

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
May 14, 2014

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, May 14, 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, Stinnette, Ehly, Harbin, Zuraf, Doolittle, and Blackburn

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any Declarations of Disqualification on any item this evening?

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, we met, myself and Mr. Snellings met with the staff about McWhirt Loop on last Friday.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good, okay thank you. Any other items to identify? Yes please.

Mr. Coen: Yeah, I've received different telephone calls and contacted both sides, many sides, different entities on items 2, 4, and 5.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Gibbons: What about 3?

Mr. Rhodes: Three is a subset of 2. Again, just for clarity, certainly while those are not declarations of disqualification, it has become practice here with the Planning Commission to identify engagements, communications we've had on specific items just to ensure full transparency. So thank you for that folks. With that, we'll move onto the Public Presentations. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to speak on any item except the four items that are scheduled for public hearing. So, if anyone would like to come forward and speak on any other item, they may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, please state your name and your address, and then there will be 3 minutes to speak. A green light will come on indicating the start of that 3 minutes; a yellow light will come on when there is 1 minute remaining, and then when the red light comes on we would ask that you wrap up your comments. So again, if you'd like to come forward and speak on any item except for items 1 through 4 on the agenda, you may come forward and do so at this time.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I thought I'd come here tonight to continue my speech from the, umm, School Board meeting yesterday. And I'll start off by 45 years ago, there was a resolution passed in the County and Planning Commissioners were awarded five dollars per meeting. Now, it's too bad Charlie Brown wasn't on the Board of Supervisors at that time, and maybe Lucy, because she would have said it should be five cents. Now, I know everyone's all up in arms about the 350 year anniversary in Stafford County and we're putting up all these signs, but it's the 175 year anniversary of Chautauqua, New York, and if you don't know where that is, that's where Jack Kemp was the Representative of western New York. Also, for those of you who don't know, it's the 50 year anniversary of Wawa. And,

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

of course, I'm wearing the hundred year anniversary of Wrigley Field. These things are a little more of concern to me, especially since last Board of Supervisors meeting we had a 7-0 vote and we're going to have a Sheetz gas station come to Stafford County. And it was no negative impacts. Of course, it's just on a floodplain, a farm pond, has an RPA. You know, those nice red Sheetz buildings with their hot dogs, you know, the turtles will glow at night and we'll have some more empty storefronts. But what I really like is how we bring jobs to the County so our school people in the Rock Hill District, they won't have that far to go to work their second jobs. Now yesterday I heard about the school budget and finally I saw someone not vote for the school budget. It was simply amazing to me. Someone finally stood up. I'm anxious to see what's going to happen with the budget in the State and see if they can stand up and, umm, it's amazing what you can do by filibustering a little bit. Now I've also learned about CIPs. You know, I can't believe I know about Capital Improvement Programs. Resolution 82-341 is an entitlement of owners in Stafford Meadows. Unfortunately our representative only got 38% of the vote; that means 62% of the voters didn't vote for him. I think someone in this County needs to go to the legislature and let's readjust that. I'm all for 3-way races, but then representative government is 51%. We already had a President who was in a 3-way race and he only won one state. It was called Arkansas.

Mr. Rhodes: Anyone else would like to come forward, they may do so at this time.

Ms. Kent: Hello, my name is Natalie Kent and I am the Regional Vice President for Harmony Senior Services, and this is Connie Miller, the Executive Director of the Crossings at Falls Run. On behalf of our residents and our resident counsel, I would like to read a statement. "Please let it be known that the undersigned residents of the Crossings at Falls Run, a Harmony Senior Services community, who are also member of the Falls Run Resident Counsel, to affirm our satisfaction and please to call the Crossings our home. The Crossings is an active senior community with varied activities that residents participate in, outings and programs in the community, we enjoy a wonderful dining program and many gathering places within the community to meet and chat with friends. We understand that the Stafford County is considering an application to expand the number of assisted living beds that can offer the Crossings, if approved, this will enhance the Crossings' ability to accommodate seniors as they move through the active age of living. We have no hesitation in offering our support of the application and no hesitation in making our own request as residents of the Crossings that the application be approved. Thank you. Michael Collins, President; Bobby Haynes; Carolyn Overton; Shirley Gill and Chet Brabeau." Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward for Public Presentations? Okay, very good; thank you. We will now move onto the Public Hearing items on the agenda this evening. The first item on Public Hearings is item number 1, CUP1400041, the Conditional Use Permit for Anderson Propane at Hilldrup. Mr. Harvey.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP1400041; Conditional Use Permit – Anderson Propane at Hilldrup - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the installation of a propane distribution tank within the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 13-9, consisting of 0.17 acres and located on the east side of Jefferson Davis Highway at the intersection with Corporate Drive, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: August 12, 2014)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Ms. Ehly for the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Ms. Ehly: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. Computer please. This evening the first item we have is an application for a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 30,000 gallon propane distribution tank in the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on a portion of a 32-acre parcel which currently contains the Hilldrup Transfer and Storage Facility. The subject property is located on the eastern side of Jefferson Davis Highway, at the intersection with Corporate Drive, and north of George Mason Road. It is within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. The CUP area, which is approximately 1/5 of an acre, is located within the northern quadrant of the parcel, which includes light industrial warehouse, distribution, and office uses. The surrounding zoning includes Quantico to the north and east, suburban residential and light industrial to the south, and commercial and light industrial to the west. The parcel contains Critical Resource Protection Area, Dam Break Inundation Zone, and 100-year Floodplain. Although the boundary of the CUP does not encroach upon these areas, it is in close proximity to them. The site is approximately 90 feet north of the RPA, less than 10 feet south of the inundation zone and 100 feet to the south of the 100-year Floodplain at the nearest points. The GDP shows the existing layout of the site and the proposed design and location of the CUP area. The storage tank is proposed to be located on an area that is currently paved, immediately adjacent to an existing propane distribution tank onsite that is owned by Quarles Petroleum, Incorporated. The structure closest to the proposed site is a warehouse building that is located approximately 1,300 feet to the west. The proposed activity onsite is described as “refilling of delivery vehicles” and “deliveries to refill the storage tank.” Access to the site is provided by two existing driveways on Jefferson Davis Highway. The southerly entrance is controlled by an existing signalized light which will provide safe entrance and exit movements. Consideration for the other uses onsite and the safe internal circulation of pedestrian and vehicular movements is shown by the identification of the proposed access route and striping of the loading and unloading area. The concern for the proximity of the site to environmental features is addressed by showing the height of the tank to be at least 3 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) and by noting that the tank will be flood-proofed in accordance with FEMA guidance. The proposed location of the tank is also shown to be outside of a waterline easement associated with an existing 8-inch waterline running between the existing and proposed tank sites or locations. Additional safety concerns are addressed by showing the removal of parking spaces to prevent the possibility of unattended vehicles within a hundred feet of the site; the provision of dusk-to-dawn lighting coverage for the entire site; the provision of signage depicting a 24-hour emergency contact number; and the provision of 6-foot fencing with three strands of barbed wire at the top and bollards around the perimeter. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this site as being within the Business and Industry future land use designation. Large scale business and industry activities are encouraged in these areas of the County. The site is also located within the Boswell’s Corner Redevelopment Area. The proposed use is consistent with the land use recommendations with the proposed conditions by staff. Policy 4.4.2 of the Comprehensive Plan discourages the development of new buildings and structures within the dam inundation zone and, therefore, staff has requested that the tank and all associated mechanical equipment be located at least 3 feet above the base flood elevation because of the close proximity to this zone. Additional conditions further both Policy 4.2.5., which advises that the County ensure that development proposals which include the use and storage of hazardous materials comply with all state and federal regulations, and Objective 4.4., which recommends that the potential impacts of flood hazards, storm surges, and high water levels be minimized. Staff is proposing several conditions to help offset any potential impacts of the propane distribution facility, primarily with regard to the proximity of the site to environmental features, the location of utilities, and public safety concerns. The applicant has agreed to the following conditions which include that a site plan be submitted for review before construction; a provision of an updated fire safety analysis; removal of the striping for parking and posting of signs to prevent parking and/or combustible storage within a hundred feet of the site; provision of dusk-to-dawn lighting coverage; provision of the in case of emergency sign with the 24-hour emergency contact number; the provision of

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

fencing and bollards for security; provision of the clear above-ground air rights for the area within the waterline easement so nothing is put on top of that; provision of pavement striping for the loading and unloading area; and also the provision of the tank to be 3 feet above base flood and all fixtures and equipment also to be flood-proofed and 3 feet above base flood elevation and the submission of an as-built plan to demonstrate that that has occurred. Staff recommends approval of the CUP with the additional conditions as the proposal is consistent with the Land Use Recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, including the Boswell's Corner Redevelopment Plan; meets the requirements of the Code standards for issuance of a CUP; is consistent with the established development pattern in the vicinity; and public safety and welfare concerns are addressed via the proposed conditions.

Mr. Rhodes: Any questions for staff? Mr. English?

Mr. English: Do you know if they sent letters to residents around there that they were adding this extra tank?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, Mr. English, there are letters mailed to property owners that are abutting... that we send... the County does send notice to abutting property owners.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for staff? Wonderful, thank you. Applicant?

Mr. Caldwell: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission; my name is Darrell Caldwell. I'm here on behalf of Anderson Propane and Hilldrup; Hilldrup being the property owner, Anderson Propane being the proposed tenant of this particular site. We have agreed to all the conditions that have been spoke about tonight. We have no problems with any of those. This is an extreme convenience for Anderson, as the existing tank is for Quarles. It provides them the ability to serve the North Stafford area with propane service without having to make multiple trips between the North Stafford area and their location in Fredericksburg. So, if they need additional propane to service their clients, this is a convenient location for them to refuel and to keep the trucks off of that long trip back and forth. The site for Quarles has been very good for them; it has worked well. There has been no problems. This site will be almost a mirror image of their particular site; fencing, lighting, protection, elevations, the tank size, the capacity of the tank is exactly the same, the access is the same. As you'll remember at your last meeting I believe, the Hilldrup company was here with a zoning application to provide some additional parking. The part of the parking that's being eliminated because of this conditional use permit will be re-established on that property as part of their overall development. So those considerations have been taken in effect. We'll be more than happy to answer your questions. One question you were talking about, the notification step to the property owners -- because this is a 32-acre site, there's a lot of property owners on that entire property. So everyone along George Mason, down to the end of the property, across Route 1 and Quantico, so I think there were about 20 or 25 different individuals and/or businesses that were notified about this particular application.

Mr. English: On your other site, did you have these? You said there's another site in Fredericksburg or areas that have the same type situations?

Mr. Caldwell: They have similar facilities on Beulah Salisbury off of Dixon Street/Tidewater Trail. That's where the main location is; that's where their trucks originate from every day.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. English: Right. So, is this... my question... the cop side of me here... is there going to be any kind of surveillance as far as cameras on those, in case somebody tries to come in (inaudible), I'm just thinking being close to Quantico and where it is.

Mr. Caldwell: No, but if you're familiar with Hilldrup's site, they do have surveillance cameras there on the buildings in various locations. And we are doing the same type of lighting that the other, the existing tank already has for security purposes. So, it's well lit and people are coming and going from their establishment pretty much around the clock; truck drivers, you know, loads coming in and out from them. So it is, yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Caldwell: If there are any technical questions, Mark Anderson with Anderson Propane is here; he can answer those questions as well.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you very much; appreciate it.

Mr. Caldwell: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Now at this time we'll open up for public comment. If there's any member of the public that would like to speak on item number 1, the Conditional Use Permit for the Anderson Propane at Hilldrup you may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, again we'd ask you, like the Public Presentation portion, we'd ask that you state your name and your address and then you'll have 3 minutes to speak. Then you'll be guided by the lights up there; green light meaning 3 minutes, yellow light meaning 1 minute, and red light would be asking you to wrap up your comments. Anyone? Okay, very good. I will close the public comment portion of the public hearing and bring it back into the Planning Commission. This one I note is in the Griffis-Widewater Election District.

Mr. Boswell: A motion to approve CUP1400041.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: A motion recommending approval of CUP1400041, Conditional Use Permit for Anderson Propane at Hilldrup and seconded by Mr. Gibbons. Any further comment Mr. Boswell? Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, I do. I think Darrell brought up a good point. The proximity of the base, it would seem to me that they should install some sort of camera, that somebody's got awareness and to make sure that the local fire departments know we've got a hazard area there. So that's my only comment.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Others? Okay, very good. So certainly the comment on I think would be noted and considered for the future in their operations. But we do have the motion recommending approval of CUP1400041, Conditional Use Permit, Anderson Propane at Hilldrup. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; it passes 7-0. Thank you all very much. We will now move onto item number 2. I assume we'll do 2 and 3 together Mr. Harvey?

2. RC1300290; Reclassification – McWhirt Loop Commercial - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, with proffered conditions, to allow for the development of commercial retail, service, and/or restaurant uses on Assessor's Parcel 44-120B, consisting of 2.92 acres, located on the south side of Warrenton Road at the intersection of McWhirt Loop, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: August 12, 2014)**

3. CUP1300291; Conditional Use Permit – McWhirt Loop Commercial - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow two (2) drive-through facilities within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District. The drive-through facilities are for a proposed fast food restaurant and coffee shop. The site is on Assessor's Parcel 44-120B and is the subject of a concurrent reclassification request from the A-1, Agricultural to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District. The property consists of 2.92 acres, located on the south side of Warrenton Road at the intersection of McWhirt Loop, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: August 12, 2014)**

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. So the Reclassification and the Conditional Use Permit of McWhirt Loop Commercial.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize John Harbin for the combined presentations for items 2 and 3.

Mr. Harbin: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners, my name is John Harbin. This is items 2 and 3 on the agenda, Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit for McWhirt Loop Commercial. Computer please. So, we will split this up between the reclassification and CUP, and to start off with the reclassification, this is proposed to go from A-1 to B-2, Urban Commercial...

Mr. Gibbons: So you're combining both public hearings?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes sir, we'll do both presentations and then allow comments. Thank you very much Mr. Gibbons for clarification.

Mr. Harbin: Yes, thank you. The applicant is Leming and Healy for Frontier Development and it's on Assessor's Parcel 44-120B, just under 3 acres in size. So this is the location and zoning of the current parcel. It is outlined here in the light blue, with the tag line of sight. It is located at the intersection of Warrenton Road, McWhirt Loop, and Litchfield Boulevard. It's currently zoned A-1, like I mentioned,

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

but it's surrounded by B-2 and M-1 zoned properties. It is also, as you can see, within the Highway Corridor Overlay District so certain regulations apply to this site that are included in that, in addition to the underlying zoning. For the existing conditions, the site is undeveloped largely right now; it does have one single-family house on it, circa-1970s or so. The rest of the site is in a field state with small trees and shrubs, generally flat--there are no streams, wetlands, or any known archaeological resources at this time. It is also directly across from the Wawa along Route 17, which is right here circled in red. There is a CVS pharmacy located to the southeast. This area, located directly to the south, is an industrial office park condo development. And then the property directly to the west is an undeveloped parcel of land which underwent a rezoning back in the late 2000s to B-2 and M-1. That's slated for kind of commercial office uses as well. So this is the proposed Generalized Development Plan as it stands right now. There are three buildings proposed; you have building A here, building B, and building C. There are two access points; one full access point along McWhirt Loop to the south of the property. You have a right in/right out proposed along Warrenton Road at the north end of the property. You also have sidewalk along the perimeter of the site and internal access for pedestrians as well. You have dumpsters located for each building generally close to the building. The loading spaces are located towards the rear of the property, back here which recognizes a less than ideal location but because of the level of development that's included in here, that was generally the best site for it. Just to note, you do have an existing cell phone tower located just offsite to the west. That is proposed to be there for the foreseeable future. So with this reclassification, there are several proposed proffers the applicant has provided. Like I said, they will restrict ingress and egress to those two entrances, one off McWhirt Loop, one off Warrenton Road. They will provide an inter-parcel connection to the neighboring parcel there to the west. They will provide an additional through lane along McWhirt Loop which we'll talk about in greater detail; that's basically a new receiving lane as you make a left turn from Warrenton Road onto McWhirt Loop. They will provide additional easements for the construction of the Route 17 project. They will provide a screening mix of evergreen deciduous trees; restrict the uses that will be operated onsite to no more than 4,117 average total vehicle trips per day. And they also proffered the peak a.m. and peak p.m. trips as well. They prohibit some uses that would otherwise be zoned... or be allowed in B-2 zoning districts such as a flea market, funeral service uses...

Mr. Gibbons: Are they in the proffers?

Mr. Harbin: Yes, all of these items are listed in the proffers. They also restrict the maximum building height to 40 feet, establish building architectural standards, and they require all signs that will be built onsite to be coordinated with the building design. All fencing, including that surrounding the dumpsters, will be of brick or stone construction, and the existing residence well and septic will be removed as well. So, for the transportation on this project, they did submit a Transportation Impact Analysis, like I mentioned. That report stated that there would be 4,117 vehicle trips per day from this site; 458 a.m. and 272 p.m. peak vehicle trips per hour. Like I mentioned, those numbers are proffered so they should not exceed that. This TIA did take into account the development of the subject site, all Route 17 improvements, and other planned projects in the vicinity. And they evaluated impacts on several intersections. The one I think most important concern is the Warrenton Road, McWhirt Loop, and Litchfield Boulevard intersection. The impacts to that are negative. There is a decrease in Level of Service and an increase in delay time as a result of this project; specifically, a.m. Level of Service decreases from C to D and there is an increase in about 10 seconds of delay time. The p.m. peak hour trips of the Level of Service maintains a D but there is an increase in delay time from this project. All things else held constant. This is inconsistent with our Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan policy, I think it's 6.6.7 which states that if Level of Service C is not practical, any improvements should be... any improvements should be made to not degrade Level of Service any more. They do propose improvements which will discuss mainly that additional receiving lane onto McWhirt Loop, but even

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

with that improvement there is still an impact on the Level of Service. So, to get into details with what the improvements they are providing as part of the Route 17 project, VDOT will build two left-turn lanes on northbound Route 17 onto McWhirt Loop. The applicant will then construct an additional receiving lane along McWhirt Loop which will then transition into a right turn lane into their development. This is shown on their GDP here in the shaded area here. This is the receiving lane coming in and then a dedicated right turn lane into their development. I will note that when they made this improvement on their GDP, they actually moved the access point on McWhirt Loop approximately a hundred feet closer to the intersection. VDOT commented on this requesting clarification as to why this change was made. We haven't received any information from the applicant at this time, but that's certainly an issue to address because in doing so there is no curb and gutter along the remaining portion of McWhirt Loop which is inconsistent with the other part of the property.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry...

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Apicella: Before you go on, could you kind of give me a sense of where the CVS exit would be in relationship to what you're showing us here?

Mr. Harbin: I think my best guess would put it somewhere in this vicinity here, because it kind of comes out right on the turn.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, the reason why I bring this up is because I use that CVS and, as you come off of 17 and you try to make a right turn into the CVS... I'm sorry, a left turn into the CVS... there's sort of a blind spot where you can't see oncoming traffic and you actually have to edge forward slowly so you make sure you're not going to be hit as you turn into the CVS. So I'm curious if that was looked at and if any mitigation measures were adopted as part of this plan.

Mr. Harbin: Specifically to that issue, I don't believe so but I think with...

Mr. Apicella: Again, my concern is this might make the problem worse.

Mr. Harbin: You will have the additional clearing with the receiving lane coming off 17 onto McWhirt Loop.

Mr. Apicella: Well, I don't know if you've been there, John, but there's a ridge...

Mr. Harbin: There's a steep embankment, yes.

Mr. Apicella: You can't see over that ridge as you're coming around the bend and then you have to turn left. You can't see what's coming so, even if you cut that off, unless you lower the ridge you're still going to have potentially the same problem.

Mr. Harbin: Right. And I think by building this receiving lane, they will have to grade out that ridge significantly.

Mr. Apicella: But what I don't know is how far in that ridge goes. So, yes, maybe you're potentially solving a problem... I'm not quite sure. Again, it is a concern. I'd like to know more about whether or not that solves the problem or makes it worse.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: Okay. So this is the construction plan for Route 17 improvements. I just wanted to show this for clarification purposes. You do have those two northbound left turn lanes that will feed onto McWhirt Loop. On this plan, it only shows one lane on McWhirt Loop because, like I said, the applicant will build that additional receiving lane on there to make it two lanes going that direction. Unfortunately it doesn't show the CVS entrance, but it does show the beginning of that turn as well.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Coen: Since you have this slide up, if I'm looking at... is it that top right-hand side, there's the... going east on 17, you have one lane that's going left, the three going straight, and then there's a definite left-hand turn lane that goes down to the McWhirt Loop, correct?

Mr. Harbin: Yes. You're talking about in here?

Mr. Coen: Yeah... well, actually a little bit farther up towards the right of the screen. And so just so I get the feel, is the turn into this complex going to be in addition to that left lane or just sort of all the people are going to come down to McWhirt, you'll have some that are going to stop to get into here and then there are others that will turn into the road?

Mr. Harbin: Are you speaking about that right in/right out entrance further...?

Mr. Coen: No. If I'm coming down from the right-hand side of the screen over towards McWhirt Loop, and then you've gone past the entrance so hopefully we won't back up on 17, but if I'm turning into this complex up, you know, closer towards the right-hand side, I'm just curious how much, you know, is there going to be like one whole lane of people who are mainly going to McWhirt Loop but all of a sudden there's going to be people stopping to make it in a pretty seems to be short entrance on the right. Do I get that from the picture correctly?

Mr. Harbin: If I'm understanding correctly, you'll have people coming southbound on Route 17. There's a dedicated right turn lane that runs the duration of pretty much 17... they will have the dedicated right turn movement into the newly constructed receiving lane which will then turn into a right turn lane into the development. That is an issue I think with the location of the current access point because it is closer to the intersection, so that's something to be noted for sure.

Mr. English: John, question. With all the construction stuff going on on 17, would they be doing that anyway regardless of putting a property in there? Making that turn into McWhirt Loop because of the CVS?

Mr. Harbin: Yes.

Mr. English: So that's going to happen...

Mr. Harbin: Yes, those two left turn lanes are going to be built regardless.

Mr. English: No matter what.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: Correct. Now, if the current development does not build this additional receiving lane, they would just block off that one left turn lane until it's finally built. Okay. Another transportation issue, during VDOT's review of this project they requested the applicant examine the feasibility of a right in/right out shared driveway between the subject parcel and the parcel to the west. This would be opposed to the dedicated right in/right out only that would access the current subject property. And staff is very supportive of this. It would provide equal access to both parcels and we think it would improve pedestrian safety. However, it could be challenging to implement with the separate owners of these parcels and the different development schedules. I do believe that the applicant has reached out to the property owner to the west over here, and I would ask that they provide an update on their conversation with them regarding this shared driveway. But essentially it would just run down kind of the center of the property line, just like that, and go straight to the inter-parcel connection allowing for very easy access to both parcels and also prevent people turning into this right in/right out only and having pedestrians walking out of their cars trying to get to the building, having that kind of conflict there. This is the approved GDP for that adjacent property. The "X" is where we're talking about tonight but, like I said, the shared driveway, there is space here as well. They provided a 50 foot transitional buffer because at the time of this rezoning, the adjacent property was in residential use. So that transitional buffer is no longer necessary, so there certainly is space there for some sort of driveway. So that's another issue to be considered. The Comprehensive Plan -- this proposal is consistent with it. It's designated as a commercial corridor within suburban land use which encourages commercial activity such as this one. There's adequate transportation facilities which generally I believe that there is. So, as a summary for the reclassification request, staff agrees that it's in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use recommendations, and that's a key part of it, it is consistent with the established and proposed development patterns on the adjacent properties like we talked about. The proffers would minimize potential visual impacts with the buffers, and transportation improvements incorporate pedestrian safety measures. However, it's not in conformance with the Transportation Plan of the Comprehensive Plan and does not meet all fire and safety... Fire and Rescue's safety recommendations at this time. So, overall, staff is generally supportive of this reclassification with the proposed proffers. We believe additional consideration should be given to VDOT's latest comments on the TIA and the inconsistency with the Transportation Plan recommendations and Fire and Rescue staff recommends that you all please consider their request regarding fire sprinklers. So, before I move onto the CUP, I'd like to address any questions specifically regarding the reclassification.

Mr. Rhodes: On the VDOT's comments, are there any of those comments that wouldn't be addressed in the subsequent discussions, technical discussion, technical review discussions of the site plan?

Mr. Harbin: Yes, such as like the shared driveway. That issue would not be addressed during the TRC.

Mr. Rhodes: That would not... okay. Thank you. Other questions? Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Help me now in the proffers.

Mr. Harbin: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: The proffer says prohibit some uses which would otherwise be allowed in the B-2 zoning district. What uses?

Mr. Harbin: That would be such things as funeral services, flea market...

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, but did you list them separate?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: It does list them out.

Mr. Gibbons: Where? I mean, just tell me what page it's on. Why wouldn't it be in the proffer?

Mr. Harbin: It is in the proffers.

Mr. Gibbons: I only see one statement in the proffer.

Mr. Rhodes: I think it's attachment 8.

Mr. Apicella: It's attachment 8, page 2 of 3.

Mr. Harbin: Thank you.

Mr. Gibbons: Page 2?

Mr. Apicella: Of 3, so it's almost at the end of your package.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay. And then I didn't see the GDP proffered. And then what doesn't he meet about Fire and Rescue? You say he doesn't meet it.

Mr. Harbin: Fire and Rescue requested that the buildings use fire sprinklers up to a certain...

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, but does the ordinance require that?

Mr. Harbin: No. It would be above and beyond.

Mr. Gibbons: Well how can you say he doesn't meet it?

Mr. Harbin: I'm sorry?

Mr. Gibbons: How can you say by staff that he doesn't meet it? If the ordinance doesn't require it...

Mr. Harbin: The ordinance does not require the level of fire sprinkling.

Mr. Gibbons: But my question is that how can you say he doesn't meet it?

Mr. Harbin: He doesn't meet Fire and Rescue's request.

Mr. Gibbons: I understand. But in the staff report it says he doesn't meet the Fire and Rescue safety standards when it's not in the ordinance.

Mr. Harbin: Understood.

Mr. Gibbons: Now, he probably didn't give you what you wanted which I tend to agree with. Thank you.

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

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, just kind of piggybacking off of your comment about VDOT's comments, again, I would like some greater clarification or specificity as to not the one that I think you've mentioned may be impractical or beyond the applicant's control, but there's another six that VDOT mentioned in their letter. I'd like to know how those would be dispensed with going forward, whether as the Chairman indicated would that be part of the TRC process or is that something we need to talk about now to try to see what is best going forward.

Mr. Harbin: Some of those other comments are certainly part of the (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: I know, but for the other six, if we could just kind of understand if something wouldn't be discussed as part of the TRC process, maybe it's number 2 or number 5... I don't know... but again, they offered up some important comments. I'd like to know what is best for this project going forward based on their comments.

Mr. Harbin: I think... and I will have to get those comments out in front of me, I don't have them.

Mr. Apicella: Again, we don't have to do it right this second, but I've got some other questions or concerns.

Mr. Rhodes: I just would clarify... the applicant will come forward so when they do, if you can just kind of see if there's any... I think the main point is which ones won't get addressed at TRC. If they're going to get addressed at TRC then I think it's less of an issue. If there's not another opportunity, it just probably should be made aware.

Mr. Harbin: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So, again, I'm familiar with the area because I go to the CVS and both on Route 17 during rush hour, 17 itself is pretty crowded. In fact, we call it blocking the box in D.C.; I don't know what it's called here. But sometimes you can't even make a right turn because there's so many people who've gone past the red light and are sitting there blocking drivers from being able to exit from McWhirt Loop onto 17, either going left or right, even if the light is green. So that's a concern of mine. But at the CVS during rush hour, sometimes you can't get out of the CVS because there's so much traffic coming from the other side of McWhirt Loop trying to get to 17. So, again, one of my concerns is the extent to which this project, coming out of this project, will put more cars onto McWhirt Loop making it that much harder for the folks who are exiting CVS to make a left or right turn, especially during rush hour, or the potential that people will get frustrated and cause an accident because they want to get out... they've been waiting a long time. And if you're looking for that one opportunity, there's just barely enough clearance and they spring out and maybe get hit. I don't know how to address that but it's a concern of mine. I'm curious, the CVS parcel... do we have an understanding of what the size of that parcel is? Just trying to get some context.

Mr. Harbin: Two acres.

Mr. Apicella: Two acres. So it's a little bit smaller than this parcel but there's one use on that parcel, right? It's got two drive-throughs... it might even actually have three drive-throughs but they're all in the same area, they're not spread out.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Anywhere else in Stafford County on this kind of a small parcel, is there a situation where there are two drive-throughs on a 2- or 3-acre parcel?

Mr. Harbin: Nothing immediately comes to mind.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, that's a concern of mine.

Mr. Harbin: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: I know on 610 you got... right there you got the Popeye's, you got the Taco Bell, and then you got the Burger King just across from the entrance to the... just down there across from iHop.

Mr. Apicella: But it's a fairly spread-out. It's a very confined space with three uses, two of which are drive-throughs. So I'm just trying to... I know there are conditions in the CUP that talk about being able to, I'll call it inter-parcel circulation, but the reality may be that that might be difficult on a 2+ acre site.

Mr. Harbin: And we will discuss that in much greater detail when I get to the CUP as well.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Gibbons went kind of towards the next kind of issue that I was concerned about. I realize that they're proffering out anything that's over, what was it 4117 or some number like that. It's hard for me to visualize what that means when I look at the list of uses, B-2 uses. They've excluded a few, three that come to mind; building materials, funeral home, indoor flea market. But there are lots of other uses that haven't been proffered out, some of which may not necessarily be compatible with the growth pattern in that immediate vicinity. For example, warehouse mini storage... I mean, I know there are warehouse mini storage in Stafford County but I don't see any in that immediate vicinity, so I guess I'm asking you from a staff perspective, seeing what you know about how 17 is developing or has developed, are there any of the vast majority of the uses that would be of concern to you that have not yet been excluded in the proffers?

Mr. Harbin: I think a mini warehouse would not be appropriate at this site certainly.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but there's lots of others; car wash, night club. Again, I don't know how those translate into number of vehicles entering the parcel but I think we might want to take...

Mr. Gibbons: Dog kennels, you know...

Mr. Apicella: What's that? Dog kennels? Again, you know, part of job here is to try to make sure, as things progress going forward, to make sure that the...

Mr. Gibbons: Wouldn't it be better if he proffered what he's going to build rather than exclude it?

Mr. Apicella: That's certainly one way to do it. You did mention that the GDP wasn't proffered so I think that's an important issue. That's it for now Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Other questions for staff? What do you think is the best way to do this? Have the applicant come up now and just actually do them independently?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'd recommend that Mr. Harbin finish his presentation...

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: ...then come back for applicant presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Address the full picture; okay. Thank you.

Mr. Harbin: Alright, moving on to just the request for a Conditional Use Permit, this would be for two drive-through facilities at the site. Obviously the same applicant, same site, same location in zoning as well. We'll breeze over that part and get into the GDP. The proposed drive-throughs would be on buildings B and C located here. They have proposed (inaudible) right there and the drive isles would wrap around the building such as this. So that is what the CUP would permit, these two drive-throughs only. Generally, I believe that the drive-through facility for building C provides the adequate access and stacking; however, building B's drive-through is a concern of mine, particularly with the full access point located basically directly south of it right here. You have cars coming in stacking to order to that drive-through. That can cause serious issues with flow of traffic throughout this site. It would make it hard if you enter the site, come in and want to come down through here if there's cars blocking it. In addition, if you're coming back through here and you're trying to get out of the site, you could have traffic blocking you as well. It's just a very tight to put two drive-throughs in and especially with the location of this full access point where it is now which, like I said, they moved it about a hundred feet closer to the intersection. It creates additional issues. The original GDP as was first submitted, had the access point a little further down McWhirt Loop, kind of in this vicinity, which, if it was there, it would allow for a little bit better flow although that would require a separate kind of analysis. So that's certainly an issue to consider in the CUP.

Mr. English: John, did they say why they moved that?

Mr. Harbin: No, and VDOT actually... that's one of the comments VDOT provided in their analysis of the resubmittal of the TIA and we did not receive a response from the applicant on that. So that's a great question. So obviously there are some proposed conditions on this CUP. The drive-throughs shall be located in the general locations as shown on the GDP. Loading spaces and truck delivery spaces shall be located outside of any required travel lane. Loading areas, dumpster pads, trash compactors shall be located and designed so that they're screened from view. Drive-through lanes shall be oriented in a manner to minimize headlight glare onto state maintained roadways; that's largely accommodated through a berm that they're providing along Warrenton Road. Additional ones -- stacking lanes for drive-through facilities shall be designed to not impede traffic circulation which is contradictory. All drive-through facilities shall include a bypass lane for vehicles not utilizing the drive-through. All drive-through canopies shall be coordinated in color and materials with the primary structure. And any canopy lighting shall be recessed within the canopy. We also included a condition about no carnival-style signs, banners, lights, balloons, windsocks; this is kind of a new thing that we're addressing as well. So staff findings -- the CUP is in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. It's consistent with the established proposed development patterns. The conditions will mitigate impacts to the road network; however, the location and configuration of that one drive-through is of particular concern and presents some potential access issues. So, should the current reclassification be approved, staff recommends approval of the CUP with the proposed conditions. However, I do recommend that the Planning Commission consider requesting the applicant relocate that full access point along McWhirt Loop in order to facilitate site access and traffic flow in that site as you enter. And, at this time I'll be happy to take any questions for the CUP.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

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

Mr. Coen: Real quickly, because one of the things that Mr. Gibbons pointed out, which I agree with, is we ask so many questions that the people don't get to talk for quite a while. But I was zipping through trying to find the information about the wind sock items. So can you pull that up again so I can read it?

Mr. Harbin: Sure.

Mr. Coen: Because I didn't see it when I was speed reading. Okay, I just want to make sure I understand, there's none of that unless it's just the grand opening. I mean, because when you were talking, it was like use of temporary things are okay. But what you're saying is they can do it on the grand opening but then they can't do a special one or whatever later on.

Mr. Harbin: Correct.

Mr. Coen: Okay, I just want to make sure I got that. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, any other questions for staff before the applicant comes forward? Okay, thank you very much. Applicant please.

Ms. Karnes: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission and staff, my name is Debrarae Karnes. I'm an attorney and land use planner with Leming and Healy, here representing the applicant, Frontier Development. You guys kept me busy back there writing down all your questions, and hopefully I'm going to answer every one of them in my hopefully brief presentation. Okay, so staff did a good job of discussing the basic application and the issues. I want to start out by telling you about Frontier Development. This is a company that develops retail properties all up and down the east coast from New York to Florida. In the audience is one of their executives, James Leach. I also have Ryan Foroughi, the engineer, and Doug Kennedy, the traffic engineer, and at pertinent times I'm going to have them address some of the questions, particularly the site circulation and Mr. Kennedy will go through the specific six issues that you questioned about VDOT's response. Alright, first of all, this rezoning, when we just look at the rezoning proposal alone, going from A-1 to B-2, I think that's a pretty easy concept. This area is all developing commercially and a proposed retail development would be consistent with the surrounding developments in the neighborhood. Obviously the big issue here is transportation. Route 17, Warrenton Road, is a regional roadway. It's at below desirable Level of Service right now and it's currently being expanded from 4 lanes to 6 lanes. And when we sat down and looked at what would be proposed, that was the crucial issue both for the good of Stafford County and frankly the future users of the site. They want their customers to be able to get in and get out easily and efficiently. So one of the questions that was raised, you have a GDP in front of you that shows the development of a little less than 11,000 square feet of uses. Why isn't the GDP proffered? And there's an easy reason for that. We believe we are being innovative in the way we're doing it. Right now, when we did the traffic study, we chose the most traffic intensive uses because we wanted... that would likely be on the site... because we wanted to accurately model the traffic in order to devise mitigation measures. And we chose the less than 2,000 square foot coffee shop, which is going to be a Starbucks by the way, a fast food restaurant totaling... so we're going to have two drive-throughs... and then a general retail or sit-down restaurant. If we proposed other uses consistent with that site, if we made it say all general retail, we could build additional square footage. The limiting factor here is the amount of traffic the site can handle. We believe it makes more sense and gives Stafford County greater protection not to proffer the building size, but instead to proffer the amount of traffic to be generated. And that's how we handled the commitment for what we build. Instead of proffering footprints necessarily, we're

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

going to proffer the maximum traffic to be generated which, by the way, I think will serve to hold down total development of the site more so than any square footage proffer. To give you an idea of how this would work, every time they come in for a site plan for the building, they would have to certify the amount of traffic to be generated by each user, almost like a parking lot calculation. And so the first user would come it... that's going to be a Starbucks... they would show how much traffic they would generate. The second user and then the third user. And if, in fact, that third user generated served to push the total number of trips over this limit of 4,117 per day average, or the peak morning or afternoon rates, then they wouldn't be able to get approved at site plan. We'll be happy to discuss that or work with you in any way, but we believe this is the first time this approach has been done and I think it's going to better meet the needs of Stafford County. As you heard, we have proposed mitigation strategies to mitigate the impact of the traffic; the additional turn lane onto McWhirt Loop. We feel that our traffic study, and you can talk at more detail to the traffic engineer, we feels this substantially mitigates the impact of the traffic. Now, one thing we ordinarily would've agreed to is doing a timing change on the traffic signals. We believe that would further mitigate the impact of the traffic. VDOT did not want to do that for the simple reason that they are currently building their road improvements and they prefer to do the study and change of signal timing after the 6 lanes have been completed. The other thing that's innovative that I wanted to stress here, in the current VDOT plans, they are doing some work on drainage issues along Route 17. Our client went ahead and dedicated right-of-way now, not waiting to see whether this plan would be approved, in order to allow VDOT to complete their work now. And so that's one of the unusual things about this case; I was on the line with the County, do you mind if they dedicate this additional small amount of right-of-way now? That's quite unusual and, again, innovative. The only other thing I want to mention about the rezoning is that... well, two things... first of all, you do see architectural standards proffered and they are consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan suggestions on site design and further someone asked questions about the Fire Marshal's recommendation. Indeed, as Commissioner Gibbons pointed out, our proposal meets the state building guidelines, the state building code I should say. And there is no requirement for sprinklers in buildings of this size and my client tells me they never put sprinklers in buildings of this size. As always, they're willing to work with you on anything but that's where we came from. Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Debrarae, let me ask you why did the Fire Marshal want to increase the fire sprinklers? Did they say why?

Ms. Karnes: They always recommend sprinklers and so I don't think there was a finding of a particular need as much as this is just a routine recommendation. Now, one more thing about transportation that I forgot to mention. You heard staff say that this proposal is inconsistent with the Comp Plan's transportation chapter. And what that says, it's the non-degradation policy and what it says is if the roads serving the project are already operating below capacity based on current needs, what they expect staff... what they expect the applicant to do is mitigate and so the conditions are not worsened. We largely mitigated the issue; however, there is a delay of an additional six seconds in the intersection movement in the a.m. and an additional five seconds in the p.m. And I'm going to... five seconds.

Mr. Rhodes: Was it ten seconds in the a.m.?

Ms. Karnes: Let's see, my notes, and I'll defer to the traffic engineer...

Mr. Rhodes: Thirty-four to forty-four?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Ms. Karnes: It's six seconds in the a.m.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Karnes: Okay. And that's without signal timing adjustments and that's without factoring into the fact that a coffee shop has an 85% at least pass-by capture. In other words, if you can capture traffic that are normally passing by the route anyway, it has less impact than if you're bringing new customers totally on their own making a separate trip just to utilize your product. I think at this point, unless someone has questions, I'd like you to hear from the traffic engineer to give you...

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Debrarae, you kind of opened up a Pandora's box when you're innovative. Now tell me how you're going to meet that traffic going in and out of your property. Are you going to put gates up and a traffic counter so when you hit a certain amount of traffic you're going to drop the gate and everybody goes up 17? You're innovative now, so how are you going to handle that?

Ms. Karnes: We are innovative. The way it does... the way it works is that when they submit the site plan, they will list the amount of traffic as calculated in the ITE Traffic Manual.

Mr. Gibbons: I got that. Boy, I got that down. Now how are you going to enforce it?

Mr. Rhodes: I think what she's saying is she wouldn't be able to construct it if it goes over the ITE guide if the number of cars that would be attributed to that use would take you over the 4,117 a day. So you wouldn't even build that type of a use; you'd have to go to a less intensive use to build. So it would be up front at the site plan piece.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, you can tell me another fairytale too and I'll believe it.

Ms. Karnes: Of course, you know, the ITE manual is the source of all of our planning assumptions.

Mr. Gibbons: I was just saying that you're innovative and I was just wondering how you were going to count, that's all.

Ms. Karnes: I'm going to rely on the ITE manual. I think what I'd like to do, Mr. Chairman, is bring up the traffic engineer who can answer any other questions based on his assumption.

Mr. English: I have a question.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please Mr. English.

Mr. English: Debrarae, why did you all move the entrance? The entrance is up further on McWhirt Loop (inaudible). Just like you said, there's going to be... if you put two drive-throughs in there, that's going to back up (inaudible). Why was it moved on that?

Ms. Karnes: First of all, I'm going to say we're certainly willing to work with the Planning Commission on this. But the reason was simply that they wanted as much of the traffic as possible to utilize the McWhirt entrance and they wanted it to be somewhat visible from 17.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. English: I agree with you, but I'm saying for McWhirt Loop...

Ms. Karnes: I mean, that's why they moved it.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Karnes: They thought it made more sense.

Mr. English: And the business, the second business, you said Starbucks is coming in, correct?

Ms. Karnes: Starbucks is going to be in building C.

Mr. English: And then the second business is...?

Ms. Karnes: Neither the second or third business has been identified yet.

Mr. English: Okay. Alright.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Karnes: So, as I said before, the traffic engineer is Doug Kennedy with Pennoni Associates and he is going to answer your question concerning VDOT's comments and any other technical question you have.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Karnes: And Ryan Foroughi seems to be coming up.

Mr. Foroughi: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name's Ryan Foroughi. I'm the site engineer on this project, actually a resident of Stafford County. I'd like to address any questions that you have regarding... Doug will get into the specifics regarding timing and mitigation and so on and so forth that you guys... that you have... but I would like to address any site specific issues. I know, if I was taking my notes correctly, obviously the entrance is a concern or something that has been brought up. Internal circulation, something that was also brought up, and so I just wanted to take a few minutes and go over some things. I haven't used this before but I will try. May I have the computer please?

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Foroughi: I'll try to bring up this map for you. This slide. Okay. So, the first... let me start off first, I guess VDOT or staff must not have received... we did respond to the six comments that VDOT had generated in their letter dated April 4, 2014. We did respond to that on April 11, 2014. Was the Commission not given that response? Have you not seen that? I guess not? Okay. So, regarding the six comments, so what we are... we'll kind of wrap all this into one regarding the site entrance and the intersection and the turn lane. Debrarae is correct; the reason that we started with the site... we situated the site entrance at this location is to maximize visibility to get as much traffic off of 17 onto McWhirt Loop so that that... we don't want anybody making a U-turn up at 17 at the next entrance up to the north or to the west to try and come back in the right in/right out. Staff actually, through our review process, made a recommendation to move all the buildings forward to maximize visibility. So we thought that as

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

that progressed, it made more sense to relocate the entrance to fit with the internal circulation of the site. I will say the entrance will be required to meet all VDOT standards. We currently meet intersection spacing on a local road; McWhirt Loop is considered a local road. We meet intersection spacing. We are outside of the functional area of the intersection of McWhirt Loop and 17. And we are beyond the 17 entrance... we are offset from the 17 entrance... I'm sorry, the CVS entrance on McWhirt Loop as well. Also, something else was brought up regarding the grade and the inadequate site distance on McWhirt Loop when you're trying to turn left into the CVS. If you look... I don't know if we can -- can we zoom this in? Actually, with the improvements on VDOT's plan, on the 17 plan... can I draw on this? There is an existing entrance in the lower right... there is an existing easement in the lower right-hand corner. That there is an existing site distance easement that VDOT has taken already with the improvements of 17 to help mitigate that specific problem. The development of this site will also address at TRC any entrances; if we don't meet site distance, we will have to grade back banks or anything that we need to meet site distance.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, I need you to speak to me in a little bit more English. So, when you say VDOT's going to do something here, what are they going to do and when are they going to do it, in relationship to when this project would be built?

Mr. Foroughi: VDOT, when they make all their frontage... when they do all the improvements on 17 when they get to this intersection, that's when these improvements will be made.

Mr. Apicella: And when is that supposed to happen?

Mr. Foroughi: I believe the construction has already started on 17 and they're working north and coming south already, if I'm not mistaken. So, I think VDOT has indicated they'll probably be around this intersection in the next 12 to 18 months is when they're going to be at this intersection.

Mr. Apicella: So, bottom line, will the grade be cut down so that that problem of not being able to see oncoming traffic from McWhirt Loop, will that be abated?

Mr. Foroughi: Either through our application process or through VDOT's development, the site distance will be addressed.

Mr. Apicella: I'm worried about reality on the ground, Ryan. So again, if this project were built before VDOT does whatever its going to do, you still have the potential issue of people making... swinging around, myself included, trying to go into CVS with oncoming cars from McWhirt Loop coming from the other direction of McWhirt Loop. And you're going to have more cars coming as a result of this project, coming back onto McWhirt Loop; not necessarily going this way, but coming around this way. So, again, my concern is the potential for or the probability of accidents occurring because people can't see oncoming traffic.

Mr. Foroughi: I believe...

Mr. Apicella: You didn't create this problem, but I'm worried that it may exasperate the problem.

Mr. Foroughi: Yeah, exactly, I understand. I believe we've actually spoken several times with VDOT about coordinating the development of our project with their project, specifically regarding sidewalk and tapers and all the frontage improvements that we are proposing and not overlapping... basically not wasting taxpayer dollars to rip up and tear up things that VDOT's doing and we're doing and so on and

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

so forth. I believe VDOT feels that they're going to be at this site doing the improvements before our application is approved and before we have a building permit.

Mr. English: Ryan, question for you.

Mr. Foroughi: Yes sir.

Mr. English: Do you have a site plan for that, what VDOT's telling you or saying they're going to do? Can you get that for us?

Mr. Foroughi: We could, yes, we have... I think it's in this set.

Mr. English: It's from VDOT saying that they're going to do the cut-downs and all that.

Mr. Foroughi: VDOT plans admittedly are very tough to read; they don't do a lot of grading on their plans. But they are showing... they are making significant improvements to that intersection, drainage and so on and so forth.

Mr. English: They don't, you are.

Mr. Foroughi: Correct. We will be required to meet the site distance.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Foroughi: And Mr. Apicella, so... back to kind of addressing what you had indicated, I believe VDOT's going to be there first. If they're not there first, we are going to be required to make our site meet site distance throughout the project. So, if the entrance has to move a couple of feet here or there or however we have to do it, we will have to meet site distance, intersection spacing, and so on and so forth. But we do think that VDOT's going to be there first on this plan.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I appreciate that. But I still have the concern of the traffic that's already on McWhirt Loop, again, exiting from the CVS going left or right especially during rush hour. Cars are stacked up and someone wanting to turn, one way or another, is prohibited because there's a long line of traffic already on McWhirt Loop prior to this development occurring, this will only make that situation that much more arduous for people. So, what can be done about that, if anything?

Mr. Foroughi: Doug, if you want to step up.

Mr. Kennedy: Doug Kennedy with Pennoni Associates. I think the major difference and the major change of the improvements and what you'll see at CVS is that the concern is VDOT plans do resurface and adjust the grades on McWhirt with their project. And, as Ryan said, we expect them to be working on that southbound direction next summer is what they had told us in terms of the work.

Mr. Apicella: I hear ya and I appreciate the response. So that deals with one of my concerns. The other concern is just the amount of traffic that's already on McWhirt Loop absent this project.

Mr. Kennedy: Right. And I think the major... the reason why, you know, in terms of innovative and what we're doing here, by adding the second receiving lane, today the problem is that traffic comes onto McWhirt Loop and, if there is backing up there in the peaks, they (a) have a site distance concern and

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

(b) they're worried about someone coming behind them from the signal and running into them because they're waiting for a gap in traffic. The proposed improvements as shown in the improvements actually widens McWhirt Loop on our side of the road which VDOT was never doing to allow two receiving lanes. That's the unique and the, I think, the innovative improvements we're making to accommodate what's out there today, but also to accommodate the additional traffic when we are adding our uses on here. So, instead of having one lane as you're turning in there having to stop two cars in to make the left turn to CVS, you'll have two lanes to come in there. So the road improvements will be improved for site distance but you'll have two receiving lanes to come in there. So traffic coming into the CVS, again, we would expect when we coordinate with VDOT, if they want to put up a Do Not Block Intersection sign for CVS, that's something VDOT could coordinate on. But we've set it up to allow for two receiving lanes where today you only have one. And I think that's the major change you'll see out there to accommodate the growth and to accommodate this proposed use.

Mr. Apicella: Sir, I see that as partial remediation for this situation of, again I'm sorry, I'm coming up 17, I make a right-hand turn, come swinging around potentially going to your project or CVS. I'm a driver. I'm at CVS. I want to turn right or left. I've got cars already coming up McWhirt Loop going in this direction, let's say it's north, to try to get to 17. A long line of cars already there. I can't turn left. I heard one potential solution is some kind of VDOT requirement to not block the exit but, again, without that being there, someone is going to get into an accident because they've been sitting there waiting to get out of CVS and they can't. That's a problem already. It's only going to get worse and people make a right-hand turn outside of this project and you have even more cars trying to get onto McWhirt Loop, also making that northbound route.

Mr. Kennedy: If I could have the computer.

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Kennedy: Again, the arrows, in terms of what we're showing in gray, the two arrows heading say westbound on McWhirt Loop is improvement of what you have today. You've got the lane coming towards this traffic signal at the CVS entrance... and this is the CVS entrance generally in here. So, the issue's going to be, as VDOT does the improvements out there, if we were not coming in today, the only thing that would be changing after the VDOT project is that it'd be adjusting the grade to the roadway with the improvements. So, you'd still have the same condition that you have out there today where traffic is going to have look at getting gaps in traffic to make the right turn out or, if they want to go back over to the, in terms of going to the Lowe's, they're going to have to get a gap in traffic to make the left turnout. That's really what it is today in terms of the improvements. The CVS entrance doesn't meet the VDOT access management spacings. So that's, in a sense, one of the reasons why we are focusing on moving our entrance to the west along McWhirt Loop so we're not creating the same problems we have today with CVS. But, in terms of our improvement, I think adding the two lanes in will help drivers getting into the site, which was one of your concerns about the site distance. They may be able to see down here along the intersection; I think that will improve. But, at this stage, we, as part of this development, I don't think can solve the existing constraints with the CVS access.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I understand what you're saying. I only think it's going to get worse as a result. And I don't dispute that commercial is probably the best use of this parcel, but putting another 4,000 cars on McWhirt Loop, especially as they're more likely to turn left on McWhirt Loop and go up in an easterly direction, is going to make this problem with CVS that much more problematic.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Kennedy: And again, the 4,000 cars is the total site. We also do have the driveway on 17 as a right in/right out which will capture a lot of the pass-by for these uses to get in and out of the site. But it is balanced.

Mr. Apicella: I appreciate what you're saying. I'm sorry to keep beating this drum. But, again, as you have Route 17 blocked during rush hour traffic, you're not going to get that many people turning right because someone's not going to let them out. So, if you're standing there waiting to get out onto Route 17 during rush hour traffic, you're going to be waiting a long time.

Mr. Kennedy: Again, and that's why I think that the timing is very good for this project because that's going to change and there will be improvement in the queues and stacking with the additional through lanes as part of the VDOT project. So that will change over what there is today, out there today. And so I think, from our point of view in terms of looking at the impacts, and we spent a lot of time working with VDOT and County staff to talk about the circulation and impacts associated with this property. We actually met with VDOT to discuss the entrance on 17 and the location of the elements there to try and maximize it away from the site in terms of what we can control with this particular land use application. It provided the alternatives to get in and out of the site and try to allow the choices. So the drivers will find, just like a water flow problem, the drivers will find the best ability if they're going north or south on 17. It's not a perfect solution but the way the design was set up was to satisfy the VDOT access management standards and coordinate with the existing traffic and let's project in the future with this site.

Mr. English: Sir, a quick question. The entrance that you have right now, that you've got circled at the CVS, what's the distance?

Mr. Kennedy: This entrance in here is over 300 feet away from the stacking queue here, Route 17.

Mr. English: No, I'm talking from the CVS.

Mr. Kennedy: The CVS in here, it's going to be probably about, around 200 feet. I can't give you the exact number.

Mr. English: Okay. Wasn't your entrance earlier moved up further?

Mr. Kennedy: Well, the original entrance was over in this area here further to the west. As mentioned, the entrance, as part of the improvements, there was not the double receiving lane. So, as part of the improvements, there was only one travel lane which you have today, what VDOT was doing here. As we move the entrance and committed to VDOT that we would provide a continuous lane to the entrance, we looked at the volumes coming in and out of the site and looked at we're going to be providing a continuous lane from the traffic signal which VDOT wasn't doing, so that's why we came up with the access and also to improve the internal circulation.

Mr. English: But you can't move the entrance up a little further is what I'm probably (inaudible).

Mr. Kennedy: As Debrarae mentioned, we thought this made the best location for the needs, the property, as well as satisfying the VDOT access management standards. But I think we're willing to work with you on the coordination on that.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. English: Because what I'm thinking is if move that entrance up a little further, it's going to help you with your drive-throughs and it may relieve some of, what Mr. Apicella was saying, may relieve some of this over here at CVS if you move the entrance up a little further.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, we didn't want to be in any position of doing access points in this area in here, because VDOT has said we are getting too close. They don't want another CVS situation.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, he's talking the other direction.

Mr. English: I'm talking about (inaudible).

Mr. Kennedy: Moving this way?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Kennedy: Okay. Again...

Mr. Rhodes: That's certainly a point for consideration.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright.

Mr. Kennedy: Just additionally, as part of the work, a lot of the comments in the VDOT referral were clarifications on the traffic study. We did look at those impacts and we've coordinated with VDOT to look at the language, the stacking, and I think VDOT wanted to clarify some of the text in the improvements that we had suggested (inaudible) to share that the comments, really 1 through 6, are really details that really would be addressed as part of the site plan review in terms of length of tapers, clarifications in text. We talked about the overall intersection impacts; VDOT wanted to talk about the impacts in the northbound left-turn lanes and so we've looked at what those volumes are with and without the pass-by traffic, and that's how we looked at the overall Level of Service impacts. So, I think a lot of the comments, the first five, are really more details in terms of... or the first four in terms of the traffic impact elements. I think we've addressed those and, again, I think it's a clarification. The intent is making sure the land use works appropriately. As the other thing on the Level of Service, in terms of the County Comprehensive Plan, as Ms. Karnes mentioned, the Level of Service does change in the a.m. peak by 10 seconds, as mentioned in the staff report. The 6 seconds was for particular movement. The Level of Service change, as VDOT mentioned... or as we mentioned, VDOT said don't change the signal timing. We did look at different options in our reports from last year for the application. What we could do to change the timing about 10 seconds; the signal on 17 is timed to move as much traffic as possible there and VDOT was very protective of that and we understood that. So we showed the Level of Services without making green time changes. And typically, I think, through timing and the overall corridor, there are ways to improve. And the reason the Level of Service overall degrades is because with the extra traffic with our site and growth on McWhirt Loop there's no change in the signal timing. So therefore, as you're adding more traffic there, then the delays do slightly increase. And the overall grade of the intersection, while it's at D, does have some movements in there based on the existing constraints. So we felt, at least in the study corridor, we were satisfying the intent of (inaudible) improvements, and again, the innovation is that we have spent a good amount of time working with VDOT, and I think the unique element of this project is adding the receiving lane so that VDOT can stripe the double left turns on 17... which is needed now.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. Karnes: Mr. Chairman, I know you want to get to the public hearing portion, but if... could we give Mr. Foroughi about 2 minutes to talk about internal site circulation?

Mr. Rhodes: Sure.

Mr. Foroughi: Regarding the internal site circulation...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Foroughi: Regarding the internal site circulation that we've shown, each of the drive-through buildings, A and B, do meet the minimum centerline stacking requirement that Stafford County requires which, I believe, is 150 feet -- maybe it's 160 feet, I'm not sure. But we do meet the minimum stacking requirements. The internal circulation is a way to... is a way to mitigate the concern that staff has regarding the entrance and basically jamming the traffic right into the stacking lane. We could easily solve that problem; instead of showing striping, we could easily show a 2 foot wide concrete median or hot sticks, which are basically the white sticks, the reflector sticks that stick up, which would then force traffic to circle the building and then come back around and come into the drive-through so that we wouldn't have those conflict points with the entrance and with the drive-through lane. And I believe the applicant, when we submit this plan to TRC, assuming everything goes favorably, the applicant is willing to look at the entrance, you know, with the internal circulation and all the other concern -- site distance and so on and so forth. So, he is committed to reviewing that location to help, you know, alleviate any concerns that the Planning Commission may have.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Apicella: And I'm not a transportation expert, but I'm just going to throw it out there. Would it be possible for the entrance/exit on McWhirt Loop to make it right in/right out only? You'd have a much longer length capability of putting cars stacking onto McWhirt Loop going in a westerly direction then you do no matter where the entrance is then going in an easterly direction.

Mr. Foroughi: I don't believe the applicant would be in favor of that. Most of... it's really a detriment to these retail uses if they don't have one full access.

Mr. Apicella: Well, when you say a full access, again, they have a way to ingress and a way to egress, they just wouldn't be turning left. It's a much shorter distance, again, going out of this site and going in an easterly direction along McWhirt Loop. Going back to the whole CVS problem here of people trying to get out of CVS, a conflict that this project might cause or exacerbate by people turning left onto McWhirt Loop from the project.

Mr. Foroughi: Okay, so if I'm understanding correctly, if you had a right in/right out at McWhirt Loop, someone coming in 17 south would come in our right in/right out entrance and then you would want to force everybody to Banks Fords?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Foroughi: And not have anybody go left to the signal at McWhirt Loop?

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Foroughi: I don't believe the applicant would be in favor of that.

Ms. Karnes: Well, I think the answer is that we're certainly willing to look at how best to make the site function based on your concerns. And it's not really clear to me whether that would be right in or right out, or maybe moving the entrance as we've talked about. But basically we're here to work with you and we believe this is a good application, it's consistent with the land use designations, it meets all the County requirements, you heard staff say they were generally in support, and, in fact, VDOT basically felt we resolved the comments. And so I'll be here to talk more to you after the public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for the applicant before we move into the public comment portion of the public hearing?

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I did have one question.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please Mrs. Bailey.

Mrs. Bailey: Concerning the GDP, there's a comment in there in regards to the highway corridor and the extenuation of curb and gutter past the entrance there on McWhirt Loop. Was that addressed in the response back to the staff?

Ms. Karnes: I believe I wrote a response back to the Stafford County staff on that. Basically, our team had a concern, an engineering concern that extending curb and gutter might cause a drainage problem, water draining into the entrance where it's located on McWhirt Loop. We were not sure, and so we didn't want to promise something that we weren't sure we would do. But we were willing to look at that at site plan and do it if it could be engineered reasonably.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, any other questions? Okay, thank you very much. We will now move onto the public comment portion of the public hearing. So if any member of the public hearing would like to speak on either item number 2 or item number 3, both dealing with the McWhirt Loop Commercial reclassification and Conditional Use Permit, you may come forward and do so at this time. I would ask that you state your name and your address. Once you do so, a light will turn on, a green light, indicating 3 minutes to speak. A yellow light will come on when there's 1 minute remaining and then a red light will come on and we would ask that you wrap up your comments. Would anyone like to come forward? Very good. I will close the public comment portion of the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission. If there are remaining questions that folks want to circle back on, we can always address those. I did take note of certainly a significant number of questions dealing with the... seen from different angles... dealing with that entrance off of McWhirt Loop, whether the implications on the second drive-through, whether the implications on some of the queuing, whether the implications on some of the flow, a lot of different dynamics associated with that one, and certainly heard willingness the applicant think it further.

Mr. Gibbons: I'm in the position to second that deferral.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, well this is in the Hartwood Election District.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. English: Yeah, I want to recommend deferral for 30 days because I'd like to meet with staff and the applicant because there's some questions about the entrances and stuff, so, yeah, a 30 day deferral.

Mr. Rhodes: That would be... just to confirm, 30 is a little different then... the next session would be about 29 days I think. The 11th of June, is that correct? So, that would be the 11th of June.

Mr. English: That's fine, the first meeting in June is fine.

Mr. Rhodes: So the 11th of June. So there's a motion to recommend deferral till the 11th of June, seconded in advance by Mr. Gibbons. Any further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Gibbons? Any other member?

Mr. Coen: If I could.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: I sort of held in reserve some of my questions till after the throng spoke. But I have some internal questions as well. I didn't know if, when this goes back, if the flow would be better if you switched buildings A and B, and that might alleviate the backup of traffic onto McWhirt to go into that. I have a concern with the dumpsters and the location of the dumpsters. If I understand, and I bothered staff on this over the weekend, but if the entrance to the Starbucks is basically looking over at the dumpster and I'm just a little concerned with that, especially when the trash is being collected. You're going to be having the trash trucks coming in to get the trash when people are going to be going. Again, with the flow, if people are going to be going in and out, to swing around these restaurants and fast food places, where there's limited parking, I was really concerned. For example, at the Starbucks, there's what, 8 in front, a couple up on 17 and then a handful over on the side. But then the people have to cut across there to get to that. And then the last one that I asked staff about was the loading dock. And just sort of the flow of it is that the loading dock is in the back part of the parcel, and then that would mean that the Starbucks would have to park there and then bring stuff in all the way through the parcel across traffic. And then lastly, the dumpster for the restaurant is across what hopefully, theoretically might be the nice entrance off of 17 that feeds both parcels. So then you'll have people carrying trash across trying to get across that area. So, those are just some of the concerns that sort of jumped out at me. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any further comments? Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion to defer to the first meeting in June signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; thank you very much and thank you for the presentation by staff tonight.

Mr. Gibbons: You've got to do the same thing for the CUP Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, that's right. So that was dealing with the... well, if we're just deferring, can we defer both in one?

Ms. McClendon: That's fine.

Mr. Rhodes: I think we're okay, since we're not approving; approval we do have to do separately. Okay, so that'll move us onto item number 4, Reclassification, Quantico Corporate Center, RC1400095. Mr. Harvey?

4. RC1400095; Reclassification – Quantico Corporate Center Building A-1 - A proposed reclassification from the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, with proffered conditions, to allow for the development of a commercial office building with a child care center on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 13C-F, consisting of 3.11 acres, located on the north side of Corporate Drive in Quantico Corporate Center, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: August 12, 2014)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I got a comment on that.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I feel very uncomfortable holding a public hearing on property that's in court. And it could affect the value of any decision that a court is going to determine.

Mr. Rhodes: I'll defer over to Ms. McClendon. Is there a...?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Gibbons and Mr. Chairman, based on the information we currently have, we don't see any legal impediment to this item continuing for consideration by the Planning Commission. But if the Commission has specific questions, I'll be happy to discuss it with the Commission in close session if that's your will.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so no legal impediment but certainly some general concerns (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: I disagree on that. It's a legal impediment; it's before the court now. And when you're discussing taking a property from an A-1 to a higher way, it affects the value of the property. Does it affect the value of the distribution or the settlement? I was very shocked that this thing was allowed to come to public hearing tonight. I mean, I feel uncomfortable and I've never gotten so many phone calls on something since the days I was dealing with the school budget.

Mr. English: I got a couple emails myself.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Ms. McClendon: Again, Mr. Chairman, if the Commission would like to discuss this in closed session, I would be more than welcome to it.

Mr. Gibbons: I didn't hear what she said.

Mr. Rhodes: She said if we'd like to discuss it further in closed session, we could.

Mr. Gibbons: Yes sir I would.

Mr. Rhodes: Let me find my little cool statement here.

Mr. Patrick: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Patrick: We have a comment that we think may be relevant to this that we could share if it's your pleasure.

Mr. Rhodes: I've got to straighten something out here anyways for a minute, so comment away.

Mr. Patrick: Mr. Chairman, this property is a part of a negotiated relocation of a daycare center that Mr. Hart had already planned and site plan had approved on another part of the property. The discussion with the County at that time when the County was buying land for their technology park was that, you know, Mr. Hart had to make the land available; they did not want the daycare to be on the I95 frontage. Silver Companies agreed, as with Mr. Hart, to relocate to this other location and the contract for this property is actually based on the 3-year old price of the previous site. So, that's one reason we think that there is no increase in value afforded by this rezoning. The second is, it's not going from A-1 to B-2; it's going from M-1 to B-2, which is actually a down-zoning. There are fewer uses they'll be able to do on this property after the property is zoned than they're permitted to do by-right on that property right now. And then, finally, we don't think that's a land use matter at all. And it's not a consideration that's valid for the Planning Commission to be considering as part of a rezoning. So, we don't think that the whole question even has merit, but we'll let your attorney address that in closed session.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much; appreciate it.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, it says right here, advertisement, Building A-1.

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we go into closed meeting to consult with legal counsel and discuss the advice regarding the Quantico Corporate Center.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, motion and second. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

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

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. We'll be back in a little bit.

8:12 p.m. - Went into closed meeting.

8:20 p.m. - Reconvened.

Mr. Rhodes: I'll entertain a motion here.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that the Stafford County Planning Commission certify on this, the 14th day of May, 2014, that to the best of each members' knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification applies. And only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the said closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed, or considered by the Commission.

Mr. Rhodes: Is there a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. English. Any further comment Mrs. Bailey? Mr. English? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion to certify the closed session 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. And now we're back onto item number 4, RC1400095, Reclassification, Quantico Corporate Center Building. Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. John Harbin will make this presentation.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: Good evening Mr. Chairman and Planning Commissioners, this is item 4, the reclassification of Quantico Corporate Center Building A-1. For background, this is a request to go from M-1, Light Industrial, to B-2, Urban Commercial zoning district. It's on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 13C-F just over 3 acres. The agent is Compton and Duling, LC, and the applicant is Quantico Corporate Center LLC. The location of this site is within Quantico Corporate Center. It is surrounded by other M-1 zoned properties and some B-2 zoned properties as well. It also has Quantico Marine Corps Base basically surrounding it as well, as is kind of shaded in this gray area over here and over here as well. There's the I95 Hot Lanes and I95 standard traffic lanes as well, just to the west of the site. This is the current view of the site. It is a largely undeveloped piece of property, basically in field condition right now. There is a stormwater management pond located to the rear of the site back here and another small one located just to the east. This wooded area to the east of the site is a preservation easement that contains wetlands. No other part of this site contains any streams, wetlands, or known archaeological features. This is the current view of the site.

Mr. Apicella: John, before you move on, can you go back to the previous slide? Can you, with your pen, outline what is the Quantico Corporate Center.

Mr. Harbin: Sure. So, this parcel has actually been developed here; that's got some convenience services and then it continues kind of back through here and then follows the County line and then I95.

Mr. Apicella: So, of this parcel, how much has already been developed, just as a percentage.

Mr. Harbin: Of the parcel under...?

Mr. Apicella: The Quantico Corporate Center; how much of it has been developed so far. Fifty percent? Twenty-five percent?

Mr. Harbin: I would say 40-50%.

Mr. Gibbons: I believe there's a proffer of one million square feet, isn't it, that must be developed? And I think they're almost halfway there.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Harbin: This is the proposed Generalized Development Plan for the portion of this parcel. As you can see, there is one large building located in the center of it surrounded by surface parking. There is one main entrance onto Corporate Drive that has a full access point; right in/right out and left in/left out. There are two additional connections provided to the future development that will be located... that's actually to the west as shown here. There is a play area associated with the proposed child care center located at the rear of the building that is fully fenced in. And there is a sidewalk that wraps around the building for pedestrian access. There's also a proposed patio towards the front of the building for a potential restaurant use, outdoor seating. This is a two-story building as we'll get into more during the architecture discussion. And, just to note now, the building front faces this direction, so the rear would be kind of back here and the sides would be one fronting Corporate Drive and then one towards that direction.

Mr. Apicella: John? I'm sorry. So, the bottom circle that you have, Corporate Drive, is that the main entrance into QCC?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: And so would this be the first building you pass as you go into the QCC campus?

Mr. Harbin: You would first pass the Navy Federal Credit Union Bank and then up the hill, this would be the first building on the right.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Gibbons: This is right across...

Mr. Boswell: And the Subway and the chicken place (inaudible).

Mr. Harbin: Right, I think that's on the left side.

Mr. Gibbons: But this is right across from where the hotel and the...

Mr. Harbin: Correct. It is across from the newly built Marriott Hotel. So, to get into the architecture of this building, there were renderings submitted with the application. Those renderings are proffered as we'll discuss more. Staff found some inconsistencies with the proposed architecture with the Architecture Design Guidelines. I've noted some of those inconsistencies here; mainly the flat roof without a cornice, the general orientation of the building which suggests buildings should be oriented towards the primary road which would be Corporate Drive. The smooth concrete block façade and the main doors are not oriented towards the primary road, and then also just the general consistency of this building with the other buildings currently in Quantico Corporate Center. So these were the original renderings submitted. The top rendering is the front, the bottom one is the rear of the building. As you can see, there is a mix of brick and stone façade on multiple entrances and large windows throughout the extent of the building. This is another rendering that was submitted with the original application showing the front of the building. Just to note, this would actually face east, not along Corporate Drive, so the rendering can be a little misleading. But, as the applicant will mention I'm sure they chose that orientation for a specific reason. So, a very similar building to what is proposed here was actually recently constructed along Garrisonville Road in the Doc Stone Commons development. These are two images of that nearly completed building. As you can see, it very closely resembles what is proposed at Quantico Corporate Center. You have the brick and stone façade, you have the large windows, a very single-level kind of plain in terms of the building itself, and the one main entrance in the center of the building. So, to compare that to some of the existing structures at Quantico Corporate Center, these are two of the larger buildings there. You have protruding wall planes to give the building some kind of different texture looking and variances to them. You have the roof cornices that kind of stick out. And then you have a largely brick and masonry façade on both of these buildings. You also have four stories as well. So, hearing some of our concerns, the applicant actually just submitted today some new renderings that address some of staff's concerns. Mainly, they've added a roof cornice to match the existing buildings that are at Quantico Corporate Center and added much more brick to the exterior of the building. You still have kind of one single wall plain on all sides of the building, but I do think this kind of dresses up the appearance of the building a bit. So, proffers for this reclassification -- they do proffer a maximum building height and two stories of building, they limit the square feet to 40,000, they require building architecture to be in general conformance with the submitted renderings; at this time it would be the original renderings but we would update the ordinance to reflect the newer ones. They would limit the exterior sides of the building to brick, split-block, stone, masonry, hardiplank, or dryvit construction materials requiring any rooftop and ground level equipment and trash receptacles to be

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

screened, provide standards for building materials used for screening purposes mainly that they would be brick or stone and match the main building, require all signs to be internally illuminated, require freestanding parking lot fixtures to be compatible with those used on adjacent properties at the maximum height of 14 feet, they would prohibit some of the uses otherwise allowed in the B-2 zoning district, it would allow for a child care center on the first floor of the building, and also require the operator of that child care center to advise parents of the proximity to Marine Corps Base Quantico and the potential for noise and vibration coming from there. They would require the building to have an automatic fire suppression system, require to the extent reasonably possible and practicable the use of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design strategies, and they would require a pedestrian connection from the parking lot across Corporate Drive to the existing sidewalk network. There is no sidewalk on the side of the road that this building is proposed. And they would require full vehicular access around the building to be maintained.

Mr. Rhodes: So they've only got sidewalk on one side there?

Mr. Harbin: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: I'll be darn.

Mr. Harbin: Yes, that is a private road.

Mr. Rhodes: That doesn't make sense.

Mr. Harbin: I agree. So, their TIA determination form states that there will almost 4,000 vehicle trips per day, 220 peak a.m., 256 peak p.m. vehicle trips per hour. These results were based on a medium intensity commercial retail use at full build-out, and what they're actually proposing to use here, which would be mainly office and the child care center and potentially like a restaurant, would result in a much, much lower traffic volume. Both TIAs incorporated... or for Quantico Corporate Center incorporated the uses that are proposed at this site and found that the transportation infrastructure to be adequate to accommodate the uses. The Corporate Drive pedestrian crosswalk, the speed limit along Corporate Drive is 25 miles per hour; however, vehicles typically travel at a much higher rate especially due to that steep grade going down to the stoplight on Jefferson Davis Highway. Traffic-calming measures should be considered at the crosswalk; maybe a raised crosswalk or a speed hump of some kind. The site is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan which slights this for business and industry uses and is also part of the Boswell's Corner Redevelopment Area. So staff finds the positives of this proposal are that it is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan land use recommendation, it's consistent with the established and proposed development patterns of Quantico Corporate Center, mainly the uses that are proposed here. And the proffers would minimize visual impacts and enhance the safety of the site. The negatives are that the architecture and layout of the proposed building is not fully compliant with the Architectural Design Guidelines. And I will note that with their most recently submitted renderings, that has addressed some of the concerns there.

Mr. Boswell: We're a lot closer.

Mr. Harbin: Yes. So, staff is generally supportive of this reclassification with the proposed proffers and would ask that the Planning Commission consider the architecture and layout of the proposed buildings and any changes needed to make it in conformance with the design guidelines.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Questions for staff?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. English: Daycare.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Mr. English.

Mr. English: The playground that's slated for the back of the playground... I mean, the daycare. Is that going to be... is it going to be fenced in? Bricked in?

Mr. Harbin: Yes. It will have a board-on-board fencing surrounding it.

Mr. English: So it's not going to be brick and mortar and then fence? It's just going to be fenced in?

Mr. Harbin: I believe so. I can't zoom in on this GDP any more but...

Mr. Harvey: Computer please.

Mr. English: And also, is that facing... where is it in comparison to 95 on this? Where is 95 to that?

Mr. Gibbons: It's way down from that.

Mr. Harbin: You can kind of see it on the location map over there. It's a significant distance away from 95. It's probably the most furthest building pad locations in the whole development from the highway.

Mr. Rhodes: One of the first slides had that orientation, didn't it?

Mr. Harbin: Yes. Did that answer your question?

Mr. English: Yes, thanks John.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, other questions for staff?

Mrs. Bailey: I do Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mrs. Bailey.

Mrs. Bailey: John, is there a restriction on the size of the child care center that would be allowed there?

Mr. Harbin: No, they have not proffered a maximum size of that.

Mrs. Bailey: Okay, so there's no restriction on the number of children?

Mr. Harbin: That is correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Just a couple of questions, one that just occurred to me. How will people know that there's a daycare center there? Is there going to be signage or something of such?

Mr. Harbin: I believe there will probably be some sort of exterior signage.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Coen: Okay, but I am accurate; I didn't actually see it.

Mr. Harbin: Yes. On the renderings (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: Okay. And then I had emailed you, in that long annoying email, if the premise is that this daycare would service the people in the whole center, individuals that work in other buildings would come by to drop off their kids. But I'm not really seeing a way for parents to drop off their kids other than taking a regular parking space. And so I'm accurate in that there's no real procedure for that.

Mr. Harbin: Yes. Right, and I think they would be... yes, they would park, walk their kid in, leave, and then go back to their office.

Mr. Coen: And if parking is tight, then it's a bit of a haul. And two other things just to put out there. The building and then the play area is separated just by a sidewalk. There's nothing... I mean, I guess the children will be fenced in, in some format. But there's really nothing between the building and the fenced in area. Mr. English put on his policeman hat, I'll put on my having done daycare at a school hat. There's always a concern about the logistics of getting the children here and there and people being around where you don't want them to be and it just seems as though there's an easy way for people to grab. And so I'm concerned about that. And then the last concern that I emailed you about was the positioning of the dumpster up towards... granted it's the side of the building, but if you're going up and down Corporate Center, it's really the front of the building that you would see even though it's supposed to be blockaded and this, that and the other. I am right that that's where the main dumpster for the entire complex, including the daycare, is going to be way up towards Corporate Drive, right?

Mr. Harbin: I believe the dumpsters are proposed to be at the rear of the site.

Mr. Coen: Down at the bottom? Okay.

Mr. Harbin: Yes. There is a loading area.

Mr. Coen: The loading dock is up at the front.

Mr. Harbin: A small one, correct. There is an additional one in the rear as well.

Mr. Coen: Right, okay; thank you.

Mr. Harbin: There's two.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions? Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: John, you were concerned about the orientation of the building?

Mr. Harbin: Yes.

Mr. Gibbons: What would you feel would be better?

Mr. Harbin: The Architectural Design Guidelines suggest the building should be oriented towards the road. This one is... the front of the building is 90° away from the road, so that's what I meant by the orientation of the building.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Gibbons: And they have no intention of changing it?

Mr. Harbin: No. I believe they thought as you come up Corporate Drive there, it would provide a better view of the building, if it's oriented the way it's supposed here. So that was the reasoning.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay; Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: A couple questions. First of all, is there a Quantico Corporate Center master plan, strategic plan, some kind of visioning document that kind of articulates what the plan and uses are at QCC?

Mr. Harbin: Absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: Is that something we can get?

Mr. Harbin: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Are there any advisory or governing bodies at QCC?

Mr. Harbin: I'll have to look into that.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I thought there was a board, some kind of advisory board... I don't know...

Mr. Harbin: A homeowner's association equivalent of...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I thought there were some Supervisors, some EDA members, I don't know the exact makeup but I thought there was some kind of institutional framework to kind of help move this thing along. But again, I could be wrong. And where I'm going is I'm trying to understand, in the context of what's proposed to happen at QCC, if a daycare center was envisioned as part of the plan, number one. And number two, was this the location that was originally envisioned or the only location that is possible on the site.

Mr. Harbin: Right. It's my understanding that a daycare was originally envisioned in this master plan for QCC. It had it located a little further down Corporate Drive where it intersects with Telegraph Road I believe. And that land where it was proposed is now County-owned property for our research park.

Mr. Apicella: Are there any other parcel, pads, what have you, on the larger campus where a daycare center could be sited?

Mr. Harbin: Sure; there's the adjacent parcel to where this is proposed. There's undeveloped pads.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Harbin: There's no other B-2 zoned property.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but within the context of rezoning, they could rezone another section of QCC for a daycare center. The proffer statement speaks to some excluded uses that would otherwise be allowable; however, there's a number of other uses that would continue to be allowable. Again...

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Gibbons: He's got them all listed.

Mr. Apicella: I know, and I've also got the list of ones that would continue. So, I'm just kind of interested why some other ones... we've got a building that's proposed to be built in this site; however, there's a lot of other uses that may not fit within this building which leads me to my next question. Is it taking up the entire... when I look at the documentation that you provided that says site, is this taking up the entire site or could other uses be also added? Once we rezone this to B-2 are there other areas of the site that could have some kind of B-2 use that's not spoken to at this point in time?

Mr. Harbin: Okay, to clarify that the rezoning is a portion of this site, as what's known as the site in the maps. So, it's only rezoning a portion of that parcel 13C-F.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Harbin: So the remaining portion of that parcel would continue to be zoned M-1.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Well that, again, that being said there are still some uses on here on the list of B-2 uses that would still be allowable. And my inquiry goes along the lines of we have a visioning document, potentially a strategic plan, a master plan, we have I think a board that is either advisory or a governing board; I'm curious how what's being proposed here fits in with the documentation and with what the governing board thinks is right and appropriate or best in this particular occasion. So, have we gotten any input from this board to see what they think about this proposed rezoning?

Mr. Harbin: I have not.

Mr. Apicella: Is that something we could request?

Mr. Harbin: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: So, both in the context of an office with a daycare center, plus all of these other uses that are still allowable that have not been excluded, I'd be curious to know what they think about that. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: And I was trying to skim through to see again, 3,957 trips a day all going through the one entrance?

Mr. Harbin: Right, that was their original form. That's what they stated.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mr. Harbin: That was using the maximum use for the site, medium level commercial retail, which is not what is proposed for the use although not also explicitly proffered out.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And then along on the same vein, not to sound like Mr. Apicella, but if we're having people drive in and out just to drop off children through this one entrance... I think I know the answer is no... but when they were doing this computation, did they take that into account?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Harbin: Absolutely.

Mr. Coen: It's always nice to ask questions you know. And then lastly, if another part of the parcel is still M-1, by-right they could put in a mini storage in that because that's by-right under M-1 next to this if they so still desired. I'm just curious why they just didn't rezone the entire parcel to be if they're not going to.

Mr. Boswell: No, that was proffered out in the original rezoning, so, they couldn't put a mini storage in there.

Mr. Coen: But I mean, they could still under M-1 put something.

Mr. Boswell: They could put a lot of things but mini storage was proffered out. Right, that was proffered out in the (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: Right, but I guess the big question is why not rezone the entire parcel if you're going to rezone, you know... instead of just one chunk?

Mr. Apicella: I think your question is compatibility. So, if you get an office with a daycare center next to an M-1, are those going to fit together well?

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions before we have the applicant come up? Okay, thank you very much. Applicant please.

Mr. Patrick: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I have to tell you that I'm very excited to be standing behind the microphone and be able to answer some of those questions that you were just asking because there's a great deal of misunderstanding about this proposal. I'm Sherman Patrick; I work for Compton and Duling. We are here this evening representing Quantico Business Center, LLC, the developer of this, what we now know as Quantico Corporate Center, and also representing Quantico Partners which is Mr. Hart and his partners who are proposing to build the building that would be located on this property that a quarter of which would house a daycare center. I feel that perhaps some people are thinking that this building is going to be a daycare center in its own right. That's not the case. No more than 10,000 square feet would be used for a daycare center use; the rest of the building would be used for office uses, perhaps a restaurant, and other things. A restaurant is permitted by-right already under the industrial zoning, so that's nothing new. And really what this rezoning is about is to create the opportunity to locate a daycare center within the park which is a part of the original plan for this park because they realize that as an employment center, you would have many working parents who would be coming to the property. And what better opportunity to serve them and support the employees than to have a location onsite where they can go and check on their children at lunchtime or where they can drop them off, whether on their way to work and when they're leaving work, so that they're not making side trips and adding traffic to the County roads. Now, not all of those people will be employees within the park; there'll be a few people from outside. But I think that it's very clear that there'll be a very high, what we call capture rate, for the traffic that is already coming to this site to go and use the daycare center aspect of the 40,000 square foot office building that's being proposed. The rezoning is being proposed because of all of the uses that are permitted in the M-1, Light Industrial zoning district, daycare center is not. The reason some questions were asked about proffers or limitations on the uses of this property, there is a set of documents that we commonly refer to as covenants. Most homeowners would know that term, but it's called a declaration in a legal sense. And a declaration is what controls the uses within this property. And this declaration is the creation of the

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Silver Company which is the parent company that owns Quantico Business Center. And it is wholly their creation. When you look at Quantico Corporate Center, what you see there is there because the Silver Companies wants it there and they wanted it there. It's not because of any County plan. It's not because of the zoning of the property, because they could do warehouses, mini warehouses, saw mills, they could do all kinds of things under the existing zoning of the property. But they've decided that they want to build an office park. And that's what they've done. And that's what they continue to want to do. And the childcare center use is only a very small percentage of the overall development of what they had in mind here. So, it's their concept. I just want to be sure that that was clear. I mentioned already that going to a B-3 zoning is a downzoning; it is a downzoning because right now you could do the warehouse and some of those other things but that's not what they want. The industrial district also allows you to do the office park and that's what they've been developing there. We're making this adjustment to one parcel...

Mr. Gibbons: I thought you said B-2 on your document here.

Mr. Patrick: I'm sorry, did I say the wrong zoning district? M-1 is the existing zoning of the property; B-2 is what's being requested on 3.11 acres.

Mr. Gibbons: Right. But you said B-3.

Mr. Patrick: I'm sorry. I made a mistake. So there are controlling documents, regulations on this; it's called a declaration. This has gone to the Architectural Review Board and I wasn't going to hand this out until later but I'll give it to you now. I have a letter from the managing principal of the project that is approving the architecture for this building. And I'll get into the architecture in more detail in a second here. Okay, let's see... how do I advance slides?

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Patrick: What you see on the screen before you now is an overall view of Quantico Corporate Center with the addition of a couple of parcels that the County purchased in this area here, on the far left-hand side of the screen. Those three parcels there were at one point, one of those parcels was where the daycare center was proposed.

Mr. Rhodes: Can you get the pen working, somebody?

Mr. Patrick: I have a bad track record with this pen.

Mr. Rhodes: I couldn't do it either.

Mr. Patrick: Okay. That parcel right there. And the County had the concept that they wanted to buy some property and they wanted to have a research park. So they took these properties from the line that I drew over to the left... I hate marking up my plan so I'm going to be very stingy with this... so they have the concept that they wanted to have that there. Mr. Hart had already contracted to buy that property, he had a site plan for that property, and he agreed with the County and with Silver and the entities that needed to, to relocate the child care concept to somewhere else in the park. And where that is, is now here.

Mr. Boswell: That piece that you have the star on, to the left, what was that zoned when the County bought it? So, it was a piece of B-2 property that you had already zoned that the County now owns.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Patrick: Yes sir.

Mr. Boswell: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Patrick: Note the location of I95 at the top of the screen and Route 1 at the bottom of the screen. You also see the entrance to the park here at Corporate Drive. And if you recall the property, you come in at Route 1 and then you immediately begin to go upward; you go uphill. Someone had asked about the developed capacity... or rather what had it been developed already versus what capacity is left. The development that has occurred already is about 40% of the potential of what's been planned for this site. This is an aerial photograph that also outlines Quantico Center Corporate Park. You can see that there are areas that are not yet developed. There are four 4-story buildings, there is a 3-story building. One of the 4-story buildings is the lodging, the hotel, that's located where I put the asterisk. And the entrance into this site will be directly across the street from there. The heavy white line indicates or outlines the Quantico Corporate Center. Mr. Harbin mentioned that the site, as he described it, was what he had outlined in blue on his exhibits and so I've used blue on this exhibit. But the actual site is what I've outlined on this exhibit in yellow. This is where the rezoning is proposed. Within that yellow boundary is 3.11 acres, and in the center of that is an office building. So some of the uses that you may be concerned that could still be allowed in the B-2 district, as a practical matter can't happen because they are going to be prohibited by the building design itself. And we have proffered the building design.

Mr. Gibbons: Why didn't you rezone the whole site?

Mr. Patrick: Somehow I feel like if I was rezoning the whole site you'd be asking me why were we rezoning the whole site instead of just doing half of it.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, I apologize to you. I'm not doubting your integrity, I'm just asking you a question.

Mr. Patrick: Because this is the property that Mr. Hart and his partners had contracted to purchase.

Mr. Gibbons: So the rest of it will remain M-1.

Mr. Patrick: Yes sir, that's correct, along with the rest of the park... along with the rest of the Corporate Center. The entrance to the site is here. And, again, the Marriott Hotel is directly across the street and the entrance aligns with that. I mentioned earlier that as you enter the site, you go uphill. And it's a constant uphill climb until you get back in here somewhere. One of the concerns that was raised or question was asked about sidewalks. The reason that there aren't sidewalks on the right-hand side of the road is because of the topography of the property and because of the topography, this site will actually notch into that hill which is an environmental approach to trying to maintaining the existing integrity of the property. Instead of mass grading the entire property and making it flat, you try to work the buildings into the topography and have grade changes between the properties. So, the reason there's not sidewalk on this side of Corporate Drive is because it's too steep and sidewalks are provided on the other side. The reason traffic operating speed is higher than 25 miles per hour is probably because there's not very much going on in there yet. It's only 40% developed. As it builds out, just as rural roads, you have a lot of people who are driving a little faster than they should; but as those communities build out, then there is a calming effect on transportation. The site itself ends back here; it doesn't go all the way back to the stormwater management structure. And the improvements that you see on the property are based on that topography as well. If you were to try to rotate the building around, then you would be bucking the grades it's called. So, if you take a rectangle and you make it parallel more or less, the major access parallel to the slope of the topography, then you're having less impact on the

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

topography and you're not doing as much grading. If you try to swing that building around 90% and then you have to do a lot of extra grading and there's a lot of extra earth disturbance and environmental impact as a result of that. If you look at the buildings throughout the Corporate Center that have already been built, that same strategy has been used. And, you can't see it as well yet in this photograph, but if you look at them closely, you'll see also that the entrances, the primary entrances to a lot of these buildings are not facing Corporate Drive. They're located in the center of those rectangles again for efficiency. If you were to put the front door of the building here and then run a center hallway down the entire length of the building, you'd be wasting a lot of building space. All of those things have environmental impacts. They will result in excess heating and air conditioning costs, as well as construction costs. And so this is the types of things that are being considered as a site like this is planned.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Patrick, I'm sorry, can you go back to the previous slide?

Mr. Patrick: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: So that's a pond over to the right-hand side?

Mr. Patrick: Yes, that's a stormwater management pond that serves the Corporate Center.

Mr. Apicella: And what barriers are there going to be between the daycare center and the pond?

Mr. Patrick: There is substantial distance and, as you've already noted and we've talked about some and we'll talk about some more no doubt, the residents or the children at the daycare center will be within that confined area. They will be within the fenced area of the outdoors or they'll be accompanied by adults when they're outside. You have to keep in mind the scale of this; I did not point this out but Interstate 95 to the north and Route 1 to the south, this site is smack dab between the two. And it's about, it's almost a thousand feet from each. This is the site plan for the proposed office building. It's 40,000 square feet, about 10,000 square feet or less of that will be used for the child care use. The outdoor play area is identified on the plan. The intended design for the enclosing of that outdoor play area is to have a knee wall, not unlike this, of masonry and to have a fence on top of that. The daycare use would be located on the first floor on the rear portion of the building. It takes up about a quarter of the total building, square footage. There is some potential for a restaurant in the front part of the building and there would be access points to the restaurant from the front, and it would also have in whatever business that locates in the front, the front portion of the building, that front wall that's parallel to Corporate Drive would have their own entrance and would have their own front. So, when that part of those tenants move in and they start to design their floor plans and they have their own identity, then there will be additional enhancements to the front of the building... if you have to call it a front... to that façade of the building so that it will have a front type of treatment. But in a building like this where you have multiple tenants, you have multiple entry points and you have multiple fronts.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Patrick, I'm sorry. Going to Mr. Coen's question, how... will there be some kind of signage, either separate from the building itself or on the building, that says Minnieland or whatever kind of daycare center this turns out to be? Or will it be just common knowledge that there's a daycare center there without some kind of external signage?

Mr. Patrick: Yes sir, there will be signage on the building. There is a space for a freestanding sign on Corporate Drive and there is also the electronic message board out on I95 where tenants or occupants of the Corporate Center are allowed to let people know that they exist.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Apicella: But on the building itself there won't be a sign?

Mr. Patrick: There will be a sign on the building. But the design and that type of detail has not been done yet because we really only know of one tenant at this point, or a couple of tenants.

Mr. Gibbons: Are you going to put the signage the same as you have on the rest of the buildings? They are always neat on the roof level.

Mr. Patrick: Yes sir. They would have to go through an architectural review under those terms of the declaration that I mentioned earlier. And the architectural review would be mandating that there be some uniformity in height. They try to maintain a standard, they call it a band, of advertising, whether that's at the top or more at a pedestrian level or not I can't say right now because they have not yet been designed. But the concept is that they will be reviewed for their consistency on the building and their appearance.

Mr. Coen: If I could... so, if I understand, the signage out on the Drive for the daycare, if there's a restaurant there'll be additional signage for a restaurant. And then there'll be signage on the building for both.

Mr. Patrick: The sign program that I noticed when I was out there earlier had addresses on freestanding signs out on Corporate Drive. And I imagine that that's going to be the way that they would continue to advertise. The major signs were on the building façades themselves. But, as I've said before, the signs have not been designed as of yet; we haven't gotten to that level of detail and scrutiny. And that, frankly, is because they're trying to build a 40,000 square foot office building. And they have the daycare tenant, of course, because they think that's an attractive and supportive use to the overall park, but they don't have all of the other space assigned yet. There was a question about the loading space at the... toward the front of the building. Again, I have to make the point that when you have a building of this type with multiple tenants and multiple entrances and uses in that building, you don't really have a front in the traditional sense. It's not like a single-family dwelling where you always, or almost always, know that, you know, which side of the building is the front. In a case like this, you tend to make all the façades as attractive as you can and make them as useful as you can because frankly otherwise you end up having interior hallways that eat up space and have the impacts that I've already mentioned. So, this loading space that there was some concern about was previously back here where the dumpsters are. And staff said, well, we don't think that should be at the back of the building; we think it should be somewhere else. I don't know if they said toward the front closer to Corporate Drive or not but this is where we put it. The playground, as you can see, the play area is on the very back of the building and so obviously you wouldn't want a loading space back in that area. The restaurant and potential outdoor seating is located at the other corner. This seems like the appropriate place to put it. And then, in addition, I mentioned to you earlier that the site was going to be notched into the hill. You see this heavy black line here that I'm highlighting now in red, that is actually a retaining wall. And so, as you drive past this property, you're not going to see a truck if one happens to be there unloading. Your eyes are attracted elsewhere and you're looking over top of it because the elevation of the road is higher. The loading operation, remember, is an infrequent occurrence and it's a very short term occurrence. So, if you get too wrapped around designing the site around a loading space, the tail's wagging the dog. The loading space itself, except when a truck is sitting in it, will be pretty innocuous; it just looks like another parking space. You'll look right over it, you won't notice the marking on the pavement I'm sure unless you're right in the site. I don't see anything else on this slide that I wanted to touch on. So, let's talk about the architecture for a minute. I handed staff a memorandum or a letter rather from the Silver Company to Mr. Hart talking about their acceptance and approval of his design. That design was

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

actually for this building, but it conveys to the next building which is also very similar. I think if there's a criticism of the design of this building, it might be a criticism of the rendering rather than a criticism of the actual architecture. It's an attractive building. It's very similar to a lot of the designs of the other buildings. What has been identified as the front of the building is the treatment, the architectural treatment here over to give it some accent and give it some relief. One of the criticisms I heard was that there was a flat wall. Well, this feature is absolutely to break up any potential for a flat wall. The architecture already has relief in it and it has a nice awning such as is customary now on a lot of architecture and protects those who enter and exit the building. So, the staff criticisms were that there were parapet walls; actually there were, they just couldn't see them. There was a concern that there should be cornices on the building and some of the other buildings did, in fact, have cornices on them. And so an alternative, as Mr. Harbin said, has been put forward that shows the cornice on the building which actually increases the height of the parapet. The building orientation, you know, the primary entrance is going to be very visible as you go up Corporate Drive but, at the same time, there are going to be other façade improvements as different tenants move into the building. And the Architectural Control Board has approved this and it's not different from many of the other buildings, most of the other buildings that are already in this area, particularly the office buildings. There was some discussion about the building materials and finishes. The new design, instead of using the sandstone-like block that you saw in the first architectural design, which were large block, they will use brick, which was used more widely throughout the development. And, of course, there's a question of compatibility with other buildings. We think this is very compatible with the other buildings. What I have in this slide is the proffered rendering that was given to staff and was transmitted in the staff report, and then I have the revised rendering, an alternative design labeled here that shows the new architecture, if you will. It's using more brick, as I said before; it has the cornice that has been added here which is common to some of the other buildings, the elements in the other buildings; there's more brick at this level, also more common in the other units. I also want to point out that there is also a feature at the end as I was describing before. A building like this has multiple entrances; it doesn't really have a front and back. If you get into a warehouse project or a back office-like project, yeah, you have a back of the building. But in an office park like this you don't really have a back of the building. This is a larger view of the same exhibits. I just had the other two I wanted to put them juxtaposed to one another so you could see what the differences were. I think this is an attractive building. In this I have tried to get the pictures next to the rendering so that you can judge for yourself about the compatibility. And you can see in this design that there's quite a bit of variation in the office park, which is not a bad thing. Different corporate users want to have their own identity; they don't want to be in a part where all of the buildings look the same. So, we have the Navy Federal which is actually visible out on Route 1. It's very different; that's an entry-type use. There's also the retailer user on the opposite side of Corporate Drive from the Navy Federal; that's where the Subway is located and several other users. And this is a side view of that building. Actually this is the view that you see from Corporate Drive of that particular building, and you can see that the front, if you will, the primary entrances, are facing Route 1 and not facing Corporate Drive. And then across the bottom we have three buildings that are pretty different from one another, but all have similar architectural themes. The one that's least obvious is this building that has a lot of glass on the front of it. Clearly they have a corporate identity that they're trying to, you know, to make the use of and make a part of their visual statement. But over on the side, the other side of the building and on the other façades, they also have the same type of brick that's been used throughout the corporate park. And there is oversight with these kinds of things. People are looking at these designs and making sure that they agree that they're consistent. So, with that, I wanted to let you know that you've mentioned a lot of things. I've tried to address as many of them as I could remember. I have a representative here from Quantico Business Center and Silver Companies. He's the Vice President, David Newman, and can answer specific questions you might have on the history of the park, but I can tell you that it's not proffered, it's zoned M-1, it's there because that's the design that they

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

wanted to create. This is not them abandoning their concept for this property. It's located in the middle of the park; it's not located out toward the fringes. There isn't going to be a car dealership nestled into the ground floor of the office building. The office building really does control the uses as well as the proffered restrictions that are being offered, and those are located in attachment 9, page 3. So there is a long list. Mr. Apicella may have a few things that he'd like to talk to us about adding to that list. We'll talk about that. But the main thing is that we hear you have questions and we're here to answer them. So, I can only ask you to ask your questions, let us answer them, and then take action on this this evening because we think that we have a very well thought out plan, we think that this is a self-regulating corporate park that has done nothing but good for the County. It's an economic success story. I can tell you that the jurisdictions to the north are talking about this office park and wondering how they can duplicate its success. And so I think it's a very strong asset for the County, and what we'd like to do is to move forward this evening onto the Board hearing as quickly as we can because time is money and it affects everyone. Also, we have this evening Tim Leopold from the family that owns Minnieland. They have 73, 75-some locations. They know their business very well. They've been in this business for over 30 years that I know of, and they do a really good job and they have some of the nicest playgrounds that I've seen. I know one of them, up where I work, is very close to me and I see it very frequently. So, with that, if you have any questions of me, I will try to answer them. I hope I answered yours. If you have any more questions, if I can't answer them I have other people here that can. The civil engineer is here as well, and we can get through all of these this evening.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for the applicant? You did a good job. Very good, thank you. I'd to now move to the public comment portion of the public hearing. If there's anyone here who would like to speak on item number 4, the reclassification of Quantico Corporate Center Building A-1, you may come forward and do so at this time. Okay, very good. I'll close the public comment portion of the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission for further discussion on the item. I do know this is, what... if there are particular final additional questions of staff or the applicant or certainly this is also in the Griffis-Widewater District. Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: I was just going to wait.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Coen: Well, just a couple of questions I had brought up weren't addressed about the... for the daycare, dropping off and picking up. And a major concern I have is, again, the entrance in and out. I mean, I can envision if there's a restaurant there, people trying to make left-hand turns on that road which, during rush hour, is pretty busy. I understand that it's notched. So I'm just concerned about the traffic aspect of going in and out and then picking up the children.

Mr. Rhodes: So those would be the applicant. Is there any responses dealing with the drop off/pick up with their particular plans or associated with the childcare.

Mr. Patrick: Mr. Chairman, if it's okay with you I'd to address those in reverse.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Patrick: And the reason I want to do that is because I want to ask Mr. Leopold to come up because he's the expert on childcare and how they run their operation. So I'll let him answer the more complicated question. With respect to the entrance, one thing that I did not cover is that the way that the application process is structured, is it tells you to take the highest and worst use, in terms of traffic

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

generation... the don't use the word use, but they say the highest traffic generators... and apply it to the entire building. And so what our traffic analysis showed when we submitted that little form, was an assumption that there were going to be retail stores throughout the entire second floor and throughout the entire ground floor. So, it really exaggerated what the potential traffic from the site is going to be. This is one of those instances where I believe that the design of the building is going to control that. But I wanted to make that point. The traffic that is coming in and out of this site is less than it would be for a, particularly during peak hours, than it would be for an office building. If the entire building were an office building, everybody would be pretty much arriving at a very concentrated timeframe. The childcare operation, as Mr. Leopold will explain, has more of a dissemination over a 3-hour period of arrivals and departures because it depends on where people are located and their work times. So with that, I'll let Mr. Leopold explain to you how they do the drop-off and pick-up.

Mr. Leopold: Good evening. On the site plan that John has, we've designated I believe it's 12 to 15 parking spaces...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Leopold: So, in the front of the play yard, you can see how it kind of angles around. So these would be considered parent pick-up and drop-off, which can be identified with signage. And a common misconception is everyone just kind of arrives all at the same time where what we've proven over the years is, you know, we open at 6, the parent drop-off starts at 6 but continues through 9 a.m. depending on different schedules, different, you know, what their schedules are and what their work habits are. So, over the course of the morning, it starts at 6 but high traffic time ends around 9 o'clock, 9 a.m. And then, on the flip side of that, when they're picking up, picking up could start anywhere from 2:30 but then continue on through 6:30 p.m. So these spots would be designated and, you know, there is a chance that those are full and when a parent or two comes and then they would have to part potentially in these areas here. Any other questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Any other questions?

Mr. Apicella: Mrs. Bailey asked this question; I'm sorry to restate it. But we heard tonight that one quarter of the building or about 10,000 square feet would be dedicated to the daycare center. What does that translate into number of children?

Mr. Leopold: Yeah, that equates to about 150 children.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And what's the highest age of child that might be at the facility?

Mr. Leopold: We anticipate that the use here will be mainly of the preschool ages but we will cater to children that are 3 months all the way to 12 years of age. And when I say 12, anywhere from kindergarten through 12 years of age which is right around 6; so 6 to 12 are considered before and after. So they would show up, you know, before school and then be bused to wherever they're in elementary school, and then they would get dropped back off in the afternoon hours and stay from approximately...

Mr. Boswell: Do you guys do the busing or do we have a school bus stop there?

Mr. Leopold: Typically in this situation we would do our own busing. I think...

Mr. Boswell: When you say typically, I mean, is that what's going to happen here?

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Leopold: You know, it depends on the County jurisdiction and how many schools they usually have. This particular situation where you've got parents in a commercial office space, it's hard for me to predict the future.

Mr. Boswell: Well, I'm just asking where your bus stop is going to be.

Mr. Rhodes: Do you have any in Stafford County where the County is actually doing the busing?

Mr. Leopold: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Where is that at?

Mr. Leopold: Aquia Park.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Boswell: Where does that bus pick up? Does it go in there or does it pick up out on Route 1? That's a tight parking lot.

Mr. Leopold: Yeah, it pulls in and then pulls out.

Mr. Boswell: Wow!

Mr. Leopold: And then, of course, there's... we also have a daycare in Park Ridge.

Mr. Apicella: So, how would the size of this facility compare to the other ones that you have in Stafford?

Mr. Leopold: This would be smaller than normal. We have designed this space to cater to, you know, the working class parents in the Quantico Corporate Center and we anticipate them to have younger children.

Mr. Apicella: And have you done a ratio analysis of number of students coming from parents who work in the facility versus those who are coming from offsite?

Mr. Leopold: Back when we were going to go into the other building, we surveyed the current people that were using Quantico Corporate Center and, you know, we did not survey outside of that Quantico Corporate Center community. So we found a large enough need within Quantico Corporate Center that would fill the requirement for us to make a daycare center work in the Quantico Corporate Center.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Any other questions? Yes Mr. Boswell.

Mr. Leopold: I did want to say one more thing, when you guys brought up safety of the play yards. I do appreciate you guys thinking about the safety and we take it even more serious than I would hope you all as a Board do. And we would definitely have a wall around here...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Leopold: ... with a fence on top of that and gated access here and here.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: Yes, I would... based on the comments and questions by a couple of the Commissioners, I'd like to move to defer this until the June 25th meeting.

Mr. Gibbons: Second Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, motion to defer to June 25th and seconded. Further comment Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: Yes, I would hope that by then we can get a comment from what here now is a tech board that can give us some insight on what they think about this. And I'd just like to say one of my conversations with a couple of the Commissioners were, they were concerned with how a daycare center at the entrance of the site was going to impact the entire site. But, as you saw on the compatibility picture we had, this isn't at the entrance to the site. It's midway of the hill going up. At the entrance to the site we've got a Teriyaki chicken, a Subway, a barber shop on the left, and we've got a bank on the right. So, we've already got B-2 at the entrance, so I don't see any harm that this B-2 commercial could cause that hasn't already been done to the Corporate Center. But anyway, that's just my opinion. That's all I have.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, further comments Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, I'd like to make two. There's an old saying, if a duck is a duck, call it a duck. So, if you're going to build a building and it's mostly office and a small restaurant, just proffer that. I'd appreciate that. And the other thing is, Mr. Chairman, I was one of three that handled this site when we got it, traded it, and went down so I know the proffers and I know what was agreed upon. And it's just not the Silver Company, this Board of Supervisors laid out what it was going to be and what it's goal was. And from the beginning we always envisioned that a daycare center would be the proper thing there. But the architect bothers me, the alignment bothers me, and those things have to be addressed. And Mr. Leopold is a very outstanding person when it comes to daycare. But when you have 150 students, 150 children, you've got a lot of traffic. Six or seven parking spaces is not going to handle that problem. And if you want to learn something, go up to Hartwood Elementary when they let out at night and every road is blocked because all the moms are coming to pick them up. So when you've got 150 children, you've got to have, I'll go back to what Mr. Coen said, you've got to have a little different pick-up or loading zone. But I appreciate it; thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. Other comments? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Thank you. My other concern, which has been more from this evening, is the restaurant aspect of it, which I understand hasn't been flushed out or cooked, but my concern is, is that once you add a restaurant into there, that's going to change some of the dynamics of the traffic as well and the time of day and etcetera. So, I understand the concept of putting the daycare in and I remember way back then when you were working on that, Mr. Gibbons, and there is a need for that. I can understand the restaurant wanting to be there, but I also have a concern with just that one entrance with that, with people trying to go different directions, especially as they go up a hill or people coming down the hill. But I understand the mindset and the different aspects of it, but I just have a concern about the daycare and the restaurant.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Mr. Apicella?

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, the applicant provided a pretty informative brief. I wonder if we could get a copy of it and perhaps also provide it to representatives of the Tech Board to help them in their review of the project, as well as any other material that we've been provided thus far.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other comments? Very good. All those in favor of the motion dealing with RC1400095, Reclassification, Quantico Corporate Center Building A-1, to defer to June 25th signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed, so we will take this back up on June 25th. Thank you all very much for a great presentation. With that we're going to move onto Unfinished Business, item number 5, RC1300524, the Reclassification of Stafford Nursing Home and Retirement Community Minor Proffer Amendment. Mr. Harvey.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. RC1300524; Reclassification – Stafford Nursing Home & Retirement Community Minor Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcels 44FF-1, 44FF-2, and 44FF-2B, zoned LC, Life Care/Retirement Community, consisting of 21.77 acres, located on the east side of Berea Church Road and along both sides of Brimley Drive, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: July 22, 2014) (History: Deferred on April 23, 2014 to May 14, 2014)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mike Zuraf will give an update for the staff.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. This issue was last considered at your last public meeting on April 23rd. There was a public hearing held at that time. The case was deferred to this meeting to allow time for the district Commissioner to consider comments made during the public hearing. In your package we included the proffers as were original proposed; there are no changes to those proffers. And then we do include the original proposed Ordinance and Resolution. And the applicant did submit to staff, which we forwarded to you, an email that included some responses to comments that were made during the public hearing and clarification on proffer coordination. And that's my summary.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any questions of staff? Any questions of anyone else? Nope.

Mr. Coen: If it's up to me, I would like to move for approval of RC1300524.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: A motion to recommend approval of RC1300524, Reclassification, Stafford Nursing Home and Retirement Community Minor Proffer Amendment, and a second. Any further comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Yeah, if I could. And I really feel I need to. I appreciate the work that staff and the input that came in. Anybody who knows me knows how important caring for the elderly is to me. And these are very difficult decisions that families have to make. As this was brought forward the first time and as we think about these type of issues, there's a lot of discussion about quality of care. But that's not what this body deals with. There are other bodies that will deal with quality of care issues. We deal with other types of issues. One of the things that I had hoped surely would be pushed through, but I'll take a moment, it's sort of how this would work to an impact of family. When family goes into one of these independent care part of the facilities, they bring their own belongings; their own furniture, their own pictures, their own bric brac. And then, if they are ill, then they might have to go to the assisted living section in the same building, maybe on a different floor. And if anybody has a family member that's been ill and they're not home, even if they're at the emergency room, they want to be in their own home. And the people who are in these facilities, in the independent ones, view them as their home. And people recover far better when they're in their home. And so, to me, this is almost like many of the issues that the Planning Commission gets which is a quality of life issue, whether it's roads, parks, or whatever, is it does giving this availability to people to be able to be in their home while they recover and improve their quality of life. And I think it really does. At our last meeting it was mentioned that, you know, thinking about the baby boom generation, to me the more immediate need is the Korean War generation who often get bypassed by society and we talk about other generations. But they're the ones that are going to need this either now or in the very near future. So I'm urging approval of this because I think this gives an opportunity for families, for individuals to have a higher quality of life and I think that's a good thing to do. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Any further comment Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No further comment.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Very good. All those in favor of the motion to recommend approval of RC1300524, Reclassification, Stafford Nursing Home and Retirement Community Minor Proffer Amendment signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Thank you all very much. We're now at item number 6, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Urban Development Areas. Mr. Harvey, I know we sent out a copy... we discussed this last time... we sent out a copy of the memo to transmit to the Board of Supervisors. We didn't receive any further comments back. We've got that all prepared to roll forward. I appreciate the efforts of staff. I don't know if there's any... still got to work on item 4, directive 4 on there which we're going to work in future sessions and in the subcommittee. But I don't know if there's much else to speak on that one unless anyone had any comments. Okay? Then we'll move onto item number 7, we're going to address... that's Monday night, correct? Monday night the 19th at 1830... where are we meeting? Here; okay. At 6:30 Monday evening. Thank you for your indulgence Mr. Gibbons. I know that conflicts with...

6. 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)**
7. RC1300324; Reclassification – Oakenwold - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, with proffered conditions, 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) (Deferred on April 23, 2014 to Work Session)**

Mr. Gibbons: Well, I'm relying on the feedback from this body.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes sir, and we will certainly provide that. Modifying that date did conflict with a longstanding commitment Mr. Gibbons had but he was very understanding about that and we'll make sure to share everything with him appropriately. So, that moves us onto New Business, for the patient folks with that item, SUB1300478, Beach Property Preliminary Subdivision Plan.

Mr. Zuraf: Sorry, just on the last item, just a...

Mr. Rhodes: No, I'm moving, we are moving.

Mr. Zuraf: Lost my chance. You received tonight paper copies of revised GDP and Regulating Plan for that Monday...

Mr. Rhodes: For the Monday.

Mr. Zuraf: ... for the Monday meeting and an additional comment provided by a citizen. And also, just to remind... and we'll provide you through your iPad updates additional information... and you might want to bring that big binder of information that was provided by the applicant. We're not going to recopy that.

Mr. Rhodes: That's fair, that's very fair. Okay, thank you very much Mike. Okay, so we're onto item number 8, Mr. Harvey.

NEW BUSINESS

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

8. SUB1300478; Beach Property, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 6 single-family lots on Assessor's Parcel 17-2 (portion), zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 22.4 acres located on the west side of Heflin Road 1,500 feet north of Poplar Road, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: August 6, 2014)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Doolittle will be making this presentation.

Mrs. Doolittle: Computer please. Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. Item number 8 is the Beach Property Preliminary Subdivision Plan, SUB1300478. The proposed subdivision is located on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 17-2 and the parcel is located on the west side of Heflin Road approximately 1,500 feet north of Poplar Road. The entire parent parcel is 55.75 acres, and the proposed subdivision is only a portion of this site and will be 22.4 acres. The parcel is zoned A-1, Agricultural, within the Hartwood Election District and the preliminary plan proposed is 6 single-family lots. Here is an aerial map of the parcel and you can see the area that's the proposed subdivision labeled site, and then there will be a remainder parcel. And the portion of this site that will be subdivided is mostly wooded. Here is the proposed preliminary plan. The primary access will be provided from the extension of Honeysuckle Way from Forest View Estates Subdivision. Critical Resource Protection Area is located on the rear of the lots 3 through 5 and will remain undisturbed. All lots will be served by private well and septic systems, and stormwater management will be achieved by utilizing LID methods such as bio-retention facilities and those will be placed within easements and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. Staff recommends approval of the Beach preliminary subdivision plan and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. English: Is there going to be any dry hydrants, I mean dry hydrants on this property at all that you know of?

Mrs. Doolittle: No.

Mr. English: Nothing?

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions?

Mr. English: Housing? What's the housing going to look like? Do you know what the housing...?

Mr. Gibbons: This is an upscale... I mean really upscale.

Mrs. Doolittle: The applicant and engineer are here as well.

Mr. English: Is he here? Is the applicant here?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for staff or else we'll have the applicant come forward?

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly. So, I'm gathering the rest of the parcel is just going to remain natural, you know, because of the water issue... even though in your picture it was pretty green and flat looking.

***Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014***

Mrs. Doolittle: Are you talking about the area to be subdivided or the remainder?

Mr. Coen: The remainder.

Mrs. Doolittle: I believe... I'll let him...

Mr. Rhodes: Applicant please. For our viewing audience we need the microphone.

Mr. Stonehill: The remainder of the parcel...

Mr. Rhodes: If you could identify yourself, thank you.

Mr. Stonehill: I'm sorry. My name is Justin Stonehill; I'm the President of Hour Homes at Grouse Point, Inc. The remainder of the property is going to be... we're subdividing it from a landowner. So their house is on the property and that's what it's going to be. They're just going to be keeping it as, you know, their land.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. English: What are the houses going to look like?

Mr. Stonehill: They're going to be single-family homes, colonials, you know, brick, waynescott... typical of what Forest View Estates which is about to be approved right now... anywhere from 25 to 4,000 square foot.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Other questions for the applicant? Or any more for staff?

Mr. Gibbons: I'll second the motion.

Mr. Rhodes: This is in the Hartwood District. Mr. English?

Mr. English: I make a motion to accept the (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Motion recommending approval of the... motion to approve the preliminary subdivision plan.

Mr. English: Yeah, SUB...

Mr. Rhodes: SUB1300478. And seconded in advance once again by Mr. Gibbons. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Further comment Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? Please Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Not so much a comment about this one but pretty soon we won't have the chance to do this for projects that are less than, what, 50? Is that the case Mr. Harvey?

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: What is this scale that will be for the changes?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Apicella, Mr. Chairman, the State Code will change effective July 1st to no longer allow a locality to require a preliminary subdivision plan for 50 or fewer lots. That would be at the applicant's discretion whether they want to pursue a preliminary plan or not. That'd be, again, at their discretion. There's pro's and con's for both; having a preliminary plan approved can provide you with vesting and also with not as much engineering involved as a full detailed construction plan.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any other comments? All those in favor of the motion to approve the preliminary subdivision plan SUB1300478, Beach Property, 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. Good luck to you, thanks! Okay, very good. All that for 3 hours sitting. Item number 9, Chesapeake Bay Ordinance. Mr. Harvey?

9. Chesapeake Bay Ordinance - Relocation of Chesapeake Bay Regulations from the County's Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances to a stand-alone chapter and certain other amendments.
(Time Limit: July 14, 2014)
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: June 11, 2014)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: July 9, 2014)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'll lead the discussion on this item. This item was referred to the Commission from the Board of Supervisors on April 15th of this year. This proposed amendment would take the Chesapeake Bay Regulations out of the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance and put it in a stand-alone ordinance. Currently, any issue that requires an appeal or a variance from the Chesapeake Bay Regulations goes before the Board of Zoning Appeals as a variance. And that's created some problems in the past in that the Board of Zoning Appeals for normal variances has one set of standards, and there's a second set of standards that apply to the Chesapeake Bay exceptions that are stipulated in the State Code. This proposal would move the variance and exception process to a Chesapeake Bay Board. It's anticipated that this Chesapeake Bay Board would be comprised of the current existing Wetlands Board. The Wetlands Board, at the present time, reviews any application for a pier, a bulkhead, a boat ramp, any shoreline protection measures that are in the inner-tidal zone; that's between the mean high water and mean low water. Typically, you're going to find an area with the Chesapeake Bay enforcement is going to be from that mean high water landward. So, it's essentially a continuation of the shoreline issue. So the Wetlands Board is a logical body to take that up. This referral would, from staff perspective, we would request the Commission to consider authorizing the public hearing to initiate the amendment to remove those provisions from both the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance, and also put them in a new section of the County Code.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'll move for approval of the public hearing for June 11th.

Mr. Apicella: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to recommend approval and seconded for the public hearing. Further comments Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the BZA, I can vouch for the fact that the conflicting requirements caused us, I don't want to say great consternation but difficulty. And so I think this is a good solution going forward.

Mr. Rhodes: To clarify, the motion was for advertisement for the next available public hearing, right?

Mr. Harvey: Right. And Mr. Chairman...

Mr. Rhodes: When will that be?

Mr. Harvey: That could be the second meeting in June. I also wanted to clarify, there's a handout at your desk. We did receive final comments from the State with regard to our draft Ordinance. There was a couple minor tweaks they wanted us to consider and, in particular, adding a definition of act which meant the Chesapeake Bay Act, correct some citations, and add some additional cross-references to State Code.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so...

Mr. Harvey: So, if we could include that (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: ... Mr. Gibbons, would you modify your...?

Mr. Gibbons: I thought I did.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, yeah, I thought I heard you (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: And I did second that.

Mr. Rhodes: (Inaudible) and seconded to accept this information. So, can we just modify the motion to accept the additional... or do we need something different Ms. McClendon? I just want to make sure we get this right.

Ms. McClendon: Hold on one second Mr. Chairman, please.

Mr. Rhodes: You got it, yes ma'am.

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, looking at the referring reso from the Board of Supervisors, they did not give the Planning Commission modification authority, so I would recommend when the

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

recommendation goes back to the Board that the changes proposed by the State be incorporated to their recommendation. But you're not really able to make those changes...

Mr. Rhodes: Ok, they did not give us flexibility. So we will move this forward for public hearing, we will keep these in hand to be part of our recommendations back to the... consideration of part of our recommendations back to the Board after we do our process.

Ms. McClendon: That's correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Got it! Okay. So, got it, okay. Further comment by any other member? All those in favor of the motion to advertise this for public hearing... I think we... you said the best load on the calendar looked like the 25th of June, Mr. Harvey? Was there a particular reason you picked that one out?

Mr. Harvey: For advertising timeline (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, gotcha. So for 25, all those in favor of the motion to recommend this forward for public hearing to be held on June 25th 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. Number 10, Mr. Harvey.

10. Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances - Review the definitions of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances for consistency with each document and the Virginia Code; and make necessary recommendations to ensure consistency and any changes deemed necessary to ensure the definitions are understood in a clear and concise manner. **(Time Limit: July 14, 2014)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: June 11, 2014)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: July 9, 2014)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Susan Blackburn will give the Commission an update on item number 10.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Ms. Blackburn: Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners, I'm Susan Blackburn. And this item on your agenda is for reviewing the definitions of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances for consistency with each document and the Virginia Code, and make necessary recommendations to ensure consistency and any changes deemed necessary to ensure the definitions are understood in a clear and concise manner. At the February 18th meeting of the Board's Community and Economic Development Committee, the

Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014

staff presented a draft document that consisted of a review of the definition sections within the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances and the recommendations as provided by the consulting firm, Clarion and Associates. Staff had instructed Clarion to review the definition sections within both the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances for consistency between the two documents and with the Virginia Code. After the discussion by the CEDC Committee, they recommended the review process be initiated and referred the item to the Board. On the April 15th meeting of the Board, they approved Resolution R14-92, which was attached in your packet, giving the Planning Commission the task of reviewing and recommending changes deemed necessary to the definitions within the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance. This review is the first phase of the rewrite of both of the Ordinances, and will provide a base for the proposed documents. The draft documents, as provided by Clarion and Associates, are included with attachments 2 and 3 and are shown in an underline and overstrike format. The comments for each definition range from altering the wording slightly to removing it altogether. Staff recommends that this item be discussed at the Planning Commission Retreat scheduled in June, and also recommends that the Commission create a committee devoted to analyzing the information and, when finished, will present its findings to the full Commission for their review and recommendation.

Mr. Rhodes: So, just to clarify, on this one it's not that we have something that we need to take to a public hearing.

Ms. Blackburn: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: This one is we've been asked to look at it and make some recommendations based on what they forwarded to us and go back to them with what we think should be done with it, which may be to authorize a public hearing (inaudible), correct?

Mr. Harvey: Correct Mr. Chairman. Staff inadvertently put a time deadline on this matter, but this was not an ordinance referral from the Board; it was a task order so to speak.

Mr. Rhodes: Kind of like our UDA/TGA; look at it and tell us some thoughts you think we might tell you to go forward more formally on it.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, got it. And this is, I think on our subsequent item, this is an item that you've got kind of queued up for the Retreat agenda to dive in further?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Any comments or questions for staff on this? Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's feasible or financially possible, but if we take this up at the Retreat, can we get Clarion and Associates to give us kind of an overview of what they did, why they did it, and maybe for some of the bigger changes kind of walk us through their logic trail?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Harvey, do you think that'd be best done by Clarion and Associates or do you think you all are comfortable doing that?

Mr. Harvey: We can check their availability. But certainly we can talk through all the various definitions, because Ms. Blackburn says there is a logic behind it much of which is in compliance with

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

State Code, trying to make it consistent between both documents, as well as taking performance standards out of definitions and putting them in performance standards elsewhere in the ordinance, and vice versa.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, if you could just give that a little thought, Mr. Harvey, we'll defer to you. If you think there are things that might be better to bring them in for, then pursue that if you feel good about it.

Mr. Harvey: We'd have to first check with their availability.

Mr. Rhodes: Sure, sure, sure, sure, sure... yeah. But if you're good with this, I think that's fine too. Other questions for staff on this one? So, we're going to dive into this a lot more in a couple weeks. Awesome; thank you very much.

Ms. Blackburn: Thank you.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

11. Planning Commission Work Session Retreat Agenda - June 21, 2014 (tentative)

Mr. Rhodes: Item number 11, Mr. Harvey... Planning Director's Report. This is all yours.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Segway from the last discussion we had, we have a draft agenda. I wanted to confirm with the Commission that this is the list of items to be considered during the Retreat. We have number 1, discussion about community meetings being required prior to rezoning application submittals and any other enhanced notification requirements the Commission may feel desirable for land use cases. Also the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance update. Continued discussion on targeted growth areas and impact statements.

Mr. Rhodes: Maybe hopefully we'll have some feedback from the Board.

Mr. Harvey: And this would be accomplished during a 4-hour period. So we could devote an hour to each or more or less time as needed.

Mr. Rhodes: We'll just kind of drive on and if we need to cut something off so that we get to all of them, we'll adjust that as we go. And donuts and bagels galore. It's not really critical for this, but if... it's just as good a time as any... could I ask, you know the different intensities are in that guide, the ITE or ICE...

Mr. Harvey: ITE, Institute of Transportation and Engineering.

Mr. Rhodes: ITE, yeah. The various uses and their intensities... could we just get a one pager, just kind of list them from the most intense to the least intense, or something like that? I assume they've probably got something that's just in there as page and can be photocopied. I think it would be just a good reference. We always have these discussions and talk about different uses and different things. Again, I think it might be helpful just to have a little picture of what, on average, they tend to think of the more intensive uses and less intense uses.

Mr. Harvey: If I remember, the published document does not break it out by intensity of use. It does list the uses that they have (inaudible).

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Rhodes: But they've got factors provided with it on the number of vehicle trips that they generate, right?

Mr. Harvey: Correct. But the document is not organized by the most intense to least intense.

Mr. Rhodes: If there's... for me personally, I don't know if others... but I think if we could just group them into the more intensive uses and the lesser, or maybe separately pull them from the document into a singular list that kind of takes the most intensive... or the ones that generate the most vehicles per day to the lesser, I think I would find that a useful little reference thing to have just as we're going through discussions and look at what they've excluded and left in and all those things.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, we'll check with the transportation staff and see if they can help us with that.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very cool. Other comments from folks... from Commissioners on the work session?

Mr. Gibbons: What I'd like to have is if we can have an inventory of what we already have zoned in the County, because at the last Board meeting there was a lot of discussion over apartments, the amount of apartments we've already got on the books.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that doable Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman. Mr. Zuraf's got an answer to that specific question but we can also do research on zoned projects that haven't been built yet.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, as far as the zoned apartment projects that have not been built, there are a little over a thousand units approved but unbuilt. And then there is another project that's kind of got an unknown factor to it, the Austin Park project up behind the Wawa on Route 1. That was a commercial apartment project; there was no specific unit number established but that's restricted by the size of the lot. So that's going to add additional units above that 1,000 units that are out there.

Mr. Gibbons: Yes sir, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Zuraf? Sorry. Is it possible for us to get that, for those of us who are better with visuals, and if there's sort of identification of where...?

Mr. Zuraf: Location and numbers on a map?

Mr. Coen: Yes please.

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Coen: I'm just sort of curious from that standpoint. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, we can do that.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

Mr. Apicella: Again, if we're going to try to get the complete picture, can we also get those that are already in existence.

Mr. Zuraf: The existing number of apartment units?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: Along with that? Okay. We can work on that.

Mr. Coen: In your spare time.

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, anyone else on that item? Okay, Mr. Harvey?

12. Planning Commission Work Session Agenda - May 19, 2014 (tentative)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Also, we have the agenda for the special work session on Monday which is the Oakenwold case. As we know with special meetings, that's the only item we can discuss, so I just wanted to bring that to the Commission's attention.

Mr. Rhodes: The one and only. Please.

Mr. Apicella: I'm still trying to understand the parameters of the work session. What's the... what are we going to try and do at this work session and what's the boundary? How far do we go? Can somebody make a motion for approval at a work session or does it have to be moved to a regular session?

Mr. Rhodes: I think you can do everything up to a motion for approval, can't you?

Ms. McClendon: Well, actually Mr. Chairman, it's really just considered a special meeting. You're calling it a work session but, unless there are parameters of your by-laws which I'm not aware of that prevents you from voting, I believe you can vote.

Mr. Rhodes: So we could actually vote it out.

Ms. McClendon: Yes, it's been properly noticed; I believe you can act on this if you choose.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Very good. And the applicant's all aware and confirmed for the date and time?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep, it's just another meeting. Okay, good.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. County Attorney's Report.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Rhodes: Committee Reports.

Mrs. Bailey: Yes, Mr. Chairman. ARB met May 5th...

Mr. Rhodes: Woohoo!

Mrs. Bailey: ... and new business consisted of the proposed crosswalk in Falmouth there at Washington and Ingleside from Belmont. And we actually looked at Phase 5 development of the crosswalk and the warning signs and discussed some possible additions that could be made due to the traffic with speed concerns. Department of Historic Resources... review of Stafford County. A grant was applied for, for additional research for slave sites and that was granted and approved. And then the COA application, they're making revisions on that. That's going to be interactive on the website once it's complete, and we made suggestions as to how to make that a little bit better, inserting some of the different links to different sites and making it more informative with additional instruction. And that concluded the meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Coen: Not to go backwards, but something occurred to me in the discussion...

Mr. Rhodes: But to go backwards; okay.

Mr. Coen: But to go backwards. But to go back to number 12, if it's like a regular meeting, is there a time...

Mr. Rhodes: Except we're only advertising one item.

Mr. Coen: ... right... but I mean is there... normally for meetings we have a public comment period. I know it's not a public hearing because we closed that. But if it's like a normal meeting, wouldn't that be the normal protocol? I'm just wondering because the idea hit me in the head and I thought, well, it might hit other people.

Mr. English: I don't think I closed the public hearing on that.

Mr. Coen: I think you did.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I think we did.

Mr. English: We did?

Mr. Coen: Yeah, because I gave a little speel about that. I remember I (inaudible) awhile.

***Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014***

Mr. Rhodes: Is this agenda just straight out of the by-laws for a work session? If it's just a special session, we also don't have our typical invocation and Pledge of Allegiance and, I don't know if it matters, just...

Ms. McClendon: That's correct. According to your by-laws, you have a conduct of order of business for regular meetings. You don't have anything set for special meetings.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Ms. McClendon: So you can take on the order of a regular meeting if you choose, but currently the agenda just shows the one item and that's fine.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Does anybody have a strong feeling one way or another?

Mr. Apicella: I think it's an impactful project; I don't think it would hurt to take public comment at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: So can we public this as a typical meeting agenda, Mr. Harvey, just going straight to Unfinished Business after we do our things through the Public Presentations?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, we'll add Public Presentations to the agenda and have it reposted.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you sir. You're a good man, thank you.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: We've only got 4 minutes.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I know, I'm getting there. Okay, without objection I'll move Chairman's report to after the approval of minutes. So, TRC information, we've got none, right? Just to confirm? Okay, good. I'll entertain a motion for approval of March 26 minutes?

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Discussed after Approval of Minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

13. TRC Information - None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 26, 2014

Mr. Boswell: So moved.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

***Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014***

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Boswell beat you to it. Mr. Gibbons, the eternal second there; very good. Any other comment Mr. Boswell? Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? All those in favor of the approval of the March 26, 2014 minutes 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. I'll entertain a motion for the approval of the April 2nd minutes.

April 2, 2014 Joint Meeting with Airport Authority

Mr. Coen: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: A motion by Mr. Coen. Is there a second?

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

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

Mr. Coen: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Further comment Mrs. Bailey? I will just comment that I will be abstaining because I did not join in the fun. All those in favor of the approval of the April 2, 2014 Joint Meeting minutes 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, one abstain. Okay, and I'll entertain a motion for the approval of the April 9th minutes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 14, 2014*

April 9, 2014

Mr. Apicella: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, we've got Mr. Apicella. Going once, going twice...

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: ... second by Mr. English. Any further comment Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English? 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. I have exactly 2 minutes. Chairman's Report. I will just highlight that by the time we meet again on the 28th of March, we will have passed up the...

Mr. Coen: The 28th of March?

Mr. Rhodes: May. May, okay. A year from now. The 28th of May... we will have passed up a very significant and important day and that is Memorial Day. And just as the word says, it is an opportunity to remember all those who have given their lives, all those who have fallen, all those who have sacrificed, and all those who have volunteered. It is a time of rest and renewal, but it is also a time of remembrance. And I would just... two things: I would just suggest that we take some moment during the barbeque, during the enjoyment you might be having if you're not having to work on that day, and do reflect and remember what makes this nation so great are all those who have sacrificed and given. The other thing is, it's a bit of a day of revelry and some fun and enjoyment, but we should always remember safety in that. Everybody is so important to each other and to this County, and so we owe it to each other and this County to make sure and take a minute and think about what we're doing and be a little bit careful and come back to work the next day, a little bit rested and renewed and reflected. So with that, we are adjourned!

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.