STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 9, 2014

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 9, 2014, was called to order at 6:31 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, Stinnette, Zuraf, and Ennis

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any declarations of disqualifications regarding any item on the agenda this evening?

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Yes, I met with the land owners / applicants for item number 3 and it turns out by chance that for a couple of years I did actually work in the same building as one of them. I thought I'll make that clear.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. So not necessarily a declaration of disqualification, but certainly to clarify to make sure you knew of advanced engagement in other context. So thank you very much for that. Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Did Mr. Coen pay his (inaudible)?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen, did you pay…that's alright. Okay. Very good. Okay. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Rhodes: And now I'll open up to the public presentation portion of the agenda. If anyone would like to speak on any item you may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, I'd ask that you state your name and your address. At that time a green light will come on indicating three minutes of time available. A yellow light will come on when there's one minute remaining and then a red light will come on at we would ask that you wrap your comments at that time. Thank you. So if anyone would like to speak, please come forward at this time.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I was at the County last week and I went up to the County Administrator's Office and everyone in there knew exactly where I lived. That's pretty interesting. Yesterday I went to the School Board meeting and they had all those awards, so senior citizens like myself would have to wait. I think my emails today kind of got their attention. I do like your format, that you're upfront with public presentations and even though I'm a controversial figure, I'm called, I do bring some value at times to these aspects. I wanted to greet our new Superintendent who has real interesting background in the County he came from. Can you believe it, he had 9 School Board

members, which means he had 9 Board of Supervisors and their population is only 33,000 people. Simply amazing. I can't say it's gerrymandering, because I don't live there and I really don't know. But one of the things I wanted to bring up, I been examining the 10 year growth of our school systems, because when I moved here in 1990, we only had 5 schools, but we had 6 School Board members. That's amazing, isn't it? Why would we have one more School Board member than the 5 schools? Then I get questioned, why should we only 5 School Board members with 5 High Schools. Well, it's because the projections in this County are highly inaccurate. I went back to 10 years, 2004 to 2005, and there were 25,419 students. We only had 25 schools at that time, so you know, good operations research analysts, we get all the data, that's why we can probably find that plane that is out there in the world somewhere and eventually will proof that someone in OR will find it. Now, in 2013 to 2014 we only have 27,229 people, students. That means we have grown 1,810 which is only 7.1 percent. Now, everyone's saying "oorah, capacity" and I say we're mismanaging it. And what's really interesting in the 2004/2005 data, I can go over the forecast. They forecasted that we're going to have 31,827 students in 2009 and 2010 when we only had 26,661. So statistically they were only off by 19.3 percent. I just love how these people look at the numbers and they can calculate everything that's going on in this County. How did I go from yellow to red? Now it's going 8, 9, 10. Am I out of time or do I have one minute? Or is this broken? I know you guys are not supposed to talk, I understand. It's going 23, 26. It's going incrementing. I could be like Senator Cruz. I could stand here for 21 hours and 19 minutes.

Mr. Rhodes: No, but certainly take another minute if you like.

Mr. Waldowski: Okay. 34 seconds? Is it fixed? I'm not trying to…

Mr. Rhodes: No, take another minute if you like.

Mr. Waldowski: Alright. Thank you, Sir. Alright. Man. I always get these extra long interruptions. It's a good thing I'm a systems programmer so I can handle these multitasking aspects. So I'll just finish with…So you planners, I know you're looking out for all these new housing and the proffers and all the school growth, so let's not just jump to conclusions. Let's look at the numbers. Let's be objective. I know you all like to be subjective and let's be careful that the civil engineers who are really good at what they do are not becoming stake holders in our redistricting processes. Have a great public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. As there any other member of the public who would like to come forward and speak on any item?

Ms. Karnes: Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members and staff, my name is Debrarae Karnes. I work for Leming & Healy on Garrisonville Road and I represent the applicant for the Oakenwold development. I apologize for my voice. I've been attacked by tree pollen allergies. It almost makes me regret advocating for tree preservation, but not quite, because that's an important planning principal. Another one is community involvement. I want to thank the Planning Commission for recently calling for a citizen task forces in more than one instance and the idea was again raised, I think at your last meeting, on the area around the airport. And on behalf of Clark Leming I'm here to urge you to involve one or two of the land owners involved in the area on the citizen task force. He sent you a letter this afternoon. I've got a copy, if you don't and lists several names and he would urge your consideration. And on that note, before I get to flashing red, I'd like to thank you for everything you do for the County.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward and speak? Okay, we'll close the public presentations and we'll move on to the agenda as scheduled.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman. Could we change the agenda and take up item number 3 first please?

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so we have a motion to modify the agenda and take up item number 3. Second by Mr. Gibbons. Any further comment, Mr. Coen? Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? All those in favor of modifying the agenda to lead off with item number 3 and then go back to the regular order of the agenda, 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. So we'll go to New Business, Mr. Harvey, WAI1400109, Bridle Lake Estates.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC1300324; Reclassification – Oakenwold - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, to allow a planned community, including up to 695 residential units and up to 250,000 square feet of commercial floor area, on Assessor's Parcel 37-80. The property consists of 231.6 acres, and is located on the south side of Centerport Parkway and east side of Mountain View Road, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: June 24, 2014) (History: March 26, 2014 Public Hearing Continued to April 23, 2014)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. 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.

NEW BUSINESS

3. WAI1400109 – Bridle Lake Estates, Lot 1B, Side Lot Line Waiver - A waiver request of the Subdivision Ordinance, Section 22-146, Side Lot Line, to allow for adjustment to the boundary line between Assessor's Parcels 60-1D and 60-1B, zoned A-1, Agricultural, located at the end of the cul-de-sac of Gateway Drive, within the George Washington Election District.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, please recognize LeAnn Ennis for the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mrs. Ennis: Computer please.

Mr. Rhodes: When the green light goes on you'll have three minutes. No.

Mrs. Ennis: I can be done in 2.5 seconds. Item number 3 is a waiver for the subdivision ordinance for Bridal Lake Estates Lot 1B. It's on assessor's parcel 60-1B. It's located at the end of a cul-de-sac at Gateway Drive. It's approximately 10.2 acres and it's currently zoned A-1, agricultural and it's within the George Washington Election District. This is a location map that shows you their proposed, the current layout as a plat that was recorded previously. This is Gateway Drive and it's a cul-de-sac and these two lots, there's actually three lots that were, a boundary line adjustment that created at the end of Gateway Drive. As I stated, a boundary line adjustment was approved in July 2013 by a developer where three parcel's property lines were adjusted to allow frontage off Gateway Drive within the Bridal Lake Subdivision. Although the lots are part of Bridal Lake, they're not part of Bridal Lake. They were brought into the Bridal Lake, but they weren't done with the Preliminary Plan of Bridal Lake. The homeowners of parcels 60-1D and 60-1B have submitted a plat for a boundary line adjustment. Review of the plat determined that a waiver was required for the subdivision section 22-146 for side lot line. In the Subdivision Ordinance, again, section 146, the side lot line states: "Side lot lines shall be approximately at right angles to or radial to curves of the front lot line, except at cul-de-sac terminal points." So what I have here is an outline of what they're proposing to do. Currently our pen doesn't work on here so I can't help draw to show you guys a little bit. There's an ingress/egress easement that's being relocated and…it's right here. I touched the screen by mistake…it's being moved over to the east side of it where I wrote new line on there. That's the centerline of his cul-de-sac, I mean ingress/egress. So the front property line on parcel 1D is moving approximately 100 feet east of going into parcel 1B. Then the side property line is moving approximately 140 from the other property line in a different direction. So the yellow is the old line from the plat that was recorded in 2013 and the blue line is what they're proposing to do. So the Ordinance requires that the side lot lines be at right angles and if you see the blue line, the triangle piece is the question. That's the issue here, is the triangle piece that they've created.

Mr. Rhodes: So what is being added to lot 60-1D on the bottom of the screen is roughly similar to what's being deducted on the top of the screen between the old and new?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes. It doesn't have to be equivalent to, but it's actually, the acreage is a little bit smaller for 1B. Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Slightly, yes, slightly smaller acreage, but generally the same and this allows a straight, flag frontage to accessing the property line, versus the property coming into a point.

Mrs. Ennis: Well, we had more of a flat frontage before and the ingress/egress easement, you can't see it on the layout very well, it was straight. It was perpendicular to each property and now it's being brought at an angle, but it's making 1D have more frontage than he had before. The waiver itself doesn't really affect 1D, because everything is better about the lot, but 1B with the cut in on there.

Mr. Rhodes: And the main point of this waiver is the fact that it's not a right angle and that point…

Mrs. Ennis: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Rhodes: …which would make that lot much smaller and not necessarily quasi equal lots or closer to equal lots.

Mrs. Ennis: Again, they don't have to be the same, the same equivalent in size, but yes. The line, we require that the property lines be straight off from the street's frontage. We don't let these zigzag lines go along any lot. There's lots of them out there, but we just don't permit them anymore.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mrs. Ennis: Currently on lot 1D there is underground springs that were discovered during excavation of the…during construction. They were trying to get their building permit. I mean, they already have their building permit, but they were trying to pour their foundations and stuff and the contractor discovered underground springs, so they tried several different locations to get the walls to form up and the contractor was not comfortable with pouring the walls in the locations that they were coming up with, because the footers had to go too deep and then there was no insurance that thing weren't going to happen later down the road, for cracked walls or whatever. Parcel 1D's most suitable location became clear to him and his contractor, that it was closer to the property line. So that puts it out, if you guys…if the Commission sees that there's Wetlands in the back of the property and then there's the two drainfields. If they were moving it over to the blue-yellow property line, that's where his house location is more suitable with him and his contractor. The waiver request prevents additional clearing on parcel 1D. It reduces the impact on the existing Wetlands in the back, the elimination of the…the waiver will not require a new drainfield survey to be done. Additional cost to the homeowner will be prevented and again, there's no impact to parcel 1B, because he has not applied for any building permit on that or started clearing his lots. The only impact would be the side lot line rule that we have.

Mr. English: Do you think he's going to have any trouble on the other side also, with the springs?

Mrs. Ennis: I did ask that of the homeowner. He's here if you would like to ask him that question, but he doesn't have the same issues, he doesn't think. I think it's the contractor, the concrete contractor didn't specify anything, but you could ask him directly, if you would like to hear that.

Mr. English: Yes, I'll wait.

Mrs. Ennis: Okay. Again, staff recommends approval of the waiver request for parcel 60-1B, for the subdivision ordinance for side lot line rule.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for staff? Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just for some clarity, if memory serves and if you look at the map, when they first were going to put the where they went through the County to talk about…is it that, as you were saying, that when they started to dig, water came up. So they moved to, as we look at the map, to the left, still was in their property to stay away from the Wetlands and water came up. And I think, and correct me if I'm wrong, if they went over towards the property line where it used to be, that's where they hit good old fashion Virginia soil.

Mrs. Ennis: Yes.

Mr. Coen: And so, they tried several different locations and I think, if memory serves, at one of the locations the equipment to dig the hole started to sink into the ground so this is an issue where a good portion of the land is, because of these springs, is unusable, so they moved it over. There's actually usable land, am I correct?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes. The applicant informed me that they had already cleared the site where they had envisioned where the house was going to be, because they want a walkout basement, so they were going for the most suitable site to get that walkout basement instead of having to build steps and go up and then there's not really a walkout. So that's what they were working with the contractor about and apparently, according to the applicant, there was several different locations tried to get those footers to pour the concrete and there was failed attempts so over closer to the property line is where they had come to the conclusion was the most suitable area. The homeowner did, just for you all's information, he did come in, the applicant came in several different times with different scenarios, trying to come up with different ways that he can please the county and getting this boundary line…he didn't want to clear additional, because he had already cleared further then where he wanted to, but trying to come up with areas and stuff and different, again, scenarios of what he was trying do and there were several other issues that would have incurred if besides just the waiver, the side lot line rule, because we were having frontage issues, because it's not a big maintained state road. He's off of an ingress/egress. This was not the homeowners doing. This was the developer who did the boundary line adjustment prior to, because they have an existing ingress/egress easement that they're off of, so they would have had frontage issues. They would have had lot shape ratio issues where he would have had an odd shaped lot. It would have been three other waivers he would have had to apply for and this seemed to be the most appealing…because the lots are just a little off, with the side lot line rule.

Mrs. Bailey: Were there other soil studies completed so that we know that the new site would be a good place for the house?

Mrs. Ennis: No, I don't think there was any other, further soils, but you can…I'll let you ask him directly if you don't mind.

Mrs. Bailey: And where exactly would the house be located at?

Mrs. Ennis: If my pen worked…it goes…it's like kind of over in the writing.

Mr. Rhodes: To the right of the reserved drainfield area?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes. Right where, kind of, where it crosses. Where the new and the old property line crosses. It's kind of over in that area.

Mrs. Bailey: Is there another on 60-1B? Is there a dwelling on that?

Mrs. Ennis: No, there's no dwelling. That is his father. They're father and son. His location will more than likely by looking the topo and stuff go underneath where the writing is, where it says 60-1B. That'll be more the location of where his house will go.

Mrs. Bailey: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for staff? Yes, Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Just so it's in the record for clarity. This is being considered under section 22-241 and section 22-243 of the subdivision waiver requirements?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes, it's under 243, the subdivision waiver.

Mr. Apicella: And so, from a staff perspective, you feel that the requirements of that subsection had been met?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes, to the most extend possible. Yes, because of the topo, because of the wetlands and stuff. This is a waiver of the subdivision ordinance, not the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Apicella: I just wanted to…because it wasn't specified in the package what the code section was that this was being requested under.

Mrs. Ennis: 22-146. It's in the first paragraph where it states the side lot line rules.

Mr. Apicella: Well that's the side lot, but the authority for the Planning Commission to grant waivers, that's under 22-241 and 22-243.

Mrs. Ennis: Do you know that off the top of your head Jeff?

Mr. Harvey: I can check the code.

Mrs. Ennis: Okay, I have to look at the book, because I don't know off the top of my head either.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, again, I just want to put it out there with the criteria is for granting these kind of waivers, just in case someone in the future comes forward with a similar request so we understand as a body that those criteria have been met. I mean, personally, I think they have, but…from what I've seen in front of me, but I just wanted to get it out there.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella, Section 22-241, authority to grant. It says: "upon assurance of the subdivider that each of the following conditions has been met: (1) The minimum requirement, if applied to the proposed subdivision, would impose an unreasonable burden upon the subdivider. (2) The granting of such waiver will have no substantially adverse effect on the future residents of the proposed subdivision, nor upon any property adjoining such proposed subdivision." And in this case, as Mrs. Ennis said, from a staff perspective, we believe that the site's specific conditions are things that are proposing an unreasonable burden on the applicant, because it has a significant effect on where they can place their house on their lot, also too, this involves these two parcels within the subdivision has no other effect on any of the properties.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Other questions of staff? Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I don't think the question was answered, what Steven asked. Where does it say the Planning Commission has the right to do that. I know where it says what the criteria is.

Mr. Apicella: It's under 22-243.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay.

Mrs. Ennis: Procedure for waiver.

Mr. Gibbons: Just for the record.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Got it. Very good. Okay. Any other questions for staff? Okay. Applicant please.

Mr. Yealy: Yes, Sir. I'm Ken Yealy. I'm the lot owner of 60-1B.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. I think there was a question. Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes. My question was, have you checked that lot on 60-1B, is that not going to be…is any springs on there? Have you checked that also?

Mr. Yealy: No. I don't anticipate a problem. It's hard to tell from this map here, because it's not a topo map, but that is high ground over there. It's just like a crest. That whole area back there is flat.

Mr. English: Yes, because I'd hate to have to see you come back if you could get it all at one time.

Mr. Yealy: No, I don't foresee that.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Other questions for the applicant. Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate it. I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, I would move to approve WAI1400109, Bridal Lakes Estate Lot 1B side lot waiver.

Mr. Rhodes: A motion to recommend approval. Seconded by Mr. Gibbons. Further comment, Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: If I could, the applicant contacted me and I walked the site and even where they tried to driveway, water came up. And it had been several days since they had done the excavation. The applicant made numerous attempts to try to relocate to go to different aspects. I mean, this is an environmental issue. This is not a cosmetic issue. It's trying to put a home on a parcel of land and trying to preserve the water and the environment of the area. So I think the applicant has gone an extra mile in trying to accommodate putting a home on the lot and they've gone the extra mile. I think it's commendable that an ordinary person who owns a parcel of land goes to that length and not just tries to say I want to do it, because I want to do it. They tried numerous options. I also would like to take the time to publicly praise the staff. The staff worked very diligently on this. They worked to try to accommodate the land owner as well as adhere to the spirit of and the wording of the laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and the criteria. And I thought it was excellent the amount of time and effort they put into it and I think it's great that we could, as a community, do something to help a regular homeowner fulfill their dream.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Further comment, Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: No, Sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Okay, all those in favor of the motion to recommend approval of the waiver 1400109 Bridal Lakes Estates, Lot 1B, waiver subdivision ordinance 22-146 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. Very good. Thank you. Now we're back to the regular agenda. I would just comment that the public hearing has remained open for item number 1 and that will be heard on March 26th. We won't have other significant commentary on that tonight, because that really should be left to be appropriate for when the public is here for the public hearing as advertised. We're moving on to item number 2 of Unfinished Business, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas. Mr. Harvey. Zuraf. Harvey. Huraf. Zuvey. Har-Zuvey-Zuraf.

2. *Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas*

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. Mike Zuraf will make the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: What was he tutoring you on?

Mr. Zuraf: I thought Jeff was going to take over.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I saw that.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Mike Zuraf here to talk about the Comprehensive Plan Amendments in relation to the Urban Development Areas and…let me get to the beginning here.

Mr. Rhodes: I will just comment as you get that set there. We had left off the last session that I was going to put together a quick summary email and I failed miserably, so I apologize to my fellow Commissioners that I didn't get that for the Board, so I apologize.

Mr. Zuraf: So at your last meeting there was discussion on and review of suggested direction in regards to amendments to the comp plan for UDAs and it was in response to some of the specific issues that the Board requested the Planning Commission address. The Planning Commission discussed and came to some general consensus on issues 1, 3 and 5 and asked staff to prepare a narrative that the Commission can look through and potentially except and forward on to the Board, so in the memo that you received

we've provided that summary and then towards the end of the memo we do then have information that begins to address items 2 and 4 from the Boards suggestions. So towards the bottom of the first page is the narrative relating to directive 1, regarding the suggestion of maintaining concept of targeted growth areas and I'm not going to go through all this, but it was generally just noting that the Commission concurs with the suggestion and would maintain the concept of targeted growth areas as represented within the urban development areas by replacing the terminology of areas currently known as Urban Development Areas with the term Targeted Growth Areas and that's the quick summary of item 1. Then with item 3, that was regarding the correlation of the UDAs/TGAs with RDAs. And that we've provided in this narrative. We included the two maps that Commission went over the last meeting for the Courthouse area RDA and TGA and along with that a summary and explanation of the changes that went into that. And then the same goes for the Southern Gateway area as well.

Mr. Rhodes: And that resulted as a little bit of an increase to each of the UDAs and now TDAs, or whatever they ended up being, but it ended up increasing the boundaries of what were the UDAs, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. And then, in each case some probably slight decrease in the RDAs.

Mr. Rhodes: Right. They kind of met in the middle.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So then, with issue 5, this deals with the desirability to retain specific UDAs. And here we included a summary of what the Commission was considering here, which involved the suggestion to remove the Eskimo Hill and Brooke Station UDAs and replace them with other land uses and we've kind of described that and within the memo described the recommended number of dwelling units in each area and provided a tally at the end. The second point to the UDAs would have been retained with modified boundaries, the Courthouse and Southern Gateway areas that we just went over. So those areas are retained as TGAs with modified boundaries. Then two of the UDAs will be retained as TGAs with some density suggestions, new density suggestions for Leeland Station area, the density would be reduced from 1,000 down to 290 in line with the already approved and developing Leeland Station project that encompasses most of this area. And then for Centerport, that area was adjusted slightly, following the discussion for the Commission. There's some specific language added that the Commission suggested there be an emphasis toward commercial development as the area has potential for targeting commercial growth due to the location and proximity to the airport, as well as supporting the right balance of residential development in this area and initially…and through that we've kind of modified the resulting amount of residential that might be accommodated in this area. We're looking at a potential 40%reduction in the residential density. That would bring the density down from 3,770 units down to 2,262 units.

Mr. Rhodes: Could you explain, Mike, where you came up with 40%, just what that was as a starting point?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. That basically, I think, the thought from the discussion by the Commission was that residential would maybe be more appropriate to the south of Centreport Parkway.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so 40% just reflects the portion of what is currently the UDA but is north of Centreport Parkway.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I got it. I mean I know that when we last addressed this for the Board back in 2012 we emphasized a suggestion as this evolves to more emphasized commercial there, there is a lot of land there, so it still can absorb residential. I just wasn't quite sure why 40%, but now I get it. It's a good starting point of how to describe a potential way to emphasize more and possibly address some things. So whether there's no particular magic to 40% other than it's just that portion that's north. It could just as well be 30 or…

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I got you. And typically as a planning construct though, it seems that we would typically kind of circle out from the main interchange and the main access there as being more commercial and then as you spread out further from the main access you go more towards residential. So as you spread out further to the north you also go close to the airport where spreading out further south is just all that other land.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, so there is…it's different situations and conditions here that make it challenging.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, I understand that. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And with the last point, the one urban development area, George Washington Village, no specific changes but the Commission did ask to make it clear in the suggestion, in the recommendation going forward that the desire to encourage retention of the current land use recommendations that support a business campus to the south of Accokeek Creek and residential more oriented to the north.

Mr. Rhodes: Well that's consistent with how we've kind of had that structured all along, right? If I could just go back for discussion among the Planning Commission if I can interrupt the presentation for just a moment just so we hit these two items as we go. The 40% is just a concept and an approach to address as much as anything to address some calculation or adjustment calculation of the number of residential units that might be applied to this. And personally I'm fine with it from that perspective. I don't know that I would necessarily, arbitrarily say that…not sure that I'm mentally at a position personally, that I would say that we'll absolutely preclude any residential from being north of the Centreport Parkway per se in a recommendation, but certainly using that as a base line for calculating the number of dwelling units that you might reduce for overall being applied there. I think that's a reasonable approach and a calculation. I think you always want to keep a little flexibility, rather than making a hard rule of where you'll have one or the other. So that's the way I digest this information. I digest the 40% as an approach, and a reasonable approach, as good as any, for calculation how much you might reduce the residential density associated with that currently UDA and soon to be TGA, maybe. I do not read those as saying you absolutely would recommend prohibiting all residential that would be north of that Centreport Parkway, so I didn't know if that's the way others were kind of looking at this. Thoughts? Okay. Didn't hear anybody disagree. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I guess I feel compelled to chime in. I think there's a difference between residential growth and high density, residential growth and obviously a UDA pretends high density and I'm not quite convinced that that's necessarily appropriate north of the area, the boundaries that Mike has laid

out. So, again, I'm not opposed to residential growth, obviously there is by-right growth in that area regardless, but in terms of high density, I'm not quite sure that high density is the best use of that area or is compatible with that area and I think, again, we've kind of been talking about for many month that commercial seems more appropriate. So if you put residential, you're not going to be able to get as much commercial over there.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright. That's fair. Because we use that portion to the north as a basis of a calculation I just didn't want the absolute statement that it was absolutely saying that we would be precluding any residential there and you've got to find the right balance, you've got to find the right balance and the right types that are in there. I do know when we did it the first go round, we put a lot of residential in the Centerport so I don't think it's unreasonable to kind of adjust that down a little bit from a targeted area. Any other comment before we proceed? Thanks Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: And then towards the end of this issue we do have a density summary where we kind of tally up all the units that are kind of affected in these changes. Initially it would be an overall residential density reduction of 4,667 units, subtracting out the Southern Gateway units that would basically shift over to suburban land use. The net effect of density reduction would be 3,967 units and then at the end of this issue we do include a suggestions or recommendation to consider that these 3,967 units could likely be reallocated among the Courthouse and Southern Gateway TGAs where the boundaries were expanded and maybe then the remainder of the units just be absorbed within suburban land use.

Mr. Rhodes: You may have done this and I just didn't pick up on it. With the added acreage that is in the Southern Gateway and Courthouse, if this were adopted it goes into those now targeted growth areas, used to be UDAs, based on how we were applying it before, how much more would that absorb. Did you do that calculation?

Mr. Zuraf: We did not go through that specific calculation yet.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I have sort of a similar question. By reallocating that number of units, is that principal the reason when you look under, and I don't mean to jump ahead, but I think there's a connection here, when I look the area specific parameters under directive 2, it's about middle of the page, to establish a ratio of dwelling unit types as a target 50% multi-family. That seems pretty high or bumped up. Maybe that's where we were. It seems like a lot more though.

Mr. Zuraf: It had recommended a little more, higher in those area so it kind of is in line, but then with the expansion of the boundaries and then also our other suggestions that these area maybe would fall in more of an urban density. The Southern Gateway and Courthouse Area, that fits in as well too. For a higher density…

Mr. Apicella: I'm with you, but can you balance it out with a little bit more on the townhouse side as well?

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Fifty percent.

Mr. Zuraf: Those are all just suggested issues there on item 2 so we can definitely modify that and adjust it and reevaluate that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: That was the end of issue 5 as far as the language that may be considered for moving forward to the Board. We did, at the bottom of page 5 there, there was a question about staff looking into the gross projections to see if there has been any change given the new population projections and I'm not going to run through the whole calculation there in the memo to show that there is no decrease. It's actually a slight increase in the 20 year projected amount of residential growth the way we had calculated the projections before. So that doesn't help us in reducing what we need to accommodate.

Mr. Rhodes: That's not a huge additional amount to address, but it doesn't free up anything.

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So, I don't know if you wanted to discuss 1, 3 and 5 and then move on to 2 and 4, or do you want me to move forward with 2 and 4. I can do that as well.

Mr. Rhodes: Other comments on 1, 3 and 5? I think 1 and 3 are very straightforward and 5 is good. You know, I had my one comment just for clarity, but then it leaves open what do you do with the 4,000 in greater specificity which we'll have to kind of wrestled with, which I think as you were saying, we address a little bit in some the follow up discussion. Any further comment on 1, 3, and 5 at this point? I think that, other than the discussion we already had, I think it pretty much captures where this body, even though a different composition was somewhat on somebody's topics…

Mr. Gibbons: We're going to be able to comment after you're done with doing 4.

Mr. Rhodes: Sure, Sure. Yep, yep. But I think it captured, I think you did a good job in capturing…

Mr. Gibbons: I'll need an interpreter to find out really you were going with your first analysis.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Alright. Then 2 and 4.

Mr. Zuraf: Issue 2 was suggestion of providing flexibility in the density restrictions and recommendations in the language within the Comp Plan for these areas. Staff went ahead and included some suggestions, some suggested parameters that, including general kind of parameters that could apply to all of these areas and then some area specific parameters to consider and so the first parameter would be to consider establishing and overall dwelling unit minimum and maximum target range or maybe a, if you have a specific number for recommended number of units in an area in a specific area, having language that says this is the target number, but it could be more or less, depending on how things go. The second general parameter would be consider removing specific numbers of each dwelling unit type. As we have it currently the language in the Comp Plan is very specific within each UDA the number of single family homes, townhomes and multi-family. That is recommended and there is no real language that allows for any waiver to that. Then the third, general parameter which then leads into specific parameters, the general parameter would be to consider establishing an overall density range for the individual areas. This would be density in the unit per acre type of numbers that

we often see and some thoughts staff had on this for consideration would be looking at Courthouse and Southern Gateway targeted growth areas to follow maybe more of an urban form where you'd have more of those multi-family townhouse products, where you could allow for more, a higher density with a range going from 3 up to 20 unit per acre, but then in the newer developing areas of George Washington Village and Centerport, is kind of suggesting more of a suburban form that would still allow that mix of unit type, but at a lower intensity, no more than 10 units per acre there in those locations. So the fourth general parameter that does include some specific parameters and following along with that would be establishing a mix or ration of unit types as opposed to specific numbers, the parameters that were suggested that were brought up by Mr. Apicella would be for the Courthouse and Southern Gateway more urban areas and have a higher ratio of multi-family and townhouse units, compared to single family units, so a 50, 30 and 20% mix there. And then in the more suburban areas having it more single family detached type product there with a 15, 15 and 70% kind of ratio. That ratio for George Washington Village and Centerport kind of follows along with the current ration that we have currently in our urban services area with the mix of single-family detached homes to apartments and town homes. And then the last general parameter would be just to kind of modify some of the language regarding how development is recommended to occur to be more suggestive rather than mandatory within the text. And that kind of summarizes the kind of suggestions that staff can go back and do more work on.

Mr. Rhodes: So reactions to these, in order to give staff some further guidance to be able to refine?

Mr. Coen: Yes, Mr. Chair. Mike can you sort of walk us through, say for example, somebody comes in and you can pick any of the either Courthouse, Gateway, George Washington or Centreport, doesn't matter, but somebody comes in with a proposal, can you sort of walk us through, you don't have to do it now if you need to do it later, but how would these matriculate through and what would the impact be? I mean, if we go through the range, how would that impact if they wanted to do x, you know, etc. I'd just be curious how it works.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, if it's, in any of the areas, if, I would say it would be depending on maybe the size of the project. If it's a larger project I think we would look to this mix and want to make sure that there's some mix, because larger projects may absorb a lot more of the growth that might occur in that area, but if it's a smaller site, I don't think you can really, on every single property go and say, okay, you have to be 50, 30…you have to provide that 50, 30, 20, but as things progress, you know, and as time passes it would probably be smart to track how the area is developing and how it is measuring against that suggested mix of development and density as well.

Mr. Coen: And I'm not sure if this, if it goes to you or Rysheda, which, as it goes forward, is easier or more defensible or more arguable, clearer for all entities to go forward. I mean, is having a range going to be too vague to where it leaves too much wiggle room, or…you know, as we go forward, which is going to be the most coherent for all parties concerned?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Coen, I can answer from my perspective. Ultimately the Comprehensive Plan and any change in zoning is interpreted by the Board of Supervisors. By giving ranges, it gives the Board of Supervisors more flexibility on how they interpret the plan. If you have a fixed number, they're pretty much locked into that and we've seen over time for various, different reasons, properties have unique features and sometimes the applicant can't meet what a specific requirement is or specific number, so they come up with an alternative proposal.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, just kind of spring boarding off of Mr. Coen's comments. It seems to me that we need to strike the right balance. I think we try to do that with the small area plan for the Courthouse and that we would, in my view, probably still need to do something like that, even if we provide ranges and the reason I say that is because no one entity is going to own the entire UDA area and, you know, if somebody comes in and, let's just say hypothetically speaking, comes in with 1,000 units, that's what we're looking at for the Courthouse UDA, I know that's not it, but, and we 've designated 50 percent to be apartments and one entity comes in and says: I got this piece of parcel right here and I'm going to put 500 apartments right there in this one parcel. While they've met the requirement, but they haven't necessarily fulfilled what we're trying to achieve here, which is, again, a mix of units and where they make the most sense, compatible with the traffic flow and street network, what have you, the infrastructure. So again, somehow I appreciate that the Board and I think because I've been advocate for providing flexibility too, but by the same token we need to kind of give some perspective or parameters. You can't put all apartments in this one little area and then just, I think, and then the rest will be single family or townhouses in the outer boundaries of the Courthouse UDA, because that's not what I think we're trying to achieve.

Mr. Zuraf: And that gets to the issue of…

Mr. Apicella: Am I making any sense here, because…

Mr. Zuraf: And those currently have been our implementation plan the suggestion to continue with some of those small area plans in what ware currently known as the UDAs and definitely keep that suggestion, that implementation action in and pursuit doing that in these other targeted growth areas, but then that gets to the issue of the…definitely, if one project takes up all the types of dwelling units that were suggested then that's something for the Commission and the Board to consider whether that's meeting the intent of the guidelines.

Mr. Rhodes: Please, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: I was also going to mention that certainly what Mr. Apicella was recommending could be incorporated into the language dealing with these targeted growth areas to say: no single project shall absorb more than x percent of the anticipated number of a certain type of dwelling units. Or things to that effect.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: The thing that bothers me, and I agree with what we're doing here, but if you followed the latest budget process, and experience I had with it, nobody is analyzing the infrastructure it takes to go forward with this plan and I don't see any CIP, I only see estimates. We can't even afford what we got now in some of the…Fire and Rescue, Sheriff, school. I mean cost for high school has doubled since we did the last Comp Plan. I don't know what a fire station cost anymore, salaries. So when you go in with a plan and you're going to say: I can handle x amount of growth. What does it take for the infrastructure to handle that growth? Is the infrastructure already there or do we have to move it. Attendance zone in the school, I mean it seems like every 4/5 years we're changing the attendance zone to match the growth area. So we approve all the…I mean I'm in agreement with what we're doing, but I don't see the other part of the puzzle going forward. I mean, is there any way we can afford this?

Mr. Rhodes: Reaction or perspective, Mr. Harvey. How do the other pieces come together?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Gibbons is saying, the infrastructure is a key part of it. Typically what we do is, we first come to some agreement as to where and how we might want to do the land use, then we look at the infrastructure, like he said, to determine if we have existing infrastructure, if it's compatible.

Mr. Gibbons: Shouldn't that be a key part of it though, Jeff. In other words, you don't want to approve the plan first and then try to provide infrastructure. If you don't have the infrastructure, you can't afford the infrastructure. That should be part of the process before you adopt a plan.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Gibbons. Usually with transportation as well as utilities we have to model them so we have to have some inputs to put into the model to see what we have. So part of it is having a straw man, so to speak, of what you might want to do and then analyze that and then see what the outcomes are. Then make some determinations whether you need to make adjustments or whether it's suitable.

Mr. English: Would we see that after…let's say we approve this now, would we see what you're talking about? To look it over before a final approval on that and where it's going to come out at?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English, with regards to transportation, the state code says that we have to send the plan amendment to VDOT for their review. VDOT is going to ask us if we modelled this and we have to have them some information on modeling before the Board could approve this amendment.

Mr. English: And what about the schools and the fire rescue and all that stuff. How does that fit into this?

Mr. Zuraf: The current UDAs text recommendations include suggested specific types of schools and fire stations and parks. That's already recommended within each UDA. We look at that and see how these changes might cause those to be adjusted one way or the other.

Mr. Gibbons: So what you're recommending tonight, if you're going back to audit that to make sure that…

Mr. Zuraf: No, we have none done that yet.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm very concerned about that, because with the price of what's going on right now, like a fire engine is over $500,000, and schools, what 85 million, that range has doubled; since we built Mountain View it's doubled.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I definitely appreciate where Mr. Gibbons is going, but by the same token, again, we're going to have 500, 1,000, 2,000 people moving to Stafford here every year, regardless of whether we have UDAs. Those infrastructure requirements are going to come irrespective of whether or not we have UDAs. So we're already stretched in the places where people are moving to in the absence of having UDAs. I don't discount what you're saying, I think, again, we have to know what the consequences are of making those adjustments.

Mr. Gibbons: I'm not being critical. I was just…

Mr. Apicella: No, I'm not suggesting you are. I'm just saying, those infrastructure requirements happen every day as people move to Stafford, irrespective of whether we have UDAs or not. And the question is, will we use UDAs or TGAs as a place to steer that growth in lieu of all over the County.

Mr. Rhodes: And as I heard it, if the Board is receptive to the recommended modifications and apply a TGA terminology and some of these other changes, then at that point in time staff would more formally lay those and start doing the modeling of what the school implications and the other things as we had with the UDAs and then that will give some more clarity which will cause more concern and raise alarm, but at least it'll identify where we would need to be targeting. Okay. Yes, please. All good comments.

Mr. Zuraf: The last…

Mr. Rhodes: So, just…you went through the five general parameters and some other specificity, what I have, what I've sensed is a general consensus here, is providing some flexibility, qualified possibly, as was discussed by Mr. Harvey and Mr. Apicella, which just clarifies that we're looking for mixes, you know, we're looking for a logical and effective planning element to it, but providing a little greater flexibility than what may have existed before and the way it was more absolute nature than it was stated previously, seems to be a consensus of the Planning Commission. So from a general perspective we would certainly like to staff working to refine that somewhat, but there is, I sense that there's a couple of other areas here you would like, as is listed here and is the density ranging 3 to 20 or others, you'd like some rations on those as well, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: I know Mr. Apicella had one comment on it that he just felt there ought to be greater flexibility to shift between a multi-family and townhome versus absolute. So maybe these numbers are not bad if they are parts of ranges on each…

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: How about any reactions on the dwelling units per acre? Is there a reason you went 3 to 20 for Courthouse and Southern Gateway? Went higher on those?

Mr. Zuraf: That was just to…that higher density would be supportive of more urban type of multi-family unit product.

Mr. Rhodes: And is that, some of that basis of recommendation based on what's already developed in the areas of those two?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, these areas are more already developed, but then…yeah…specific…some of the plans went forward with the re-development area plan. The small area plan did kind of support…

Mr. Rhodes: RDA structure and everything.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: And, Mr. Chairman, also both Courthouse and Southern Gateway already have existing apartment and townhouse communities where as if you look at George Washington Village and

Centerport, they do not have basically much of any development out there, so having a more dense development is more consistent with what's already on the ground that Courthouse and Southern Gateway as compared to Centerport and George Washington Village. That's why staff felt that George Washington Village and Centerport should be more suburban in nature.

Mr. Rhodes: So complementing some of the existing development?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, got you. Other reactions on those? No negative reaction then to…okay. So I guess then what I sense is you're concept, it may in the end result tweaked a little bit, but the concept of the higher range of density in those areas the rational logic sounds good and flushing that out seems reasonable and what you're applying to the other two major ones at Centerport and George Washington seems reasonable as well. Certainly seeing if that's able to absorb the 39,067, or whatever that number is, is going to be the other part of it as we start to model it a little. Now will you do a little bit more of that modeling as we get ready to talk next time to see how it might absorb those?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, we can definitely go back and see how that all fits.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright. Great. Other comments on number 2, Mr. Zuraf or Commissioners?

Mr. Zuraf: No. That helps. I guess, so in addition to how the density fits just come back with some, I guess, just additional as far as what is going to go to the Board, the additional adjustments to these parameters.

Mr. Rhodes: So a little bit more language maybe on how you might apply the ranges, addressing ranges to include the ratio of dwelling unit types, maybe do those in ranges. I'm completely making this up now, but so multi-family 40 to…

Mr. Gibbons: You do pretty good with it.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes. Multi-family 40 to 50%, townhomes 30 to 40%, you know, single-family 20 to 25%. You know, something like that, so it gives a little bit more of ranges, little bit of language reinforcing the fact that we're looking for developments to be a bit mixed, or not just all cluttered in certain areas or we would want to know why that's the best way to go in some of our planning construct. And then a little bit of a sense of how you think, with the added acreage of the existing Southern Gateway and Courthouse, how much you think that might accommodate of this 3,900 whereas the rest I guess would become more suburban land uses or spread throughout or something. Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Great. And the last point we don't have too much to add. It's directive 4, which was the issue of analysis of compatibility issues with residential around the airport and I just provided the summary of where we are with meeting with the Regional Airport Authority.

Mr. Rhodes: In fact we could kind of take this as an opportunity to segway to almost committee reports for the lack of…Mr. Apicella, if you'd like to comment a little bit on the meeting the other night and certainly we got a subcommittee that we're merging up with the Airport Authority.

Mr. Apicella: So the Planning Commission met with the Regional Airport Authority last week. We had really good attendance on our side as well as theirs. I think we had 6 of our 7 members. The purpose of

the meeting was to discuss land use compatibility around the airport. Ultimately there was a request for a joint meeting that resulted from the Oakenwold discussion that we had at our last meeting, that rezoning proposal and the associated public hearing. At the meeting the authority members reiterated their concerns about high density growth around the airport. Especially in terms of potential adverse impacts on airport operations. They did not seem to be concerned by-right development in those areas or non-residential development around those areas. They briefed us on compatibility standard developed by other jurisdictions. I think the one that they walked us through is there was a Washington State document in some reform in a power point. They also talked about Manassas and about Woodbridge. They recommended and we agreed that it was a good step forward to establish a joint subcommittee consisting of two Planning Commission members and two SRAA members. Mr. English and I will be serving on behalf of the Planning Commission. The subcommittee will further explore Stafford Airport land area use compatibility. I think, what we also talked about was informing that effort with a draft airport compatibility report that would be prepared by their consultants. That document would consider related information and material from other states and jurisdictions who have already developed land use compatibility guidelines. The subcommittee is charged with making recommendation to the entire Planning Commission which could involve changes to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Rhodes: But certainly that would clearly help them form directive 4 for our requirement for the Board.

Mr. Apicella: Absolutely. And ultimately, what I want to say is that, again, my intent, and I think of the other members as well, intent the process to be open and transparent with good discussion from various stakeholders with diverse view points throughout the process as it goes to the subcommittee, as it comes to the Planning Commission, as it ultimately goes to the Board of Supervisors. I would also point out that the Comp Plan itself establishes a requirement to develop compatibility land use guidelines. That's in the implementation plan. I think it has a scheduled due date of December 31st of last year and we've also been tasked by the Board of Supervisors to look at the land use compatibility around the airport. So this all is, as I think Jeff said at the meeting, kind of gels together for us to step forward and come up with some reasonable guidelines with public input throughout the process.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Gibbons: Have you started meetings already?

Mr. Apicella: As I recall, the way we left it is the SRAA would tasks its consultants with coming up with a draft working document for us to start with and that would be modified as we had discussions and deliberation with the public.

Mr. Rhodes: Has there been any indication of a time line for that?

Mr. Apicella: No there is no indication. So we can certainly engage, see where they are and find out what kind of timeline they have.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Well I'm concerned about the time line and the application that's before us.

Mr. Apicella: I think, as we discussed, it's probably unlikely that we would have something to produce and get in front of the Planning Commission before the due date for the project in front of us. And I will

also say that this process, as I see it, is not specific to a particular proposal or proposals, it's in general about what makes sense in terms of land use compatibility around the airport.

Mr. Rhodes: I mean, certainly it'd be great if we had a lot of information, but…

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I agree. Now, I do note there's been a couple of emails and a letter and it was spoken about during the public presentation earlier and I know staff's got that so it's available for the record, which talked about composition on the subcommittee. I would just highlight a couple of reactions and certainly entertain reactions of the fellow Commissioners, but you really got a subcommittee, a joint committee that's established by a Planning Commission subcommittee and an airport authority subcommittee that's going to work together in a construct so you got a, kind of complicated dynamic for one and even if we were inclined to modify that some, you got both bodies that you going to kind of wrestle through. I think probably as useful as anything for the last, gosh, the vast majority as far as I can recall having the privilege of being with the Planning Commission, whenever we've had these subcommittees working, obviously they're advertising, they're open to the public. Anybody, any member, any interest party can observe all of it and I can't recall a time where we haven't entertained, if anybody was willing to sit there and listen to it, that we didn't offer them the opportunity to comment of each session. I would expect that we would provide for that opportunity again regularly, because all it does is further inform our dialog and our communication. So I'm sure we'll at least, we'll certainly make that available, given the complicated nature of this subcommittee's developed item. I don't know that we need to do any modifications to its composition, but I'm sure we'll be receiving and entertaining commentary by anybody who's sitting and observing. Other thoughts?

Mr. Gibbons: Well, it's not a thought, but it's the first time…so you're decoupling this committee from any action before the Commission. That's important.

Mr. Rhodes: I'm sorry, please clarify. No just say it again. I'm trying to understand I understood you.

Mr. Gibbons: I'm trying to be like you tonight. I'm trying to go around something to go back to something. No. We got an action before us right now.

Mr. Rhodes: Are you talking about item 1 that we'll pick back up next session?

Mr. Gibbons: Right. So you're going to decouple this effort. I thought we were going to have something come in from the Committee before we took action, but if you say no, I'll support that also.

Mr. Rhodes: My, and again, I don't want to get in, certainly I wouldn't want to get into specifics of item number 1 because that's a public hearing item and that deserves the public being able to be here for it, but I think as a general sense to the question, my reaction is if we could get something out of the subcommittee that would be formed and somewhat finalized and we're ready to go forward there wasn't time for that application which has a time line of June 24th, that would be a wonderful thing. I wonder if that, in my mind I question whether…

Mr. Gibbons: Well let me come back and ask you another question. Between the Board and us, we have a year to look at something, we're restricted to 90 days, but there's nothing preventing you from going back to the Board of Supervisors with a request, you know, give it to them because you don't enough information on hand to make a proper decision and ask for another 30 to 60 days.

Mr. Rhodes: You mean an extension on our 90 day deadline on that application.

Mr. Gibbons: No, we got 90 days and if we don't have all the information in our hands before the end of 90 days…

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I think that certainly would be something if we had the ability to do that and I just don't know. I think that would be a dialog and debate that we should pose as an issue at the continuation of the public hearing so that it was in front of all public…

Mr. Gibbons: Or the applicant can request that it be postponed. So there's one or two avenues you can do.

Mr. English: How would you…I mean would you, would we send the applicant a letter asking him what they want to do?

Mr. Rhodes: I wouldn't want to…I just want to be careful and please correct me, Ms. McClendon, if we're fine here that's good. I know we've got an advertised public hearing so I don't want to have too much discussion on an item on the agenda that we've told the public we will talk about next session, so I don't want to get very far into it.

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest waiting for the next meeting because this is procedural requirements of that particular public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes: And that way the public who knows we're going to talk about it next time can hear all that goes into that discussion. I mean it's a great point, I just think…

Mr. Gibbons: No, I heard you decoupling one thing, I don't mind that.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know that I was intending to necessarily decouple. I don't know if one would be timely enough to feed the other. But we'll talk about that next time. Especially if it's going to be a formal motion or some suggestion, we probably should do that during the public hearing, especially when we got an advertised public hearing.

Mr. Gibbons: Because I didn't gather that in the motion that we went forward with, that it would be longer than whatever the action we had on the table.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Gibbons, I beg to differ. I think I specifically said at the meeting…we talked about it that given the time frame it takes for these things to mature, both at the subcommittee level and then just to get here as a final product to be delivered to the Planning Commission for consideration, that's probably going to take month, realistically. And I did not think that the Committee…and I don't know when, and we can ask the SRAA when are they going to deliver their product. They said they were going to do it as quickly as possible, but that could be a month, that could be two month. Two month from now would be pretty close to the deadline for that particular project that you're talking about, so I'm not saying they're decoupled and I'm not saying that it might not help inform, but in terms of a specific product laid on the table for the Planning Commission to consider and deliberate on, I think it would be generous to consider that we would get that within a two month time frame at best. I can't say with certainty, but…

Mr. Rhodes: Just to remember, because we are on…associated with item number 2 which is dealing with the response back to the Board. What was our timeline to get our response back to the Board? I know we said we'd do it as quickly as possible, we'd do it incrementally, if necessary we keep them update and I don't remember the deadline. They gave us a certain amount of time to give them, I thought, I think I recall…

Mr. Coen: Beginning of June.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that what it was. Okay thank you. So I know we've got to charge on that which we may have a complication on one of them but if we can at least get them forward that be great. Okay. That's very good. Further discussion on item number 2.

Mr. Coen: If I could, just a couple of things. Yes, I would be curious as to the timeline for the various things if we're still going to make the June 1st deadline, particularly with the item 2 issues of the density and analyzing the density and such. And then on directive 4, this I harped on last week and I'll just do it again. Certainly I agree that it would be very problematic or difficult to add members to the subcommittee, but I also think, just as a conceptual aspect, this aspect of doing land use compatibility standards is something that goes into the comp plan and my mind set, and I said it last week and I don't want to bore people, but it wasn't on television so the people at home didn't hear it, was that it should sort of follow the same process that we did when we were doing the Comp Plan and I'm not saying it should be as long, but…I know Mike was diligent and staff was diligent reaching out to all areas of the public for their input and I know that there was a process where members of the steering committee went and gathered information, brought it back to the whole committee and I know several of us that did it reached out to people on all sides of the issue to bring it in and so I would hope that the subcommittee, our members of the subcommittee, after meeting with the Airport Authority people would meet with other citizens who are stakeholders and have a business or whatever, because I just think perceptually it is different to say, you're allowed to talk after we give you what we've decided. That's not how it…the perception will not be inputted it will be reaction. If we come up with a proposal that is contrary to somebody, then the onus is on them to come and try to convince us that their side is right as opposed to them being part of the process. And I just think psychologically it sends a signal and I don't know whether the subcommittee could go and meet with other people or I know one of the other things, correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Zuraf, but I remember I didn't go back to look at my old emails from way back then, but I remember that there was certain little subcommittees that staff met with on different topics. And the reason why I remember it is, because somebody couldn't go to the one that she wanted to and she went to a business one and sent a really nasty email why was she going to something that promotes business when that wasn't her interest. And so it's stuck in my head, so even if staff met with individuals and got their input, I just think that that would make a cleaner process.

Mr. Rhodes: And typically, certainly our subcommittees have invited in, gotten feedback and input from different folks.

Mr. Gibbons: I think he raises a good point, Mr. Chairman. I hate to raise the point again. I think we're into something that's a little broader than responding to an application before us. I think what Steve is doing, I mean, I think they're doing the right thing. The lack of having a plane at the airport has probably caused us a lot of headaches right now. And to take time, maybe 8 to 10 months or a year to do something and do it right and put it in the Comp Plan where it belongs is the right thing, but not to have something before you today that you don't have something to base on.

Mr. Rhodes: Agreed and it may be as we respond, because again, we respond to those 5 directives and one of them being particularly this topic. It very well may be that our response back to the Board is very fulsome information on 4 of them and 1 of them explaining why we think it takes more time to get it.

Mr. Gibbons: What do we need to take much more time? We got it pretty well down to where we are.

Mr. Rhodes: On directive 4, on the airport land use planning.

Mr. Gibbons: I'd rather get something before the Board and have them take a look at it then waste 2 or 3 more months and then…

Mr. Rhodes: If I understand you, I don't think there's any reason we probably can't get good information on 1, 2, 3 and 5 before the Board very soon and then what we may then be also explaining and for item 4 it's going to take us a while more to get it done. Yes, I can see us going possibly that way.

Mr. Coen: And if I may, sort of tagging on and I ask that our subcommittee really push this when they meet with the Airport Authority. If this is going into the Comp Plan and our Comp Plan is for another 15 years, we need to know where they're going in the next 15 years. We know there's an airport extension of the runway that they hope to have done by 2020, but then they have to have something else in mind beyond that. Everybody does. I mean, our fire rescue does, sheriff's department does, the school does this, everybody does this. I think it's counter intuitive to think that people have to figure out how much gasoline and what their flight plan and the wind, ferocity and all this, has to be before they take off, don't have a plan in mind for what they're going to do for the rest of this plan and I think we owe it to everybody, including the Supervisors to have as much information in this Comp plan so that 5 years from now, if they wanted to put in another runway, we're not having the same issue in 5 years or in 7 years, so I think they really need to push, our members I hope will push for what their future plans are so that we can incorporate that into this document.

Mr. Rhodes: One and certainly entertaining the other discussion on item number 2, but one thing I would just state is, I will try to do what I said I would do last time, which is, because we did commit to them updates on how we're forming and so I'll try and work that, I really will try and work that this time for 1, 3 and 5 and we got much more fulsome information here and I'll try to qualify a couple of elements in 5, but I'll draft something up and get it out to all the members and certainly have it for the record and to the staff in the next few days and then get your reactions to so we can give them their update.

Mr. Gibbons: I think the concern I have, and I'm just being upfront with it. We spent a whole almost year on TDRs and then it fell flat on its face. I don't want to spend another year or so on an airport discussion if the Board is not in line with us. So before we start going like 8 or 9 or 10 months on another study…

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Sir.

Mr. Gibbons: I think we ought to go up there and say here is where we're at. I mean, we waste a lot of time.

Mr. Rhodes: I couldn't agree more and I think that's been the…I agree and that's the thought on 1, 3 and 5, is keep feeding them what we got as we're going so as we get something forming on this I think

we ought to feed it iteratively to see if we're on track or if there's a negative reaction, let's hear it earlier versus later.

Mr. Coen: And if memory serves me, there was a question or two, I think one of them was for Mr. Gibbons, that we wanted feedback to help us along the way, so certainly at this juncture we could give them where we've actually voted on 1, 3 and 5. What we're still looking at as far as 2 and ask, say this is where we're at number 4. If you have any input to give to us on x, y, z and q to help us hit the deadline by June 1st, we would appreciate it. Quite honestly, I agree with Mr. Gibbons. I think we could give them almost all of where we're at now and get their feedback, and that way we won't be spinning wheels even between now and June.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I'll try and work that into a draft communication to the Board Chairman and we'll share it (inaudible). Other discussion item number 2? Okay, wonderful. Thank you Mr. Zuraf. We've already done 3, so Planning Director's Report?

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The only item I have to report to the Commission tonight is a product of me looking at old Board of Supervisors minutes. I thought it was interesting; I came across a discussion in 1969 about the Planning Commission and how hard they work. And at that point in time, the Board of Supervisors recommended a salary for the Planning Commission. The Commissioners at that time were paid $5.00 a meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Woohoo!

Mr. Harvey: So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention. That was something that was acknowledged a long time ago, that the Commission does put in a lot of work and effort.

Mr. Rhodes: Forty-five years ago.

Mr. Harvey: And should be rewarded. So that concludes my report.

Mr. Rhodes: You're a kind soul. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Rhodes: And we kind of addressed Committee Reports, I think.

Mrs. Bailey: I have one.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright, thank you very much. Please.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, ARB met April 7th and we considered two COAs, St. Claire Brooks' Park. The restroom remodel was approved. The Barnes House restoration and addition was approved. Let's see… the Department of Historic Resources - still waiting for results of the review of the Stafford

County. Nothing's received to date. ARB website undergoing reviews so if you have any suggestions for updates, changes, we're looking for suggestions for that. Falmouth Master Interpretive Plan, that goes back to BOD in May and to discuss the issue with parking. And then we are also looking at the COA revision of that application, and that's been deferred to our next meeting on May 5th.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good, thank you. So that's two times you've already met, correct? I think that's nearly as much as Mr. Hirons met in the entire first year… no, that's great. It's reinvigorated. Good stuff. Nothing for the Chairman's Report.

Mr. Gibbons: Sir, could I ask…

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I attended the history fair up at Mountain View on Saturday and one of the highlights was part of Jeff's department. I think GIS comes under you?

Mr. Harvey: They're actually under the IT Department.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay. But anyways, they had a booth up there and they had the aerial map of Stafford filmed by the Marine Corps back in the late 30's. And then they have two new tools in the GIS. So, in the future, I'd like to see if the GIS can't come back and show you the new magnifying tool they've got that goes all over the County and comes up in 3-D and it tells you where everything's at.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, that's great!

Mr. Gibbons: And then take a look at the Quantico Overlay; it's pretty darn close to where the growth happened. But it was the first aerial; I think it was '37 or '38.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Gibbons: But it was the hit of the show up there, was the GIS Jeff.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Thank you Mr. Gibbons. TRC information? Does everybody have packets for the next session? Does anybody have a packet for the next session?

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

4. TRC Information - Meeting April 9, 2014

Mr. English: I do want to mention something too, that our nominees for our awards were approved, correct?

Mr. Rhodes: Yep.

Mr. English: When is that going to be…?

Mr. Rhodes: Is that June?

Mr. Harvey: I don't recall.

Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Baker sent out an email on it. For some reason I thought it was in June. I don't know why I think that.

Mr. English: I think everything we mentioned was approved.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep. All except for Glenn; Glenn had gotten it the year prior so they didn't feel like that would be appropriate. Very good, thank you for that. Okay. We have no minutes to approve. Is there any other final items anybody? Speak now or forever… Wonderful. We are adjourned.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.