

Mrs. Hornung: The number is 14, 1400016.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. I'll just comment that there is good logic behind the block length ordinance. It's to ensure ability to cross over alternatives and options as was mentioned. This one, as we have in the past with a couple of occasions, not a lot but a couple of occasions, have in the past, this one mitigates some environmental issues but that I think has good logic to it. The other thing that, for me, is a mitigating factor is that it's not like this is extending the block length of something that goes to a cul-de-sac. There are options at each end, each alternative, and so when you kind of get to a midpoint that cuts the distance out. We've had some instances where they have been a block length associated with a cul-de-sac and that becomes problematic when people are locked in over long distances. So that's why I'll certainly be supporting this. If there are no further comments, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of the motion to recommend approval of WAI1400016 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; passes 7-0. Thank you very much. With that we'll move back onto the regular agenda which is Unfinished Business, item number 1, Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas. I think you had a bit of an update there Mr. Harvey?

*1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas*

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman, Mike Zuraf will give the update.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Yeah, this item is just a quick update on the Comp Plan with regard to the Urban Development Areas. At your last meeting, January 22<sup>nd</sup>, we reported to the Commission that the Board had received an update on how things were proceeding with the Comp Plan updates, and this happened at their retreat in January. After that retreat, the Board did schedule to discuss providing the Commission more specific direction. This was going to occur at their February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, their last meeting. They did not discuss the issue and deferred the item to their next meeting on February 18<sup>th</sup> when all members would be present to discuss it. And that's the update we have for you now.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. I don't know if there are any questions from staff.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: The reason why it was delayed is they had an illness of one of the Board members.

Mr. Rhodes: Right, right; Mr. Snellings. I don't know if anybody has any particular comments. I would just suggest that possibly Planning Commissioners have a little discussion with their Supervisor, just make sure we understand the intent here. I do know the resolution that was proposed which was a general one to be refined and as necessary or not by the Board members, was fairly general. It just essentially said look at what you suggested before and consider RDAs and tell us if you'd modify your recommendation. So, I think there may be some other interests in there and just getting clarity on that so we don't waste anybody's efforts, staff, ours, the Boards, and make sure we're addressing the issues that need to be addressed. It might be worth just a little discussion in the interim just to make sure you've got an understanding where your Supervisor's at on that, and can reinforce to them the greater the clarity coming the greater we can work to address, or at least consider, the issues that they have. Okay. Any other questions for staff on this? Right, very good. Thank you very much Mr. Zuraf. With that we'll move onto item number 2, Adoption of the New Proffer Guideline Policies. Mr. Harvey?

2. *Adoption of New Proffer Guideline Policies*

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you recall, the Commission did establish a committee to consider proffer guidelines. It was originally scheduled to meet tomorrow but, due to the weather considerations...

Mr. Rhodes: Wimps.

Mr. Harvey: ... it is being postponed to next Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup>, at 8:30 a.m., in the ABC Conference Room. Staff has prepared a comparative chart. We can go through that if the Commission wants. Also, staff would seek input from any Commissioners regarding any questions they have for FABAs regarding FABAs' position on the proffer guidelines and/or any other suggestions for the discussion.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I do want to first off thank Mr. Gibbons for taking this on and, additionally, I thank Mr. English and Mrs. Bailey for volunteering to participate in the committee to have this discussion. Always good to have discussion, clarify issues and items of interest to make sure we're considering all the

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

elements in there. I also appreciate the efforts of the Commissioners on the committee to press this forward so that we can try and get it up to the next meeting and ensure that we move this forward deliberately. Particular interests of staff...

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, just one comment. They wanted to have it a further date out but we made it next Friday so we can get it in the mail, email it to each Commissioner before the following meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, and ...

Mr. Gibbons: That's the best we could do under the circumstances.

Mr. Rhodes: No, under the circumstances, greatly appreciated the efforts to continue to keep that on track and move it forward deliberately. We want to consider all issues but we don't want to have to miss another meeting associated with it if not necessary. Would you all like to go through the information that staff had developed or just have staff talk about it a little bit?

Mr. Gibbons: I just wanted to comment. This was an outstanding effort by staff to digest that and put it in something to where we could have a cheat sheet and go down through. So I want to thank the young lady that just came to us from Florida. This is kind of jumping into the fire bank.

Mr. Rhodes: Here here. Another great effort by staff, and I know you all are working to be able to get straight to the issues and try and get real language that is considerable in the Ordinance out of the process, so it will be something clearly to be considered. Everybody's worried about the snow.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to discuss the chart or discuss any technical issues. Ms. Ehly's here and she can walk the Commission through it if you so desire.

Mr. Rhodes: Why don't we just kinda quickly just in summary go over the chart, if you could please... since she's here.

Ms. Ehly: Good evening Mr. Chair and members of the Commission.

Mr. Rhodes: Good evening.

Ms. Ehly: I'll just go right to the chart unless you want me to...

Mr. Rhodes: No, please, that will be fine. Thank you.

Ms. Ehly: Okay. So, I can just... as an example of how the chart is identifying the issues from the FABA letter, the first column identifies the location in the letter of the concern, and then the next column is a general subject matter. The next column identifies the viewpoint of FABA, and then the next column identifies how it's addressed in the proposed guideline document. And then the final column has some general comments from staff. And it's broken up into several slides. So here's the first slide; I'm not sure how you want to go through all the...

Mr. Rhodes: No, that'd be fine. I think possibly focusing on the staff comment aspect. You know, certainly you can quickly summarize what the positions are but the staff comment aspect and just expanding on your all's perspective there would be helpful.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Ms. Ehly: Well, Mr. Chair, with regard to the parks issue, in the methodology to identify the suggested contribution amount, all park land in the inventory was used in the methodology. And that's how the parks are designed, with passive and active areas. And then with regard to the schools, the new neighborhood generation rate is based upon actual data provided by the schools, so it's more real time data rather than a countywide average. The level of service, using the current CIP, is what the Virginia State Code requires, and the level of service as pulled out from the current projects in the CIP is what's incorporated into the methodology rather than projected ideal level of service standards that are in the Comprehensive Plan. So that's also real time data.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Ehly: Then with regard to the various credits, as the Commission probably recalls or does recall I'm sure, there were many different types of credits that were considered. And, in the end, they were eliminated with the thought that establishing a maximum cash contribution suggested amount at the rate of 25% less than the 100% of value would kind of account for all those types of credits. And then the timely spending comment, with regard to spending of proffer money, the State Code does identify 7 years for transportation proffers. But staff also would like to note that currently proffer contributions are generally spent in a timely manner as soon as they are available. With regard to the offsite easement dedication, staff feels that this is necessary to determine whether the property owner where the offsite easement would be located, we need to have their consent so that we know it's buyable, that the project could go forward. The geotechnical requirement, the same situation; before you move forward you need to know that the land is suitable for development for the type of public facility that it's being dedicated for. The by-right credit is the same comment as the other credits, the 25% reduced proffer amount would account for the various types of credits that were considered earlier. And then, the credit for early payment, state law limits currently the ability for the County to collect proffer amounts early as they must be collected specifically after final inspection and before an occupancy permit is issued. And then there was a question of why the two-thirds vote would be necessary to amend proffers at a meeting. And that's required by the Commission By-Laws. With regard to larger proffer contributions promoting sprawl by discouraging rezonings, the type of development that the rezonings permit, it's not... you can't have that without rezonings. And also, most importantly, development is targeted by the future land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan, not necessarily by the proffer amounts -- whether they're large or small. And then also the maximum proffer amount is viewed as an incentive to rezone at the 25% rate.

Mr. Rhodes: So, I guess stated a little differently, reducing it from the maximum is considered as a positive or incentive associated with rezoning.

Ms. Ehly: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Or to some degree.

Ms. Ehly: Well, establishing a maximum proffer amount rather than... because early on there was discussion of whether the County would follow Chesterfield's example with establishing that maximum amount or going with the range without a maximum cap.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Ehly: And again, lower proffer amounts incentivize development and staff's comment is that, you know, the Commission did consider the Chesterfield example; the amount I think was around \$18,000

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

cap. And it was considered and studied by the Planning Commission. Regarding the issue with the proffer amounts targeting growth or encouraging growth in certain areas, growth is targeted through again the future land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan where you can rezone those properties in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan as identified there. The growth rate, the County uses the state population projections to determine the growth rate. That kind of was a paragraph or so in the letter. And then with regard to using current population numbers or the 2010 Census numbers, staff certainly agrees that we can update the population numbers every year. In fact, Mr. Zuraf does do that for the Planning and Zoning Department already, so those numbers can certainly be utilized.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Ehly: And that's the end of the chart.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Comments or questions? Please, Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I just want to say I think it's a great piece of staff work and it accurately reflects our efforts to date as well as our views and comments that occurred over the time period. So I appreciate what you've done here.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, it ought to help make the discussion next week very effective, so great.

Mr. English: Did they get a copy of this? FABA?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I did forward it to the FABA representative because I knew it would be a subject of discussion for the meeting. Also, I asked them if they had any particular position regarding changes to the narrative part of the proffer guidelines text, and also asked them if they had a preferred proffer dollar amount that they found that their organization believed to be acceptable.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Get it all out on the table. That's great. Other comments for staff? Please.

Mr. Apicella: Will anybody from staff be in attendance at the meeting? Great.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, there will be several staff members, from legal counsel to Planning and Zoning to also Finance.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any other questions for staff on this topic? Well again, I appreciate the efforts of staff, I appreciate the Planning Commissioners who have volunteered to partake in the committee, and I appreciate the effort to keep things moving forward very deliberately. So it should be a win/win. It's good, it's always good to have the issues clearly known and understood and considered in any process. Very good. With that, I'll move onto the Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

4. 2014 Calendar Year Work Plan

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. With regard to the Planning Director's Report, I have 3 items for the Commission to consider. One is the Calendar Year Work Plan. I've provided a copy of last year's Calendar Year Work Plan for the Commission to consider making as a basis for this year's work plan.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Some of the things on this work plan we didn't get to, some of them may need to come off, others may need to be modified. Certainly we'll put a new target date out there as far as when we anticipate working on these things. For instance, Public Notice Standards; it was discussed last year at the retreat and at other times but no real action took place or a consensus took place on how to deal with that issue. So the question would be, do we want to consider that for 2014 or not?

Mr. Rhodes: I think we left that as a parking lot item. While there were some interesting points on it, nobody seemed to be... So unless somebody has a driving force, or a driving push on that one, I'd just set that one aside.

Mr. Harvey: With regard to Impact Statement Standards, we really didn't make much progress or pay much focus on this item, but we certainly can add it for this year and redouble our efforts to try to hone in on it. Especially at our retreat, we can talk about that in more detail. Because I got the sense from the Commission previously that there was a desire to have another retreat this year.

Mr. Rhodes: Maui or Lanai?

Mr. Harvey: Pardon?

Mr. Rhodes: Maui or Lanai? Or A, B, or C? Okay.

Mr. Harvey: Also, we know we're going to continue to work on the UDA Comp Plan Amendments. The Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Plan, there had been some staff work started but nothing significant to have it in a form to bring back to the Commission. In talking with the Public Works Department, that's one of their projects that they have on their docket for this year so we that this will gain some more traction. Also, with the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Re-Write, I've had initial presentation to the Board at the retreat and then also following up with one of their committees. So, we're working through the committee process for referrals back to the Planning Commission. The first order of business right now is working on marrying up the definitions between the subdivision and zoning aspects of the code. Also, making it compliant with State Code and doing some other cleanup efforts. So, I anticipate the Commission's going to see this in the spring and work through it. And, Mr. Chairman, at that point in time you may want to assess whether you want a committee to work on that aspect or not because it is fairly involved.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: The Master Environmental Plan, staff has been working on that and we'll probably have a document that we can present to the Commission sometime late this winter/early spring. And that document is intended to take all of our various Comprehensive Plan elements that deal with environmental aspects and combine it into one document. And as far as Fiscal Impact Model, that was something the Commission suggested we do after proffer guidelines are resolved. So we can keep that on the calendar if the Commission so desires. And if there's any other item that the Commission feels that we should put on here, please let me know and, as I said, we'll...

Mr. Rhodes: Where are you in the Ches Bay work? Don't you have some rework going on that?

Mr. Harvey: Yes. There will be an ordinance... a series of ordinances coming to the Commission probably in April. We had some initial discussions with the Board's Community and Economic

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Development Committee about moving the Chesapeake Bay Regulations out of the Zoning Ordinance and putting it in a stand-alone ordinance. And there's a number of reasons for that and I can explain later. But that would bring a subdivision amendment to you, a zoning amendment, plus another code amendment to establish a new subchapter for the Chesapeake Bay Act.

Mr. Rhodes: So if I tracked your comments... I just want to see... I think in the spring to late spring timeframe there's subdivision/zoning/Ches Bay-ish and whatever referral work we get on the UDAs, that's just with the Comp Plan. And then later this year, probably late summer/fall timeframe is the draft Master Environmental Plan and probably before that possibly some work on Fiscal Impact Model which we had talked about last year after we get the proffer guidelines hopefully resolved and clarified on where we're headed on those. So those first 3, though, seem like, if nothing else, topics we might take some time if we do carve out a Saturday, a half day on a Saturday, to just kind of dedicate some time to work some issues that's a packet of items and anything else anyone feels we need to raise or want to look a little deeper into, that we might be able to address on a given day. So maybe we'll look at kind of setting those with that as a potential target of time that we maybe focus some time on it and then we look to see if we need some other committees to work some issues. Other thoughts?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, over the last year, maybe more so than that timeframe, one of the issues that I've raised is the way we have to deal with, or the way we are dealing with rezonings. And I wonder if we can put that kind of back on our radar scope to see if we have any flexibilities or alternatives. My concern was and is the short 90 day clock that we have and that the first time we, as a Commission, see these items is at a public hearing which, again, I think triggers the 90 day clock. Some of those rezonings are very comprehensive. I think, again, Spotsylvania might have some alternative approaches that we might want to consider, like they require a public meeting before it comes to the Planning Commission. So, again, I'd like to see if there's...

Mr. Rhodes: Is that a community meeting by the developer before it comes (inaudible)?

Mr. Apicella: I believe it is. I believe that's a requirement... I haven't been able to actually find it in their code but I remember reading it in the paper and who knows whether you can believe what you read in the Free Lance-Star or not but nonetheless I think it would be useful. Again, I feel overburdened on this short plot that we have.

Mr. Rhodes: Maybe we can add that as one thing. We'll just go back over the map of items and issues and where things are coming from. I will say that was a great item that you had pushed, I think last year or maybe... I think it was last year... as we talked about it last May. What was very helpful for me was getting a clear idea at the different various advance points where it's coming through staff. And now that you're giving us those updates, the DRM schedule and the others, it does at least help track it a little bit better as it's coming forward so it doesn't quite come with a surprise. But certainly breaking that down and mapping through the pieces and steps and looking at any alternatives that may be out there I Spotsylvania or others would be worthwhile.

Mr. English: Is that something that staff could look in about Spotsylvania? I agree with Steve on that; I like that idea. Do you think they'd give us a copy of that to see how they do that?

Mr. Rhodes: Maybe we might just take that a little half step further and that is, again, if we make this one of the topics as we work towards a date in possibly May, I think those are proven beneficial. I know it's always a joy for staff and everybody to carve out another half day but I think they have proved beneficial.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

But in advance of that, in addition to the mapping that you all did, a great mapping of all those steps where it comes in and out of the system, not only just looking at Spotsylvania but looking at the surroundings and where you see something that's different than how we handle rezonings, just raising all those and we can just consider it if you can uncover any other unique steps that we don't do.

Mr. Harvey: Certainly. And some of them may be governed by policy rather than code.

Mr. Rhodes: Right, right. It's going to be good to know. Please Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: I know this may be onerous, but could we sort of look at maybe Prince William as well besides just Spotsy to the south? Maybe the ones that have dealt with things a little bit differently. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: Sure. We'll look at all comparable jurisdictions and see what we can glean from looking at their various policies.

Mr. Rhodes: That would be very helpful, thank you. Other thoughts? Okay, so I think we've got those 3 packaged kind of on the first, in the spring, late spring, leading up to the offsite, or to the whatever we're calling it... the thing up the hall on a Saturday. And then the bottom couple that we'll deal with probably later this fall as far as flushing out a work plan and then we'll see what else fits in around there. Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: You're welcome.

Mr. Rhodes: Other items? The other item that I wanted to discuss... well, there's 2 more items. One, I'll ask Mr. Zuraf to come up and talk about, Population Projection Comparison. At the last meeting, Mr. Gibbons had asked for information about our population projections versus what was in the Comprehensive Plan, and Mr. Zuraf is here to give some explanation to that.

Mr. Rhodes: Great, thank you.

5. Population Projection Comparison

Mr. Zuraf: So, in response to that request we provided to you a chart that kind of brings together all the different numbers that we've kind of received over the last few years from various sources. In the chart we have, as a starting point, the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau number for the County. And then since 2010, the Weldon Cooper Center, through UVA, they prepare the population estimates. And that 2013 population estimate, that is basically considered a July 1, 2013 population estimate. That was the population estimate that was just prepared and released just a few weeks ago and there were news articles about that. So, in comparison then the next column looks at the annual population estimate that was projected in the Comprehensive Plan, the 2010-2030 Comp Plan document. And you can see that the population was projected to be much higher. At the time when these estimates were developed, they were prepared by the Virginia Employment Commission. Through developing the Comp Plan and a lot of it being tied to the Urban Development Areas, we utilized the state resource as was required by the state legislation at the time. So the Virginia Employment Commission had prepared these projections. They were prepared back in 2007, back before the recession, so it was projected that the population would be much higher.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: How far out does Weldon Cooper project?

Mr. Zuraf: They do the annual estimates. They did also prepare... they have 20 years out projections.

Mr. Rhodes: In 2007, what would they have said about 2010? Do you have any idea? I'm just curious.

Mr. Zuraf: Back then, Weldon Cooper did not do the projections back then. They had transferred over to Weldon Cooper.

Mr. Rhodes: Got it, okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So, yeah. And then you can see, there's a 12,000 population gap between Weldon Cooper and the Stafford Comp Plan. And from that, we worked out preparing some more recent population estimates working off of the Weldon Cooper Annual Estimates and then projecting out on an annual basis. That's the last column. These projections were developed back in the very beginning of the year and those recent County projections look at recent growth trends, building permit data, and look at the annual increase. But basically, when we get out to 2020 on that County estimate, that is an attempt to match up with the GWRC FAMPO projection that was discussed last year when we were considering what projections do we use in the future. So, that does ramp up... that makes an assumption that building permits would kind of continue to increase over the next few years and then eventually level off. And so staff will likely be adjusting these numbers on an annual basis just as trends and data changes. But this is the latest information we have for you.

Mr. Rhodes: So, you and Weldon Cooper are 170 off. Who's right? Comments or questions for staff? I mean, certainly at the heart of this is, you know, what should we be using for the Comp Plan, what should we be using for the basis in our planning construct and what's the best way forward, certainly as current as we can be. I mean, we only update the Comprehensive Plan so often but we can certainly update our planning construct information I think, at least for our purposes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I think Mike answered the question, but what I noticed was, again, the 12,000 population delta carries on through about 2017, and then in the last 3 years it goes down significantly. So, the following year it's 10,000, 9,000, and then 7,000. So I'm just curious how we're getting there. I think maybe you said it's just to marry up with GWRC, but that's, you know, that's a lot in the out years between 12,000 and 7,000.

Mr. Zuraf: It basically reflects a gradual increase up to about that 2017 year and then the building permits, we make the assumption that it kind of levels off a bit. So the difference doesn't continue on because the building permit numbers in our assumptions kind of stay the same; that difference shrinks back down.

Mr. English: Mike, how come you don't have the Census for, is the last Census 2012 or 2013? The United States Census Bureau, when was that last conducted?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the decennial census would have been 2000, the previous one.

Mr. English: 2000? So, every 10 years... okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: I would just... the one comment would be is no question at all about anything on our staff. But I think if we keep our bases of numbers on something that's a bit more independent like the Weldon Cooper state numbers, I just think there's a sound planning construct to that. It's not up to the different adjustments and a different model, but point to one definitive source. I think there's something to be considered there. Great!

6. R14-28 ARB Membership

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, another item on my report, we attached the Resolution that was recently passed by the Board of Supervisors referring an ordinance to the Commission, and we've made copies of the ordinance and have it at your seat. Specifically, this ordinance amendment would change the number of people to be on the Architectural Review Board. It would change the membership from 5 members to 7 members. The Board, in its referral resolution, asked the Commission to appoint its member within 30 days which you have done, but I also recall from my attendance at the Board meeting there was some sense of urgency on the Board's part to consider amending the code to change the membership from 5 to 7. This amendment would simply do that.

Mr. Rhodes: And that's the only change, right?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: And I'm not saying anybody's necessarily for or against, but we could go ahead and push this forward to public hearing now, couldn't we? Because we have the language right here?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: And certainly gather more information as the staff does the staff packet and get the input from the public hearing and decide where we stand. But it's a fairly straightforward proposed change for public comment, or to go to public comment. Thoughts?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, with that in mind I would move to put this matter to public hearing and ask staff to craft the appropriate language commensurate with what the Board has asked us to do here.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Motion to move this to public hearing.

Mr. English: Second it.

Mr. Rhodes: Second, Mr. English. Any further comment Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No sir.

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

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
February 12, 2014*

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None? Very good; passes 7-0. Thank you. Anything else Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman. One final thing; at your desk you're going to find a series of handouts.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, what is this stuff?

Mr. Harvey: It's to update your notebooks.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: In particular, we try to get the Commission members a number of maps; we didn't get all of them done yet but the maps you have before you are the Anticipated Transportation Needs Map for the County, the County Road Map, a Zoning Map, as well as an Election District Map. We're still working on the active Subdivisions Map. That would have the subdivisions that are active within our... that we're tracking on our master list, and have them located on a map by Election District. We're still working with GIS on getting that to you. Also, you'll find a series of what we call cheat sheets for the different zoning categories which lists the uses that are allowed in the zoning category, the setbacks, and those things, all on one page. So, we use that quite a bit in working with customers and I'll think you'll find it to be very useful.

Mr. Rhodes: That reference brought me back to high school.

Mr. Harvey: And also Mr. Chairman, we've been working with the IT Department to figure out the best way to get the Commission hooked up for prior staff reports and those types of things. We've had some discussions with them recently and have figured out a way to use hyperlinks in your iPad agendas. So, we're going to work towards rolling that out for you so it's not as cumbersome for you to go back through all the back information on one really long spool.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, that'd be great. Will they be able to... I'm so technical... will the hyperlinks include like past meetings agendas? So, say we discuss it at such and such date meeting and they carry it forward and they have a hyperlink back to that agenda?

Ms. Knighting: Like on the agenda where it says... On the agenda where it says it was held a certain day and deferred, you can click on the date it was deferred to and it will pull up that report... hopefully.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

Mr. Rhodes: Wonderful; thank you very much. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Committee Report; anything further Mr. Gibbons? Okay, very good.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just curious what has happened or will happen with our... I'm trying to remember what it was called... our Shoreline Committee? I think we... my hope was that we could do a meeting during the evening. I know the Board members have their own meetings on their respective Board dates but that probably might not work for some of us on that committee.

Mr. Rhodes: I think it's still rolling to shore.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I have not heard any recent discussion of a meeting date yet.

Mr. Rhodes: But we have told them who's interested!

Mr. Apicella: Is there a way we can just kind of...

Mr. Coen: ... Put a motor on that boat?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: I will check back in with the Administrator's Office on that.

Mr. Rhodes: These are all horrible tonight by the way. Okay, thank you Mr. Harvey. If you could just inquire. Appreciate that. Nothing for the Chairman's Report. TRC; does everybody have what they need? We good?

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

7. TRC Information - Meeting February 26, 2014

Ms. Hornung: I'm sorry but Jeff... Mr. Harvey may have it.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, for the 26<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Harvey: We have 2 items Mr. Chairman; it's at the respective Commissioner's desks.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*February 12, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Everybody's good on their times? Okay? Cool. Very good. I'll entertain a motion for approval of the January 29, 2014 minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 29, 2014

Mr. Coen: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Moved by Mr. Coen. Any second?

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mrs. Bailey. Further comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Bailey? Any other member? 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; passes 7-0. Anything else folks? I wonder if it's snowing yet. Very good.

Mr. Coen: It was snowing in south Stafford when I came in.

Mr. Rhodes: We are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.