

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
January 14, 2015

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, January 14, 2015, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Director Jeffrey Harvey in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Stinnette, Zuraf, Blackburn, and Ehly

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Acting Chairman, I'd like to make a substitute... a motion on the agenda. I'd like to take the Election of Officers and make it unanimous, the incumbents. That's my motion.

Mr. Harvey: Do we have a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Gibbons, as motioner, I've been advised that the Commission should take up your motion for each individual office separately.

A. Election of Chairman

Mr. Gibbons: I never win one anyways, do I? I'll make it for number A, the incumbent.

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, we have a motion and a second for election of a Chairman with the incumbent officer being Commissioner Rhodes.

Mr. Apicella: I make a motion to close nominations.

Mr. Harvey: So, I'll call for the vote. All in favor say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. Harvey: All opposed?

Mr. Rhodes: Abstain.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. We have a new Chairman, Mr. Rhodes. And I'll turn the rest of the meeting over to you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

B. Election of Vice-Chairman

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion for B be the incumbent.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, there's a motion for the election of the Vice-Chairman to be Mr. Apicella. Is there a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by barely beat you Mr. English. Is there any other nominations?

Mr. Gibbons: Steven can't close it but I'll close it.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, motion to close. All those in favor of the election of Mr. Apicella as the Vice-Chairman signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed?

C. Election of Secretary

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I move for C, the incumbent.

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, a motion and a second for the Secretary to be Mr. Coen. Are there any other nominations? With that we will close nominations, very good. All those in favor of the election of Mr. Coen as the Secretary signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Are there any opposed? None opposed. We have the Election of Officers completed. I will now move on. Are there any Declarations of Disqualification this evening?

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. English: I met with Mr. Payne a week ago in reference to the George Washington Village.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, certain not necessarily a disqualification but for full transparency, a meeting with Mr. Payne. Thank you very much Mr. English. Anyone else?

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, on item number 2 I met with the applicant.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Again, just for full transparency, a meeting in the interim period.

Mr. Gibbons: I do like that term transparency.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, absolutely. There was in the interim period a meeting Mr. Gibbons had with the applicant on number 2, but no items of full disqualification as necessary. Very good, thank you. We're going to move onto Public Presentations. This is an opportunity for anyone present to present to the Board as a whole on any item except for item number 1. Item number 1, the public hearing remains open for and therefore we'll have a separate opportunity for comment and public comment on that item. But if you would like to speak on any item whatsoever, just anything except for item number 1, you may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, we would ask that you state your name and your address. Once you do so, a green light will come on indicating that you have 3 minutes available to you. Then a yellow light will come on indicating 1 minute, and when the red light starts blinking we would just ask that you wrap up your comments. So, anyone that would like to come forward please do so now.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. Yesterday when I went to the School Board I brought an empty envelope and I wrote on the back of the envelope, and I got to discuss the IB Program but then we found out later it was just a discussion item. But for some of you, this is the fourth quarter they call it. You know, it's the fourth year in your term of office and, if you ever noticed, my name is Waldo. So, where's Waldo? He's at the Planning Commissioners meeting. So keep watching that logo out there; you never know what's going to happen. You know, we had a new election of the Board of Supervisors to inform everyone. And of course we have two pictures that are still out of date. And just so the citizens do know that two of the Supervisors are elected to office in 3-way elections which means they are not true representatives; they don't have 51% of the vote. So, basically, whoever they're selected Planning Commissioner, they're also serving in that aspect. Speaking of Planning Commissioners, one of the key aspects of being a Planning Commissioner is you have to get certified and do lots of these

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

aspects. And the BZA is another body that's in the County; it's called the Board of Zoning Appeals. And hopefully in Richmond we're going to resolve some of these aspects of do you be... are you allowed to be a Planning Commissioner or are you allowed to be on the BZA, or both? So maybe we can get some legislation on that aspect. The other thing I think that the Planning Commissioners really need to look at is your own by-laws. I know some of you do not live in the district that you represent. We have seven districts. It would seem to be non-partisan that if you do not live in a district and you're representing that district, seems to me like that's a conflict of interest. I don't know what your by-laws say, but I just want to bring it to the public's attention of some of the things that go on in the County that you're not aware of. Also be aware of that sometimes when large projects get planned, that sometimes the projects have large tax exemptions. One of the ones that I know personally was a YMCA that was going to be built across from a piece of property I bought, and it was going to be a 99-year tax exemption. I'm not sure if there's any of these existing for Walmart or any other entity in the County. But I do know 7-Eleven was in the Guinness Book of Records and it's the exact business that tore down a 200 year old magnolia tree. So, let me close with do you want more treetops or more rooftops in Stafford County.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Thank you very much. Anyone else would like to come forward and speak at this time? Seeing no one come forward, I will close the Public Presentations and we move onto Public Hearings. We have item number 1, RC1400155, the reclassification of George Washington Village, continuation from our last session. Mr. Harvey.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC1400155; Reclassification – George Washington Village - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural; A-2, Rural Residential; R-3, Urban Residential – High Density; B-2, Urban Commercial; and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts to the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, to allow for the development of a planned community. The project is proposed to include up to 2,957 residential units and up to 1,550,000 square feet of commercial floor area, on Assessor's Parcels 28-87; 29-32, 29-36, 29-38A, 29-39C, 29-81, 29-82 and 29-83; 37-63; and 38-1, 38-1A, 38-3, 38-4, 38-4C, 38-55, 38-58C, 38-58D, 38-66, 38-69, 38-70, 38-70A, and 38-71, consisting of 1,051.59 acres, located on the north side of Ramoth Church Road and south side of Courthouse Road, west of Interstate 95, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: March 10, 2015) (History: December 10, 2014 Public Hearing Continued to January 14, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Mike Zuraf for the staff presentation.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. This item, as mentioned, is a reclassification for George Washington Village. The project was a continuation of a public hearing that occurred originally on December 10, 2014. Just a quick summary and reminder of what is being proposed. This is a reclassification of property that has several current zoning district classifications and all those different zoning classifications would be combined into one zoning district; that is the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District. The applicant is Augustine South Associates with Charlie Payne as the agent. The location of this site is shaded in... hatched on the map and it covers 22 parcels over 1,051 acres. The property is generally bounded by Courthouse Road to the north, Interstate 95 to the east, Ramoth Church Road to the south, and Kellogg Mill Road and Accokeek Furnace Road to the west. This is the image of the General Development Plan that was included with the proposal. And this shows the proposed layout of the project. This depicts development of approximately 1.5 million square feet of commercial development; a maximum of 2,957

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

dwelling units that do include a mix of single-family detached units -- those are in the yellow shaded areas, 1,885 of those; 322 townhomes -- those are in green; then 750 multi-family dwelling units -- those are the dark blue/purple shaded areas. Also, the overall design concept divides this development into several neighborhoods or villages and then does include a commercial town center which generally is the red area -- it identifies the location of the town center. This evening I want to focus on that at the last meeting there were several questions raised by the Planning Commission. So I want to kind of focus on that. In your memo, the staff report that you received, we laid out all the different questions that were raised by the Planning Commission at the meeting. In addition, I did include an attachment that pulls out all the issues that were raised in the staff report and just kind of simplified that on a 4-page document for your reference. But, again, I want to focus on the Planning Commission questions that were kind of grouped into different categories. The first questions have to do with the proposed Community Development Authority, which is proposed to be established under this project. Some of the questions include how would that be established. And, for a Community Development Authority, that would occur as, or established as by approval by the Board of Supervisors of a specific agreed to document that sets out the terms of what would be provided by the Community Development Authority and how those improvements would be funded. And there were questions of what improvements would those be. The proffers do spell out the improvements that would fall under the Community Development Authority and it does include some of the main improvements of the construction of Mine Road, all the way from Courthouse Road to Ramoth Church Road, Woodcutters Road through the project; those are the two primary crossroads that are proposed; intersection improvements at key intersections along the way; and then...

Mr. English: I've got a question. In reference to the CDAs, with the Transportation Impact Fees, would that be like double taxing them because they had the CDAs (inaudible)?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not certain how the impact... I'd have to look into how the impact fees would apply in this case, if there would be a... I think it has to be evaluated on as to what the value of the proffers that are proposed, how much that is in relation to the Transportation Impact Fees.

Mr. English: So, but the CDAs will be like not such a proffer but that's just a separate thing that the homeowner would have to pay, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the CDA payment is a separate tax.

Mr. English: But that's going to be some of the roads and then you're charging for the impact fees on transportation, isn't that double taxing?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check on that. I'm not positive as to how that exactly would be accomplished in this case. Okay, so the improvements do include the right-of-way dedication that's needed through land dedications. And cash contributions are proposed to go through the... cash proffer contributions per unit would go through the CDA and funnel into the projects. The bond payment method would be determined by the developer and is partly a function of what's financed and how the structure of cash flow is to pay off the bonds. This question was sent onto the applicant so they may be able to add on to some of this explanation. There were also questions about the County experience. There are two other projects in the County that do have a CDA; that includes Celebrate Virginia North and Embrey Mill, which...

Mr. Gibbons: What's the other one, Widewater?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: Embrey Mill. Mainly for the construction of Mine Road there.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Is it possible also if staff could check in to see how that's working with those two developments? I was just curious.

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. English: Alright, thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: The next issue...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, before Mike goes on.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Apicella: So what happens if the CDA is not able to raise the full amount of capital that it needs to support the infrastructure improvements?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the requirements in the proffers are still for these improvements to be made, so I would say that the project likely would not be able to proceed if the cash is not there to make the improvements that are needed for the project.

Mr. Apicella: When you say the project won't be able to proceed, I mean, I don't see a linkage in the document, in the proffers, that sets milestones. So, again I'm not quite clear how we would know when to stop allowing development, because the infrastructure improvements for the most part aren't specific to certain things happening.

Mr. Zuraf: That may be something that would be good to clarify then in the proffers, ask the applicant to clarify.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Then with transportation there were several questions about some of the key road network improvements; Woodcutters Road and Mine Road. There were questions of what the value of this type of these improvements would be to the County and, generally, as far as the investment would go. And basically the question was like what percentage of the traffic using the roads would be generated by the development project versus the benefit to the County, because there's going to be some offsite usage of these roads. And staff, through evaluation of the Traffic Impact Analysis, roughly determined that anywhere from 26.4 to 41% of the usage of Mine Road from offsite... offsite traffic would utilize Mine Road was the estimate we could derive from the traffic study. And the equivalent value then to the County would be 13.7 to 21.4 million dollars' worth of value to use from outside of the project itself. And this is based on an estimated project cost of constructing Mine Road of 52.2 million dollars. This was an estimate that staff had worked on back in 2011 with some transportation planning work. So that was not a number from the applicant himself, but we acquired that number through private previous work. And through the evaluation of the traffic study, the data, as related to Woodcutters Road, it did show that 100% of Woodcutters Road would be utilized by onsite development. I don't know if that necessarily will be the case, but that's what the traffic showed. In that case, all of Woodcutters Road

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

would benefit... be a benefit only to the development. Then there were questions about the impacts of the network should the improvements not fully be made through the site, so there's not a complete linkage from Courthouse Road to Ramoth Church Road. And staff commentary on that is that there would be some impact on Courthouse Road if there was not a full north-south inter-connection. It would increase impacts on Courthouse Road to the east of the site with cars having to travel over to access Interstate 95. And then also likely impacts on 95 itself and Jefferson Davis Highway as cars would have to utilize that north-south route as opposed to having that Mine Road alternative. And Ramoth Church Road itself, they would experience... that would experience increased impacts as well as vehicles existing the subdivision would more so utilize Ramoth Church Road than Woodcutters and Mine Road.

Mr. English: What kind of effect or anything do you think it's going to have on Zachary Lane and Kelsey Lane?

Mr. Zuraf: It could have some effect on Kelsey, I know, because that would be connecting through.

Mr. English: I think Zachary and Kelsey are right there together.

Mr. Zuraf: I don't believe Zachary connects through into the project though.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: But Kelsey definitely is showing an inter-connection; I'd have to check on Zachary.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: There are also questions about commercial and residential phasing. Some of the points we made in our response was that commercial would be dependent on the interchange and road improvements. That was noted by the applicant, given this scale of development. You would need an enhanced intersection and road improvements to access increased development in this area. There would likely be... also there was a question about whether this project, the commercial development, could occur on its own without the residential development. There would likely be a need for more residential development in this area to support any more commercial development in this location. Given that you already have a significant amount of commercial already approved in Embrey Mill and on other properties along Courthouse Road in this area. Also, there were questions about if staff could suggest any kind of phasing for the residential development. Staff is suggesting possibly a residential phasing of 150 per year. This is based on an assumption that the project would take 15 years to build, and assuming consistent steady growth over that full timeframe of the project. And those 150 units would be appropriate for the townhouse and single-family units. When you get into the development of multi-family units, those tend to all be built as one, under one project, and so that 150 unit cap would be difficult for that type of project to fall under that type of cap. Also, with commercial development phasing, that commercial and village areas should somewhat be tied to residential that is occurring in those adjacent villages. But as far as the overall phasing of the town center, the larger town center, staff would probably defer to the applicant as to what would be appropriate there. There were questions about the school proffers, if a school site had been identified. It had not but there is a new layout that the applicant will be providing tonight that we just received. I believe that may address that issue. Also, questions about when the proffered lump sum payment would occur. The proffers say that it would occur at the 2,500th unit. Again, assuming consistent growth of the development over the 15 year period, it would occur 12½ years into the project. That's when the lump sum payment for the schools

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

would occur. And then there were questions about the typical school cost, acreage, and capacity of the different types of schools in the County. And these are ideal costs that the County uses in their planning efforts.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, these capacity levels, how do they compare to what is expected in terms of the number of students? So, for example, how many elementary school students are we expecting versus the design capacity?

Mr. Zuraf: So, in this project, the School Board staff estimates that the elementary student projection is 1,309 students. The middle school projection in this project would be 726, and high school projection, 1,058.

Mr. Apicella: So that tells us that for an elementary school, this project will fill up an elementary school, three-quarters of a middle school, and about one-half of a high school.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: There were also questions about the Fire and Rescue station site and also when that would occur. Based on the proffer language of providing a site at the 1,800th unit, that would occur 9 years into the 15 year project should, again, the project be consistently developing over this timeframe. With the cost information that staff received from the County CIP, a typical fire station cost might be \$7.6 million for construction; that includes to build the facility and also acquire the appropriate equipment, you know, the fire equipment needed. And then maintenance estimated in the CIP was \$2.4 to \$3 million per year for a fire station.

Mr. Coen: Mike, just a quick question on the Fire and Rescue aspect. Do we have any information as to the Level of Service of the existing Fire and Rescue? I mean, if this is going to be 9 years out before they get the fire station, it'd sort of be useful to know if they're already in that area under the gun or if they could actually handle 1,800 more units until they'd get a new fire station.

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check to see what the Level of Service is at the nearest fire stations that would service this area.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Also, there was a request on the staff had noted some need for additional studies, environmental studies, to determine the extent of the Resource Protection Areas and condition of the cultural resources, and we're not certain of the timing of when those studies might be provided. And also a question about when we may get follow-up VDOT comments on the Traffic Impact Analysis. VDOT has requested a follow-up meeting with the traffic consultants, and they're working on scheduling a meeting which may occur as soon as next week. And also, questions relating to comments we made about the existing proffers that apply to Augustine which is the commercial portion of this site, known as Augustine South. There are certain proffers that are required to occur at the 800th unit of Augustine Central and Augustine North. Currently, the total unit number between Augustine North and Central is 545 units. So, ultimately, there is about 255 more units to go before the Colonial Forge/Augustine Central project could not proceed before the improvements that are required to occur in Augustine South would have to occur. There was also a request to kind of spell out the makeup of the

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

\$35 million in improvements that are stated in the applicant's information, and staff has requested a breakdown of the improvement costs that were provided. There was also a follow-up kind of question to provide a summary of the proposal as it compares with the George Washington Village Urban Development Area and provide an overall map that shows the site in relation to the George Washington Village Urban Development Area. This map is a map of the County's future land use plan. The light purple area depicts the George Washington Village Urban Development Area. And the George Washington Village Urban Development Area calls for a more urban form of development to occur, where development might be on smaller lots, clustered together, and be more pedestrian oriented. The George Washington Village UDA recommends a specific amount of development up to and specifically to the areas south of Courthouse Road I want to focus on. The area south of Courthouse Road recommends a maximum of 3,450 dwelling units with a mix of units between multi-family, townhouses, and single-family homes, and 1.6 million square feet of commercial between Courthouse and Accokeek Creek. And then to the south of Accokeek Creek, 8.7 million square feet of commercial office space. The proposal itself, in relation to these recommendations, meet I guess the recommended number of multi-family units. There are slightly more townhouses and the project itself is not in conformance with the recommendations south of Accokeek Creek though, where many of the single-family dwelling units are located. This area is where the office development is recommended. The proposed density and uses to the north of Accokeek Creek are consistent with the general recommendations of the UDA. And the form of development in the town center is consistent with the recommendations in this UDA. Staff does believe though the form of development in the village areas is not consistent with the intent of the UDAs which is to promote more urban form of development. The general form is more that of conventional suburban development. There were questions and discussion about the adjacent private wells and how many are in existence. Staff identified 48 private wells on properties immediately adjacent to the subject area. And the question of how much would each person need to pay to connect to the system, to the public water system, and that would cost \$8,397. Also, as you're aware, the County is working on developing land use compatibility standards around the Stafford Regional Airport. And there is a draft document that has been worked on and there was a question of how this project would follow those recommendations. And there's different recommendations because this project is so large. Different areas of this site include different recommendations in this draft study. For the areas of the project south of Accokeek Creek, the planned commercial areas are identified as being compatible use. The residential development is not considered to be compatible within 3,000 feet of the runway of the airport, and also not compatible in the identified H-3 zones. Their residential development is supported with additional review standards in the remaining areas south of Accokeek Creek. The areas north of Accokeek Creek, again, residential development is supported with additional review standards in the H-1 and H-2 zones, and the planned commercial uses in the town center are identified as compatible uses in that draft document. Other comments that were made, there were concerns about the project proceeding before the interchange improvements; the location of the school not being clearly identified; the amount of development located along Woodcutters Road was a concern; also the location of the park on the southern edge of the project identified as might be challenging for kids to access this park. And the request for comments from the School Board, you did receive this evening a memo. The School Board discussed the issue at their meeting last night and initially the comments from the School Board staff identified several requests for additional land for a middle school/high school site and other things. And the School Board, through their discussions, given the amount of development and growth projected, they would desire to see cash proffers provided in lieu of the specific land. And also, the other comment was there was a request for the standard cost and maintenance cost of a similar size park complex, and staff was not able to access that information. Then also, again, you did receive other new information -- the letter from the School Board. Also, there was a letter from the applicant; they are requesting an ordinance amendment and Comprehensive Plan amendment, and they are here to kind of go into more detail on that. And, as I mentioned, they have a new overall layout they want to show you

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

as well that addresses some of the concerns that were raised. And with that, I will leave it for any questions.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for staff.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Mike, was there ever a CDA in Widewater or was that a different...?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Gibbons, yes there was a CDA in Widewater. It was for the purpose of constructing a road which was called Widewater Parkway. That CDA has stopped functioning; however, there is some residual funds still left over and we'll talk about that a little bit tonight in another rezoning case.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, so there's two active...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Gibbons: ... one has problems and the other I gather is all right?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check on the status.

Mr. Gibbons: What would you have to check?

Mr. Zuraf: For Embrey Mill, whether...

Mr. Gibbons: No, I think that's alright so far, but I think the one in the south has got a default, doesn't it?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I believe the issue there is the road hasn't been taken in by the state. So that's one of the issues. I'd have to look to see (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: Aren't they behind in payments?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Coen: Just one more fire department type question, when you check with them on that. Could you also see if there's a certain number of units that a fire station is supposed to be able to service, if they have certain baselines or parameters that way? That way we'll know if one station is sufficient or if we need... if it's insufficient. Thank you.

Mr. English: And on Mr. Coen's... following up on his question. Will they be able to decide where that fire station will go on that property? Or is that for the developer, to ask?

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. Zuraf: That has been identified on the layout plan.

Mr. English: Did they have an input on that?

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, as far as...

Mr. English: The location of where the fire station (inaudible)?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I don't recall them having a problem with the location.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for staff? Okay, applicant please.

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman and other members of the Planning Commission, my name is Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer and we represent the applicant. Happy New Year to you all.

Mr. Rhodes: Happy New Year.

Mr. Payne: It's always a pleasure to be here and thank staff for its presentation; we appreciate their expertise and background information that they have provided to you and also to us. Some of which we received just most recently so I will respond to it to the extent that I have knowledge. But otherwise I will give it my best shot. Before... well, soon we'll have it up... but before I get into sort of our revised concept plan that we have put together, you all may have received a copy, I assume, that I sent to Mr. Harvey today which was a request obviously for a Comp Plan amendment. That will obviously also require an application, but I wanted to make sure you had this in hand as to what the parameters were or the issues that we were looking at in regards to that amendment. We'll be filing that soon after this public hearing, but I wanted you at least to have that in hand. And just very quickly, the issues that we are looking at that we will eventually want this Planning Commission to look at as you deliberate over the future Comprehensive Plan is obviously the UDA which you are looking at in a capacity for the UDA to George Washington Village. The capacity is about 4,180 units. We are proposing about 2,900 of those units; they can't fit in the location that has been described in the current Comprehensive Plan so we want to talk about the spirit of that issue and why we believe that those units should be allowed south of Accokeek Creek. We have also talked about why the commercial should be focused towards the interchange, the new I-95 interchange, and again, all of this is in the letter that you have so I won't go into too much details because I know brevity is key. We have also talked about the visibility for commercial viable uses for many, many years that have gone undeveloped south of Accokeek Creek. We've also in there talked about future marking conditions; I think yesterday's... or Monday's meeting of constituents who are looking forward to new commercial and retail investment was very exciting to hear and read about. You had 62 people engaged in that discussion about the future of Stafford County and the fact that they would love to see a stone bridge in Stafford County and that's exactly what we're proposing here. So we are good to see that many of the residents perhaps who don't show up at these public hearings, maybe a majority of the residents that we don't hear from could very well be supporting this type of project. We've also, in the proposal for an amendment, have talked about restricting any residential uses outside of 3,000 from the centerline of the airport. So, I think those are things that you've been looking at and we too have been looking at. And you'll see in our revised concept plan that we've adopted many of those, many of those initiatives. Is it just ask for the computer? Is that what I need to do?

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. Payne: Thank you. Perfect; thank you. Thank you Mike. As you can see, we have significantly, or however you may want to describe it, in our opinion significantly revised our initial concept plan. We have moved, as you see, this red line here. We have moved residential, all residential units north of that; that line represents 3,000 feet from the centerline of the airport. I believe that was a recommendation between the Committee... Planning Commission Committee, Joint Committee I should say, the Airport Authority, so we have adopted that. You'll see these pink colored or little dark pink colored units; these are the single-family detached units. Even with my glasses I can barely see here. Obviously this is the East Village, Central Village here, all single-family detached, West Village here, all single-family detached, and North Village, all single-family detached. We have proposed to move the townhouses that we had somewhat disbursed, I believe, the North Village closer to the town center. We had 322 additionally numbered; we've reduced that number to 300 to fit the policy under the Comprehensive Plan, so we have reduced the number of townhouses. And, as you can see, the commercial is still here. This is multi-family... I'm sorry, these are the townhouses in purple, and the multi-family is in yellow. Again, putting them closer, the more dense residential uses closer to the town center. The retail and the commercial is in red and you'll see that we've got these commercial nodes spread out as well in addition to the commercial that's located in the town center. They'll be spread out throughout the project. And this future commercial is not part of this rezoning; it's already zoned B-2. It's our plan to also utilize that as part of this overall development. That's about 350,000 extra square feet of commercial. And please note that even though we have asked for a rezoning of 1.55 million square feet of commercial, that's not our limitation. We would love to see it much higher than that. So that's just a minimum that we would develop the site for. Other changes, key changes, again, I've talked about the outside of the 3,000 foot area of the centerline of the airport. If you'll also notice our density for the units is more consistent with some of the staff comments regarding creating a more urban setting. Units south of Accokeek Creek are more of 2 units per acre; north of Accokeek Creek are 4 units per acre, more dense. Obviously there's more land mass south as well. We have expanded the park area from 40 acres to 80 acres. You'll see the park area is located in here. We have located the school site which is inside here. That was one of the issues and concerns of staff before. And we based the school site on the most recent Anthony Burns Elementary School site, and the acreage for the same. We again have concentrated, as I've noted, more of the units in an urban setting so they can create more inner-connectivity. We have moved the fire station closer to Ramoth Church Road, which I think was also a question.

Mr. Rhodes: Where is that? I'm sorry.

Mr. Payne: It is... let me get my bearings here... sorry Mr. Chairman. Right here, sorry.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: It's a small map up here; I probably should cheat on my big map. We have removed the second connection to Accokeek Furnace Road. We, again as I've noted before, have created more commercial within the overall development of 350,000 square feet which is already zoned and not part of this rezoning, maintained our trail connectivity, we have moved units away from Kelsey Drive, we've also removed the connection to Kelsey Drive. Right now, just because what we would assume would be the fire department issues, we have only an emergency access showing there. So there will not be a connection to Kelsey Drive. And I think you had asked me about Fitz... I'm sorry, Zachary. There's no connection to Zachary either.

Mr. English: (Inaudible - microphone not on).

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Payne: No, that's correct. And, for purposes of along Kelsey, as many of you may know, we own property along Kelsey. They will be single-family homes, very similar to what's there now. Again, addressing some of the concerns that were raised by citizens at the last public hearing. And, again, we've got more open space as well. So, what's the percentage now? Well, it was at 43, so it's over 43%, so we've actually increased the open space as well. I don't know if you have any questions of the redesign at this point in time because I'm just going to move onto some of the other questions and issues that came up just so that we can keep moving on this because there's obviously a lot of material to absorb and still a lot more to come. On the CDA, we, just so you know, we have retained and had retained for some time, a professional consultant, Municap, Inc., who has worked in the County before. They have closed about 135 public funding programs at about \$2.8 billion. So they're very... have a lot of experience. We're working with them on many of the cost numbers in the CDA requirements. Staff has noted out generally how the CDAs work, you obviously have a couple CDAs in the County that are presently operating. What we plan to do before our next meeting, we hope, if so desire to continue this meeting, would be to have a draft CDA agreement in place to share with this Planning Commission which will outline in more detail obviously our phasing, cost, and the financing process. We believe, and there was a staff comment about an alternative to the CDA. I think the reality is, is that without the CDA being approved by the Board of Supervisors, there won't be a project. So the alternative to attempting to finance this via proffers and what that would require and the impact that would have...

Mr. Gibbons: Can I get you to repeat that one more time please?

Mr. Payne: As you may recall in the last staff report, there was a comment that we did not provide an alternative to the CDA, meaning that we didn't provide sort of a proffer program, if you will. If the CDA was denied, it would fall back on the proffers, right. What we're saying is, is that if the CDA is denied, there won't be a project.

Mr. Gibbons: So, you're saying if the Board doesn't approve a CDA, then this project is dead?

Mr. Payne: That's correct.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Yes sir. We just don't think, from an economic perspective, timing perspective, the County having to build public facilities, and infrastructure perspective, it won't work for the town center, it just won't work. We won't have enough time to do it. The key to the CDA is obviously the economics. And remember, I'm sure you all know about the CDA, there's no liability to the County. The liability is to the property owners and to the developer. It's floated by a private entity. The County has no full faith and credit, no liability, etcetera. So, this is built by the private sector; which means, you can build it cheaper, you can build it faster, typically you can build it a little more efficiently. Just so you have an idea of what we're looking at in regards to the phasing of this, of the CDA, because there's been some questions about that, typically what will happen is, and what we plan to do, is the initial infrastructure and the initial development will be built by the developer. And you may recall that in our proffers we have a section that says that we would collect X amount of money from single-family homes, from multi-family homes, and from townhomes, and those dollars would kind of go into an escrow if you will to pay back towards the CDA. Mr. Gibbons raises a good question about what happens; you know, we've got one that maybe hasn't paid its debt or maybe that's one that's failing -- I don't know all the facts behind that one. But I've heard and read some of those issues. There's no escrow funds, if you will; there's no seed funds, if you will, to pay during a rainy day. And that's what happened; there was a rainy day that came when the market changed. What we plan to do is to build the initial infrastructure

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

with the initial part of the development, have those dollars setting aside so that when a rainy day does come, that would partially fund the CDA. The other ways you fund the CDA is through a TIF; so it will be Tax Incremental Financing that will be part of the CDA agreement that we work with the County on. I'm sure many of you or all of you know how that works. And the County tax is at a hundred bucks; we would want to get 10 of that 100 to pay towards the TIF. That's typically how it would work.

Mr. English: A question again about the CDA. How would you... say the CDA was approved, how are you going to get that to the person that's buying the home? How is that going to be (inaudible)?

Mr. Payne: Okay, so there'll be a TIF, a Tax Incremental Financing, that will be on the entire project. Okay. So when a resident or a commercial developer, whoever pays for their taxes, like I was saying just use a round number, a hundred bucks, the TIF agreement could be that we get 10 bucks from that hundred to pay towards the CDA. So, from the resident, not from outside of the development, but within the residence... I'm sorry, within the development they pay the TIF. Okay, so within the P-TND the TIF will be paid and collected. In addition to that, the second tier of that would be the collection of the proffers, okay, which is about 35 million if my memory serves me, full build-out. And then the third part of that would be the assessments. So each resident would be assessed a certain amount of money each month that we'd pay towards the CDA. Now, you're not going to fund the full CDA on your first phase; you're going to phase it over time. Okay. So, the first phase we're thinking is going to be about 3 or 4 years if this is approved. After subdivision plan approval, we would likely go ahead and float the first bond, about 20 plus million bucks we'll say, which will allow us to start to the north and to the south to commence the construction of Mine Road. And then at that time, the question had come obviously about phasing in schools; we would also, at that time, dedicate the school site and also pay the \$10 million in cash at that point in time towards schools. So, the first phase would include schools. I know before we had talked about making all this has to be revised in a proffer statement and all this has to come back to you, but before we headed towards the end and now we're putting it back up the front. Okay? Again, the first part of the initial development, we're paying for the infrastructure. And about year 3 or 4 after that process begins, we're going to go ahead and start floating the bonds and start building the infrastructure and dedications to the schools in cash. So, I don't know if you have any questions on that but that's generally how it's going to work. Again, more details as this process evolves because this is relatively new to us. We just kind of got it yesterday; the engineer's been working hard on it so we're still kind of working on the numbers as well. We're also looking at the numbers that staff has provided. Someone had asked a question about what portion was ours? Well, we had an estimate of about 35 million in transportation and staff has 52 million just to build Mine Road from Courthouse to Ramoth. So, we all kind of need to get together to get our arms around these numbers.

Mr. Rhodes: It's a good road.

Mr. Payne: Yes. We'd take 52 over 35 in a heartbeat. Just want to make sure I didn't miss anything on the CDA part. I've got lots of notes here to forgive me. I've talked about how we would collect the funds. I don't know if anyone has any questions on that, again, a TIF or collected proffers and special assessments. And someone had asked, you know, what kind of happens if the debts' not paid or bad times. Again, we've got this rainy day fund we've got set aside which will be fairly significant. It's on the developer. The developer is securing the whole thing. So, the property within the development that's not otherwise been sold to other owners or third party property owners -- it's on the developer. So the developer would be on the hook, okay, at the end of the day. Not the County. Transportation. As I noted, staff has just for Mine Road alone has talked about a \$52 million cost to extend Mine Road from Courthouse to Ramoth Church. Our number was around 35; we're still looking at that as we crunch the

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

numbers. And that doesn't even include Woodcutters extension. So, there are still lots of numbers here to talk about which we're happy to do. I think it'd be very important to, just as a quick reminder, this is a down-zoning in regards to traffic impacts. I know that I stated that last time. It doesn't always resonate. But remember, this property is already zoned by-right for 462 residential units which would cost the taxpayers, if you will, with no proffers about \$22 million just using the County numbers. Okay. So I just want to make sure that we understand that. The other part of that is, about 8 or 12 million in industrial or commercial space could be built out with very little requirements to build infrastructure. So, you wouldn't see Mine Road extension, you wouldn't see Woodcutters, none of that. It would have a huge impact on Ramoth Church Road, huge impact. Just by looking at where our commercial and industrial properties are, and Courthouse, it will have an adverse impact on the interchange if we were able to do industrial and commercial at our location without the infrastructure of Mine Road and Woodcutters. So I just want to make sure that we understand that. In fact, our project is 43%, as proposed, is 43% less trips than by-right. So this is a down-zoning from an impact transportation perspective, okay? And also, it's a positive zoning in regards to that revenue. So I just want us to remember that in regards to what we can do by-right. Again, we're generally constructing two roads which have been identified by the County, right, in its infrastructure plan as part of its Comprehensive Transportation Plan that the taxpayers would otherwise have to build that we are going to build. You've heard estimates tonight ranging from 52 million etcetera just for Mine Road. And it will be built by the private sector. Now, there's been discussions, do we look at trips in regards to... and I will tell you, this is the first time I've had many, many rezoning cases where staff has asked me to build a road and that we would get credit for building a road, but this is the first time we said we're going to build the roads and they said, well, maybe we're not going to give you full credit for building the roads because we think that you're actually going to be the only ones utilizing it. But that's not accurate. That's not remotely accurate. We will be the heavy user on the Courthouse Road and entrance into our town center. We'll use about 52% of that capacity into the entrance of the town center. But basically the rest of Mine Road, in its 4-lane capacity, is going to benefit the County. We're going to have less usage in the low percentiles if you will, if you're looking at trips. So the capacity will be greater if we build a 4-lane Mine Road for the County -- and for other users. So, when you look at... when you do a TIA, a Transportation Impact Analysis, you're looking at approved projects or projects that are currently in place. You're not looking at future projects. So I think that's important to understand that when you're looking at a situation, we're going to build two significant roads that the County has planned is for the future. Which is what we should be doing anyways, honestly. We should be building for the future; shouldn't build it when it comes. The other thing that we're adding, that we're going to put in our proffer statement, is you had VDOT do a presentation here prior to our hearing last week and thought the timing was good for us to hear what they are going to include and not include in their package. We are going to, as part of our revised proffer statement, we are going to realign Austin Ridge Road and we are going to expand Courthouse from Austin Ridge to Mine Road, which were both part of VDOT's initial plans. That's about 8 or 9 million dollars in addition to the roads we're going to build from Woodcutter extension and Mine Road extension. So, that will be part of our revised proffer plan. That will be built in the initial phase as well. So we want to time it with the interchange construction that will be occurring at the time. Now, the County and/or VDOT's going to have to get the right-of-way for that, but we will build it, and we'll pay for it. Except for our right-of-way; you know, a right-of-way we'll be dedicating obviously. And again, we can get into the percentages of capacity. Well, staff has not seen our analysis yet so we still need to get that to them. We want them to analyze it but I think you're going to be pleasantly surprised to see the amount of capacity that will be created by a 4-lane parkway if you will on Mine Road from Courthouse Road to Ramoth Church and to the interchange. The other important that I want to make sure we don't miss is why Woodcutters is important. We don't need Woodcutters per se... maybe a small portion of it for our project. We can connect to Ramoth Church Road for our development; we could do that and still be able to have the same number of units.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

But, does it improve our development? Sure it does! But we don't need it, just to be honest with you. We're building it for several reasons; one, obviously to attract folks from Colonial Forge into our development so they'll go to the town center and spend money -- that's a very positive thing. But it will also relieve Ramoth Church Road. The County does have plans to improve Ramoth Church Road; it will not have to do so sooner. If it wants to do so later, it will have a choice to do so or not do it at all. Woodcutters will take a lot of that traffic that would typically go on Ramoth Church Road from our project or elsewhere on Woodcutters. So I think that's important to understand as part of this process and we look at evaluating what is a fair proffer, okay, for transportation. Schools, Mr. Chairman, I know you want me to get moving; I'm moving as quickly as I can. Schools -- again, we're going to do this in our first phase of financing, first 3 or 4 years. We are going to provide a school site, \$10 million in cash for the construction of that school. Just so you know, for the elementary school, you know, we're probably contributing about 51% of the students there from our site, but we're paying for, you know, half the costs too. It's about \$22 million I think was the estimate I saw from the school system for a new elementary school. And I believe that's at full build-out, equipment, furniture, the whole 9 yards. And again, again, we're still evaluating schools. So these projects are about economics; they're not about whether they can economically work. Especially when you've got this much infrastructure, you've got to build. It's not that we think schools aren't important, they're extraordinarily important. But you get bigger bang for your buck, greater tax revenue with infrastructure; it benefits schools. But we're also going to give money to schools. So that's what we're looking at. So we don't want people to think we're ignoring schools, because we're not. Believe me, I hear about it every day. Phasing -- we talked a little bit about phasing, 3 or 4 years after approval, commence construction, start floating bonds. Talked about tying commercial into this. You know, this is the first time we that we had seen staff's recommendation regarding limitations of townhouses or single-family detached at 150 a year. We'll look at that. That may be something that's reasonable. We're still at two tiers here... well, actually one tier and then here's a new tier is that, you know, we wouldn't build the 751st residential unit without building 30,000 square feet of commercial or having a permit for the same. And then we wouldn't go beyond 2,000 units without having a hundred thousand square feet of commercial. And, I'm not trying to be cute, we're not saying hey, you know, we're just going to have just a residential development here and be happy and kick back. That doesn't work for our project. The town center is what works. So we need the town center, but you have to have the rooftops first. It's all market driven. You probably read that in the paper today. It's all market driven. You've got to have the concentration of rooftops there. That's just the facts. So, we all want that. We want it. We want to get there as quickly as we possibly can; we think there's some good synergy happening around the interchange, around Courthouse. We're still looking at what we can and cannot do from a phasing perspective, but it is just so market driven you don't want to bankrupt a project by putting something that is just not reasonable in a proffer statement that going to have to come back here and get it revised. So, we want to be able to tell our investors here's our plan, here's how we're going to do it, and hopefully we'll get them here sooner rather than later. And we are talking to people -- a lot of people... on the commercial end. As again, we don't want to limit this project to 1.55 million square feet of commercial, which I would argue is one heck of a economic center for Stafford County. I don't know if there's... there's not another one like it. We'd like to build even more, so we'd like to go beyond that which we have shown on our plan, about 350,000 additional square feet. Plus we've got commercial spread out through the project. Utilities -- I know this is important to many of the neighbors and many of the people who came and spoke. I think it's important to understand that with this project, the Utilities Department is going to collect about \$50 million in tap fees. I know that's going to make some folks in Utilities who are planning to expand Utilities very happy. And we're going to be more than happy to pay it. If we have an impact on property owners with our development project, whether they have a well that goes dry and we're the direct impact, what we're planning to do, when we start extending utilities into our site, both from the north and south side, we're going to put in escrow \$50,000 for each side. So on the north side, we'll put

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

in \$50,000 for the Utility Department escrow, \$50,000 on the south side. If there is an issue where we cause a dry well, the Utility Department can pull from that escrow and go ahead and pay for the tap fees for those individuals. We'll provide the easements because we'll already have the extended utilities, so we're going to be able to do that as well. So, we think that's a fair number because we don't think we're going to have significant impacts. I think staff identified 48 surrounding properties; I'm not sure of those properties who has wells, who has septic, who has water, I'm not sure what the mix is. We thought that was a fair number to look at looking at what the tap fee costs were. And again, we'll re-evaluate as I go. If it looks like there's a greater number of folks who are being impacted, I will obviously contribute more, if that's the issue. But we thought that that would be a fair number to start with. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I think I've covered most of the questions and/or bases. Again, I apologize that since we last met, that we have... that we have sort of reinvented this a little bit. We heard you loud and clear. It's like moving an aircraft carrier to try to make sure it works on many fronts, not only the financing part and the CDA front but also conceptually. We've got RPAs, we've got wetland areas, we've got environmentally sensitive areas we've got to be cautious about when we move things around, we moved units, we've moved units outside listening to the airport's concerns, listening to the Joint Committee of the Planning Commission and the Airport Authority about building within that 3,000 foot centerline, we thought that that hurt us but we made the adjustment. Because we felt that the airport is important, its future is important to Stafford County, we think we're going to help them. We think we're going to be an asset to them as well. So we want to be a good neighbor and we took a look at that as well. And we also listened to you, Mr. Chairman, in regards to phasing of schools and some of these other capital improvements, and we want to expedite those as quickly as possible. We will research the fire station capacity question Mr. Coen. We haven't evaluated that yet so we are looking into that as well. We still need to tackle this CRPA analysis. We're going to talk to staff a little bit more about that. This is a huge project. Before even getting past you, if we were to go ahead and take that study, it's in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. And the cultural resources analysis I think we can probably get that done fairly quickly; we're going to look into getting that done as well, but we'll get back with staff on that.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: I've got a couple questions but I think I'd rather get the public hearing going first.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah. And did you have more Mr. Payne?

Mr. Payne: No, Mr. Chairman, that was it.

Mr. Rhodes: And certainly we can... I can just suggest, if there are primary questions that you feel should go to the applicant right now before the public comments necessary to get some things out there, we certainly can do those. Otherwise, we can always get back to the applicant afterwards and I would like to, they've been very patient, like to get to public comment. Is there anything particular that needs to go to the applicant right now? Okay, thank you very much Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: Thank you for your patience; appreciate it.

Mr. Rhodes: And now I'll move onto the public comment portion of this public hearing. If there is any member... and thank you very much for your patience; it is a very big project, there's a lot to it, so we wanted to make sure and get some information out there, but I do want to get to your comments. So if there's any member of the public that would like to speak on this item, item number 1, you may come forward and do so at this time. Just for to set expectations, it is not a question and answer interactive

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

dialogue, it is just an opportunity for you to put some statements out there, issues out there, and points out there. Certainly if there is follow-on dialogue and an opportunity to get that addressed readily, we will certainly try to. But I just don't want to have a misunderstanding on the process here. But it is your opportunity to get to comment. So I'd ask you to state your name and your address. A green will come on giving you 3 minutes; yellow light meaning 1 minute; red light we would ask that you try to wrap up your comments. Thank you. Sir.

Mr. Waters: My name's Jon Waters. The proposed Mine Road will be in my back yard. I'm not very happy about that. And I went around the County; they say this whole project is based around the town center. And how do you operate the...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Waters: I took some pictures that I wanted to go on here. I'm not sure who's operating it.

Mr. Rhodes: They'll get it there and we'll take care this time.

Mr. Waters: And you just scroll through. I went around and took some pictures of all the different establishments in Stafford that are empty business. Right now there's just everywhere you go in North Stafford there's commercial space for sale, empty office buildings, virtually on every street. I mean, I only went through North Stafford, from Quantico Office Park to Garrisonville Road and a little bit on Route 1 here. But some of these big office buildings that people have built here recently in the last few years, most of them are empty or getting that way really fast. The Defense Department and the government is downsizing and so these big companies with these big office buildings... Here we have a picture, this is 11 o'clock on a workday and it's virtually empty at this office building, Barrett Heights Road. There's another view of the same office complex; empty. Center Street, my wife's company, General Dynamics used to occupy an office right there. It was full at the time when she worked there, now it's pretty much empty. Here we go -- some more signs saying For Sale/For Lease. And this place here, Tech Parkway, I don't know what's going on with that but those places have been empty for 4 or 5 years. That Salad Deli opened up; went out of business immediately. They're just sitting there vacant. Another shot of the same little retail space, the sign saying there's all this land for commercial development and stuff like that. This is another shot of Tech Parkway right there. There are some buildings in Tech Parkway that are pretty, you know, I think the government... ones that are pretty full and stuff. But most of them you can't even say they're half full because they're not. You can't be positive and say the glass is half full in this instant because they're not. There's just too much space. Here's another one here on Garrisonville Road, empty parking lot, empty building. This place, I don't know what the story is on that. It doesn't even have a For Sale/For Lease sign out in front of this place. It's finished but nobody's occupying it and it doesn't look like anybody's interested in it. More signs. Everywhere you go. And this is not just in North Stafford. On Route 17, all the way down Route 1. This is Quantico Office Park here. They've got some people that are up there but they've got a lot of space that's still undeveloped. Empty parking lots in the middle of the day. This is right down on Route 1 here, south of Quantico Office Park. More strip mall, empty strip malls or partially empty strip malls. And this is the place behind the Post Office here that had some people in it but for some reason they went out of business. This is the strip mall with the Food Lion in it, empty spaces there. We have empty spaces in the Aquia Park strip mall. This is across from Aquia Harbour, the Aquia Towne Center. That place has been sitting there empty for, I don't know, 5 years now, something like that. And here we have the Aquia Towne Center. I'm sure a lot of people, you know, back in the day said this is what we need. We need Aquia Harbour and we need a big fancy Towne Center here. And here we go... what does it say here? Eat, Shop, Play, and Work. Well, how many people are working at this new

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

office building? Virtually nobody. You can shop at one of these empty stores here; there's only like 2 or 3 left.

Mr. Rhodes: Do you have very many more sir?

Mr. Waters: What's that?

Mr. Rhodes: Do you have very many more?

Mr. Waters: No, it almost done, almost done here. So this is I guess what the Towne Center, when they tore it down, was supposed to look like when they rebuilt it. I don't know why they didn't; nobody's interested in it I guess. But where did it all go? Here's a good shot right here; great place to play, just like the sign says. And I just don't think we need a bunch more retail space and stuff when the County's full of it and nobody's using it. What's it going to be like in 20 years? There's more and more people shopping online instead of going to retail stores. And more and more people are getting delivered... their meals delivered instead of going to restaurants. So in 20 years from now, this place will be virtually obsolete I think. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Okay, we will end the public comment. Did you want... I know there's a lot more new information...

Mr. Gibbons: Do we have a soft copy of what he just said?

Mr. Rhodes: We can get those printed up?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, I'm going to end the public comment portion and we'll bring it back into the Planning Commission. I know there's going to be a lot more new information. Do we want to keep the public hearing portion open so people can...?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, the concern I got is, I'm the old clock-watcher, every time we get another meeting we get new information, it comes off of our clock.

Mr. Rhodes: We do have a time limit of...

Mr. Gibbons: March, right?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, March 10th, which is really actually February 25th because we won't have a meeting before March 10th.

Mr. Gibbons: That's correct. So, I think that the developer, if he wants us to keep on doing this, I'd like to keep it open too. But maybe give us a 60 day extension, because we're going to be backed up against, I mean, another meeting (inaudible).

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: We have 3 more meetings right now with the time limit we have.

Mr. Gibbons: It's just a request, that's all.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Well, we can... we did kind of end a little bit abruptly. I wasn't sure if there were other follow-on questions or open issues remaining that wanted to be addressed towards the applicant? I think you had some.

Mr. English: I had a couple.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Payne, if you could come forward.

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman. And of course we have our consultant here as well if I can't answer the questions.

Mr. English: Just 2 questions for you Mr. Payne. In reference, you said that you've got 43% more open space. Is that downsizing as far as housing? Is it going to be less housing now since you have more open space?

Mr. Payne: Well, we've reduced the size of the houses is probably a better way to put it. We have 22 less townhouses. We've created a little more urban-like feel to the south.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Payne: So the houses, am I correct, the houses are actually... the lots are smaller than they were before.

Mr. English: So really you haven't reduced the housing then.

Mr. Payne: Twenty-two lots... 22 units is what we (inaudible).

Mr. English: And another question is, in reference to your... my concern is the well situation. You said you're putting \$50,000 on each side, so there's \$100,000.

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. English: There may be, I know for a fact there's certain places that County water does not run through there, because it stops at certain places. So, you're going to have to dig a well. And digging a well is probably going to cost you about \$15,000, so if you had a row of houses, you had 10 houses, they go out and you're going to have to dig wells, are you going to be able to do that? Because if there's no way to have water hookup on certain areas, if the County has stopped at certain places... it stops at the commuter lot and it doesn't pick back up again I'm thinking just below, just up from Rock Hill Road. So there's like a donut hole that there's no water at all. And then it picks up at Embrey Mill but it's not across. So, what about that situation? How would you address that?

Mr. Payne: I didn't know about that situation; very good question. If I can, I'm going to let my engineers take a look at it and see what that number possibly could be. And then I'll come back to you and say here's how I think (inaudible).

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. English: And then also, if there well goes dry, I mean, how fast are you guys going to be responding to these folks because if it goes dry...

Mr. Gibbons: They'll get a water truck and fill the wells like we had to do in Augustine.

Mr. English: Right. So that's another question I'd like to know.

Mr. Payne: We'll come up with a plan as well; if they do go dry, what our plan would be. How about that?

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for Mr. Payne? While they're thinking, when do you think we'll have the revised proffers and some of this other information you were discussing?

Mr. Payne: Certainly less than 30 days or within 30 days.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: Again, this new configuration is relatively new to all of us right now. I mean, we're still analyzing it.

Mr. Rhodes: And just to confirm with counsel, the ability to go beyond the time limit, that is with the applicant approving or agreeing or requesting? How does that go?

Ms. McClendon: Yes Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: And I respect obviously Mr. Gibbons a lot and I appreciate his foresight in where this may end up, but I would ask respectfully to see what happens after the next meeting where we are. And at that point in time I can address whether we can continue.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: Is that fair?

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, what bothers me now is, Charlie was right, God Bless his soul. He came in and he said this is a game changer. When you take a look at the complexity of what we've got here and how we've got to integrate it with 3 other subdivisions that's already been platted, it's going to take time Charlie. So if you say after the next meeting, that gives us 2 meetings to work it out. And that's not fair. If it's worth all your effort to change it and try to work it out with us, I just think that you're pushing... I'd rather give it to the Board now and say it's incomplete and when it's complete give it back to us then to let the clock keep going and then we're up again... we always get up against the governor at the last meeting when we're looking at stuff at the 11th hour. So that's why I brought it up.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I'm with Mr. Gibbons. I've raised this point several times on less complicated rezonings; this one is, since I've been here, the most complicated and I feel backed up into a corner especially in light of the fact that, with all due respect to Mr. Payne's comment, 30 days before

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

we're going to get the next proffer potentially, the next proffer revision. I mean, that's a big piece of this. That puts us... we'd have one more meeting after that. I think it would help us all to know that we have more time collectively to massage this and see that it's, I'll use this term, fully baked before we, you know, before we go in the wrong direction here. So, I think having more time and knowing that we have more time, is beneficial to everybody.

Mr. Rhodes: I think we are making progress with this very big and complex thing, but those are fair points. So, what I'm hearing is a desire to know we're going to be able to work this deliberately versus assuming we will. Because I assume we will.

Mr. Payne: I'm working fast, that's all I can tell you. I do not want you to have a half-baked project in front of you in which to make a decision. That's not my goal. And I won't be successful if that's what happens; you're going to turn it down and you should. So I'm not going to have a half-baked product by the time it gets back to you in 30 days. I will... when I say that, you know, we're going to try to get probably revised proffers in 2 weeks, we'll probably have revised numbers by then on our CDA, and we'll have a revised GDP, I would think. Do you think we can get that done in 2 weeks? I don't want to waste your time, so, I understand that and I appreciate that respective. So we're going to hustle on our end.

Mr. Rhodes: Understood. And I would just submit that as you are working on those revisions, you might consider, in advance, because if we get it and we meet back on this session after next we will only have one other session to act on it. I would think at that point I would be surprised that everybody is very confidently being that session that they know they'll be able to close out the next time. So I would also be talking with your clients about what to consider about an extension in the process in there too. That's my assumption. Maybe it'll be a perfect world and everybody... and the skies will clear and it will be a beautiful sunny sky, the palm trees will be swaying...

Mr. Payne: It's always my hope, but it's January. But, we will, during the... in between now and the next meeting, analyze that as well, and I will send a letter into the Chairman and to Mr. Harvey as to where we are with it and where we think we will be and if we need additional time we'll ask (inaudible) for the additional time.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, other questions for the applicant? Okay, there's more to come, but this is... this is your'n.

Mr. Gibbons: I'm not afraid to give it to the Board even if it's incomplete and say this is where we are in the process. You only have a year to look at it, and let them either send it back to us or maybe they get it extended, because even though... it's just like Santa Clause comes at Christmas. They're going to be under the gun in the next month trying to get all of this. This is, like Mr. Apicella said, very complicated applications.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, before we decide on any action, if I might ask staff to also take a look at the latest proposal that's been provided just tonight and to overlay... I know it's not been approved and that we haven't talked about it and that it has a ways to go... but the land use compatibility zones, if they could overlay that with the proposal, this new proposal so everybody can see it in that context. I think that would be helpful.

Mr. Rhodes: Good. Understanding it's not governing now but still to have an idea how it would work. Right, okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: For clarification, the airport land use compatibility plan.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, just to see how it would work. Okay, other thoughts or other points? Mr. English is right on his button there.

Mr. English: I hear you what you're saying, Mr. Gibbons, and sending it to the Board, but I think in all fairness to Mr. Payne, I would like to give him another 30 days and leave the public hearing open and see where we are in 30 days.

Mr. Rhodes: That would take us to February 11th session.

Mr. Gibbons: Just one meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, at that point in time, we would have one meeting to deal with it.

Mr. English: (Inaudible) decision and if we can't come up with something, we'll send it to the Board as it? We'll have to.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, and we could act right then if we weren't comfortable with what time we had left in order to give the Board their time.

Mr. English: That's my motion.

Mr. Rhodes: So there's a motion to defer this to February 11th session, keeping the public hearing open.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Eh, Mr. Boswell beat you, sorry. Mr. Boswell, second. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Boswell? Any other member? Please Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, to the extent that anything is available that the applicant may have in the interim, if they want to share it with us, I certainly have no problem with that. Again, because what will happen is we'll get it Friday before the Wednesday when we have to look at it. I think the more time we have to digest it in between, the better again for everybody.

Mr. Rhodes: We are talking about the 7th and 8th of February, just so you know... lots of reading. Okay, yeah, I'm with you; understood. Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: And if I can piggyback on Mr. Apicella, the whole point of keeping the public meeting open is so that the public would be able to give a comment. We really can't comment because a lot of this information was new to us tonight. They clearly couldn't comment. And so, quite honestly, the most information that can be made available that can be put some way for the public to see, even if it's on your own website and you let us know or Mr. Harvey know and then we can scream it from the rooftops

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

to people that can go to that website and look at the new information so the public could actually have some input and be able to have informed comments; that would be helpful.

Mr. Rhodes: Great; good point. Okay, any other comments? All those in favor of the motion to defer this to the February 11th session and maintain the open public hearing, 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.

Mr. Gibbons: Remember the promise tonight; if they don't get the CDA it's (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I heard that. Okay, very good. We're going to move onto item number 2 of Unfinished Business, RC1400221, the reclassification for Winding Creek. I assume we'll do 2 and 3 together?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. RC1400221; Reclassification – Winding Creek - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District, to allow a greater density single-family detached subdivision, of up to 97 units, be developed on Assessor's Parcels 29-4 and 29-5C. The property consists of 63.13 acres and is located at the intersection of Winding Creek Road and Embrey Mill Road, within the Garrisonville and Rock Hill Election Districts. **(Time Limit: February 10, 2015) (History: Deferred on November 12, 2014 to January 14, 2015)**

3. CUP1400222; Conditional Use Permit – Winding Creek - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a cluster subdivision of up to 2.25 dwelling units per acre on Assessor's Parcels 29-4 and 29-5C, which are concurrently under consideration for a reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District. The property consists of 63.13 acres, located at the intersection of Winding Creek Road and Embrey Mill Road, within the Garrisonville and Rock Hill Election Districts. **(Time Limit: February 10, 2015) (History: Deferred on November 12, 2014 to January 14, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Please...

Mr. Gibbons: I'd like to delay this one more meeting. I promised to meet with those people and I haven't quite got the whole thing done.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: The Winding Creek one?

Mr. Gibbons: Right.

Mr. Rhodes: Is the... so, you want to forego the presentation and commentary?

Mr. Gibbons: (Inaudible) for the next meeting and I promised to meet with the Homeowners and I couldn't get it done over the holiday. I did meet with the Board member.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so, if it's the will of the Commission, is there anything to preclude since we've had it advertised deferring at this point, just so I know the rules? Mr. Harvey? Ms. McClendon?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, my recollection is the Planning Commission held its hearing and closed the hearing and (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: So, it's ours to do.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, Mr. Gibbons has a suggestion here that we forego the presentation and defer this until he can talk to the community... the folks he's going to talk to. Thoughts or reactions?

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, I would second that. I think that's an excellent idea.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So, it's a motion and a second; further comments from folks. Mr. Gibbons, further comment? Mr. Coen? Anyone else? I feel a little awkward that we're here at the point and the people are here and the staff has presented, personally, that's where I'm at. However the members go. So, there is a motion and a second deferring this till the... what the heck is today?

Mr. Harvey: January 28th.

Mr. Rhodes: The 28th, January 28th... all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Opposed? Aye. Okay, it passes 6 to 1. We have deferred. Very good. We are now onto item number 4, RC1400159, Reclassification of Reserve at Woodstock Lane. Mr. Harvey.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

4. RC1400159; Reclassification – Reserve at Woodstock Lane - A proposed reclassification from the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District, to allow for a single-family detached residential subdivision, of up to 41 units, be developed on Assessor's Parcels 21-167 (portion) and 21-170. The property consists of 36 acres, located at the intersection of Telegraph Road and Woodstock Lane, approximately 1,100 feet east of Jefferson Davis Highway, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: February 10, 2015) (History: Deferred on November 12, 2014 to January 14, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Erica Ehly for the staff update.

Ms. Ehly: Good evening Mr. Chair and Planning Commission. If I could have the computer please? Just as a quick review, the applicant is requesting a reclassification from the B-2 Zoning District to the R-1 Zoning District to develop a proposed 40-unit single-family residential development on a 35-acre site, located at the intersection of Telegraph Road and Woodstock Lane in the Griffis-Widewater Election District. A future hotel site lies to the north, Carl Lewis Park is to the east, to the south is Aquia Harbour Subdivision, and undeveloped land is to the west, which contains the Brent Family Cemetery. A public hearing was held on November 12, 2014. Staff has provided additional information in the staff report to address concerns by the public and the Commission. In this presentation, I'll briefly summarize those points. So, the first issue was the current state of the transportation network surrounding the proposed site. And staff continues to recommend full transportation proffers to address the proportionate impacts to Level of Service capacity and safety of the intersection of Woodstock Lane and Route 1, and also the intersection between Telegraph Road and Route 1. In the backup documentation, according to the capacity analysis submitted by the applicant, 80% of the traffic generated by the proposed development will impact these failing intersections. Additionally, we would like to note that staff has received additional information regarding the status of the proposed intersection improvements related to the VDOT study. The VDOT study did mention several alternatives to address the issue at the Woodstock Lane/Route 1 intersection. The improvements are contemplated for inclusion in next year's budget, with the application of \$1.2 million which had been collected by the Widewater Parkway Community Development Authority. The improvements will need to be reviewed by FAMPO still, for consistency with the regional plan before submission for federal funding. And the next issue was additional buffering between lot 28 and the stream channel to the south, and also buffering between lots 28 through 37 and the existing residential homes. The GDP has been revised to include undisturbed buffer within open space Parcel A. And the proffer statement has been revised to state that the parcel shall not be cleared and shall remain undisturbed. And this is just an excerpt from the GDP showing the two locations where the notes are on open space Parcel A. The next issue was school impacts. Widewater Elementary is over-capacity and Shirley Heim Middle School is approaching capacity. These are proposed to be mitigated by the 2019-2020 school year through redistricting process. Additionally, the school division made a comment regarding the safety of the intersection between Woodstock Lane and Route 1 as it is dangerous for buses; they have to go up to the northern intersection which is signalized. The next issue is a comparison; we received a request by the Commission at the public hearing to compare the existing by-right and proposed reclassification development impacts. Those are discussed in the staff report in greater detail, but the summary is the evaluation supports the reclassification to a residential use within this area with the mitigation of impacts to there's a few public facilities where the demand is increased as identified. The staff report also summarizes the past reclassifications which went from commercial uses to residential uses over the past 10 years; there were four of them. And there was a concern regarding the buffer around Brent Family Cemetery; a comment from the public regarding federal code regulations. It's been determined that the buffer as depicted on the GDP is in accordance with the federal code regulations and also noted that the closest points within the proposed development are at lot 9, at 470 feet, and lot 7, which is 320

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

feet, from the cemetery. The applicant also submitted this color rendering to illustrate open space and preservation areas on the subject property. Additionally, it should be noted that the applicant has proffered \$10,000 to Brent Family Cemetery planned improvements upon approval of the first subdivision plan. And just to reiterate from the last meeting, staff does find these positive aspects to the proposal consistent with the established development pattern. The proposed uses and development pattern meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, the right-of-way dedication on Woodstock Lane accommodates planned transportation improvements, and the monetary proffers meet or exceed the Parks and Recreation and Fire and Rescue category recommendations. Staff also finds negative aspects which concern the intersection of Route 1 and Woodstock Lane regarding safety and capacity, and monetary proffers do not include a per unit contribution for transportation, library, schools, or general government in order to offset these impacts. And staff again recommends approval of the proposal with the consideration of per unit contributions overall that are closer to the proffer guidelines and also with a special consideration to transportation proffers in relation to the Route 1/Woodstock Lane intersection.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Questions for staff please. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Did you discuss with the applicant some flexibility on the cash contribution should it not be needed for Fire and Rescue or recreational facility uses?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, Mr. Apicella, the proffer statement does state that should that amount not be used for Fire and Rescue, that it could be used for transportation and I believe... and schools.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for staff? Thank you very much. Applicant please.

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman and other members of the Planning Commission. My name is Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer. I'd like to thank staff for presenting information to you regarding our project and additional information that you had requested. Did I hear correctly that there's \$1.2 million budgeted for the intersection... or the...? It's available?

Mr. Harvey: It's currently being discussed. There is money still left within that defunct Community Development Authority fund. One of the projects that's been studied and discussed with VDOT is the Woodstock Lane/Route 1 intersection for improvement. So it's possible that those funds, if it's adopted in the CIP and accepted by FAMPO as a project, could become part of the Six-Year Plan and move forward for engineering and construction.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good, thank you.

Mr. Payne: I think it's also important to note that this project is still subject to impact fees, so it still would be paying impact fees because there are zero dollars being paid towards transportation. So it's not meeting its minimal amount in regards to the impact fee so there's no credit. So that would be... so you would be paying per unit for the impact fees, transportation impact fees. And, as staff noted, there's dedication of right-of-way necessary for Woodstock. And you may recall, this is a downzoning project. In fact, the traffic generator from these 40 units would be 96% less than what it could be done by by-right; it's zoned B-2. So, the traffic issue is actually being minimized. The intersection issues that are happening right now on Telegraph and Route 1 are existing, not caused by this project. This project is actually adding very little to that, in my opinion. The overall impact, and again, this project is paying impact fees and other strong proffers for Parks and Recreation at the Carl Lewis Center and at the Aquia

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Fire and Rescue. If dollars aren't applied to Aquia Fire and Rescue, they obviously could be utilized for schools and/or roads in that particular area. We did meet with the Brent Cemetery folks; they're here if you have any questions for them. We talked extensively about what their proposed improvements were or are to be. I think they're still working through that process but we've got a general idea of what that cost would be. We decided to make a donation in that regard which we'll do when we submit the first subdivision plan. We also told them that, you know, we'll be there clearing the site in the next couple of years. If you're there making improvements, or in that process, we'll be a good neighbor and come over and assist you with that process as well. I don't know if you have any other questions for me, but I think staff has covered some of the questions. I know Mr. Coen had questions about open space and buffering; hopefully that rendering helps. And we did proffer the 50-foot buffer behind lot 28 if my memory serves me, and also in between 28 and 37 to the adjoining properties on the other side. And we're preserving all the open space that you're seeing. Sorry Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for the applicant. Mr. English.

Mr. English: I just wanted to know if we could just hear from St. William of York, if they're satisfied with what's going on. Can you come up?

Mr. Rhodes: I'm sorry, we're being telecast nationwide... or something like that. If you could just state your name sir and where you're from, we'd appreciate it. Thank you.

John Amarantides: John Amarantides and I'm from the Arlington Diocese.

Mr. English: Are you happy with the outcome of this?

Mr. Amarantides: Right now we're basically just mowing the grass, cutting the trees, and the gravesites are deteriorating. So anything that we can get in order to try to restore some of the stones, the walls, the altar, would be helpful, very helpful.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Hey John...

Mr. Rhodes: You're the star tonight.

Mr. Amarantides: Yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: What was discussed the other night that this is really the only active cemetery you have in the Diocese today.

Mr. Amarantides: It is not... well, the Brent Cemetery is not active. I mean, it's...

Mr. Gibbons: I mean, it's still a cemetery owned by you.

Mr. Amarantides: It's still a cemetery but we've got several cemeteries.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Other questions for the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: So, it's about what, 55-60% of the parcel would be left as open space?

Mr. Payne: I believe it's more than that but... I've got a percentage here, sorry... 66%.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Gibbons: Need a motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, we'll bring it back in. This is your'n.

Mr. Boswell: Yes sir. I'd like to make a motion that we approve RC1400159.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion recommending approval by...

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: ... Mr. Boswell; second... no, Mrs. Bailey beat you... second by Mrs. Bailey. Further comment Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: I'd just like to say I had some concerns with the transportation issue.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, I'm sorry, excuse me. Ms. McClendon?

Ms. McClendon: I believe the applicant has presented new information tonight that the Planning Commission needs to accept prior to voting tonight.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, there's stuff that wasn't available? What'd they present, I'm sorry. I just didn't register that.

Mr. Boswell: I missed it too.

Ms. McClendon: I believe the proffer statement.

Mr. Rhodes: Proffer statement? Okay, I apologize. Thank you very much Ms. McClendon. So, excuse me, we need to back off from that motion and that second and we'll get to it in a moment. So, first we need to entertain a motion to recommend receiving... the proffer statement is new?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, the GDP and the proffer statement are new.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so we need to have a motion to be able to act on the new information that's received this evening.

Mr. Boswell: So moved.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Boswell, second by Mr. Coen. Any further comment Mr. Boswell? Mr. Coen? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion to accept the new information as received in order to act upon it 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. Now we would entertain a motion to recommend approval of RC1400159.

Mr. Boswell: So moved.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mrs. Bailey. Any further comment Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: I just wanted to touch on the transportation issue; it was a sticking point at the last Planning Commission meeting but it looks like that's being worked out. And I'm glad to hear the cemetery is getting some help. And we've got a lot of open space. I think it'll be fine.

Mr. Rhodes: Great, okay. Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I too have concerns about the transportation issue and I do hope that that will be resolved in a timely manner. I've had the opportunity to go to that intersection many times from some of the housing developments there, and it is a little bit tricky. So I do hope that that does come into fruition. But, on the other hand, I know that some of the property owners that were backed up to that particular parcel, specifically those within the Aquia Harbour subdivision, are probably a little bit more happy to know that they'll be backing up to residential rather than commercial.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Yes, please Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly. Along with the transportation concern is concern for the proffer for schools. However, very pleased with the amount of open space, which is excellent. And I'm also very pleased about the buffering towards the creek which one of the people who spoke last time raised, as well as sort of the buffering or keeping the open space towards other homes in place as well. So it's nice that you listened to the people who spoke last time and I think you addressed those. So thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Mr. Apicella.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I think it's important to, at least from my vantage point, to point out that it's very rare that we have a rezone from business from residential uses. I mean, we've only got four cases in front of us. In three of those cases the parcels were... or the piece of the parcels were very small where the business didn't make sense. The fourth instance was Abberly which, again, I think is a unique set of circumstances. So I would hate to send the message that we're changing our construct here in Stafford County that we think residential is better than business. That usually isn't the case. In this instance, it is the case because if we left the by-right zoning in place, it would make, it would exacerbate the issues that are occurring at the intersections. This actually is a better solution than what is currently in place. And, for those few reasons, I think it's a good idea to go down this alternate path and allow a small amount of residential. And lastly, the fact that they're preserving as open space two-thirds of the parcel I think is also very laudable. So, for all those reasons, I think this is a rare instance where we should go down this path and approve it and that's why I support it.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any other further comments? Okay, all those in favor of the motion to recommend approval of the reclassification for RC1400159 signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Thank you all very much; appreciate it. Item number 5 is just deferred and waiting for other actions to occur. Item number 6 I think the Board is actually going to bring this up at their work session on the 20th; correct Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct, starting at 5 o'clock.

Mr. Rhodes: So, they had talked about maybe doing a separate work session a weekend or some other things, but they've decided to actually start talking back on the UDA and we've given them information, TGAs and other things, but they're going to have a work session at 5 o'clock on the 20th of January to discuss this. I unfortunately won't be able to be there. I know Mr. Apicella's still looking at some things. At minimum, I intend to draft up something to capture some of the macro points that we have submitted before. I would share that with everyone before I would send it in. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, a 5 o'clock meeting is almost impossible for me to make. I would request that perhaps our Secretary and maybe one other person attend, if they would like, to sit in on it so we can, you know, get direct feedback on the context and outcomes of that discussion.

Mr. Rhodes: And just to remind, we did have the opportunity to talk with the Chair and the Vice Chair several weeks ago, to talk a bit about this. They've invited the Chair and Vice Chair back; both of us just can't figure out how to make it. But if others would at least like to be there to hear the conversation and maybe to participate in, I'm sure Mr. Harvey could share that with them; if there are one or two

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

others that are available. And again, I am going to try to scribe some things down that I would share with you first that I would also submit to them in advance of that. So, if you would consider that, it would be helpful. Okay, item number 7, New Business. Mr. Harvey.

5. SPR14150371 – Liberty Knolls II, Block Length Waiver - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, Section 22-156, Block Length, to allow for a block length of 2,113 feet, which exceeds the maximum allowable block length of 1,200 feet, on Assessor's Parcel 29-17, currently zoned A-1, Agricultural, located on the north side of Courthouse Road approximately 1,100 feet east of Winding Creek Road, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(History: Deferred on October 22, 2014 until further action by the Board)**
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) (Discussed at June 21, 2014 Retreat) (Chairman coordinating with Board of Supervisors)**

NEW BUSINESS

7. Discussion on cluster development standards within Virginia

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Blackburn is going to give a staff presentation regarding some of the cluster standards we find throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. This was initially requested by Mr. Apicella in concerns about our current cluster regulations.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mrs. Blackburn: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members, and Happy New Year!

Mr. Rhodes: Happy New Year!

Mrs. Blackburn: As Mr. Harvey stated, at your November 11th meeting in 2014, you voted to request additional information on cluster provisions throughout the Commonwealth. One of the first... and several questions were asked. First, it was the background of cluster provisions in the Virginia Code. I provided you with 3 major bills; the first one was done in 2002, House Bill 346. And that provided cluster provisions to be optional. It also stated that it was to be a by-right without increasing density and... but that you could increase the density with a special approval. Then in 2006, Senate Bill 374 was adopted. That made it mandatory for localities with 10% increase in population and it must be applicable to 40% of the land that is agricultural and residential; that it shall be a by-right use with the same criteria for density otherwise permitted; that you could increase the density by special approval or as a by-right in compliance with standards of the ordinance; and it discussed existing ordinances as of 2002 to be in compliance if the cluster is a by-right notwithstanding other requirements. In 2011, Senate Bill was passed, 783, and that included provisions for definition of the open space or conservation areas, and also talked about existing ordinances as of 2011 shall be brought into compliance. The next question was to identify the results thus far in our County. So far, we have 2... for the R-1 clustering... so far we have 2 approved subdivisions, Brooke Village and Shelton Knolls. Brooke Village, the original lots, if there had been no bonus provided through a CUP, was 14 at 1.5 dwelling units per acre. They received a CUP for 20 units at 2.1 dwelling units per acre, which is an increase of 6. And Shelton Knolls was 71 lots at 1.5 dwelling units per acre, and their Conditional Use Permit allowed for 1.97 units per acre, which provided for 94 units; an increase of 23. I also provided you copies of their layout,

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

as far as using the open space goes. And then there was the list of the Virginia jurisdictions that provide the bonus density as part of their cluster provisions.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Susan, before we move on from the subdivisions that have already been approved, there are some that I will say that are in the queue waiting for Board approval, like Courthouse Manor, that were also bonus density type subdivisions. Were there any other besides Courthouse Manor you can think of?

Mrs. Blackburn: There is the one that was not heard tonight, Winding Creek, and I think they're only getting 3. And which was the other one?

Mr. Harvey: There's also one off of Truslow Road; it's not quite made it to the Planning Commission yet.

Mrs. Blackburn: Okay, Woodstock doesn't have any bonus density at all. We've got like three.

Mr. Apicella: I guess my point is, it's not just these two.

Mrs. Blackburn: No, we have a few in the works and I would be more than happy to get their latest layouts to you all and their numbers.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mrs. Blackburn: That's no problem with that. And out of all the jurisdictions in the state, there are 49 jurisdictions that are required to have cluster provisions. Out of those, 36 have them. And out of that number, 11 have the bonus densities. And I gave you a list of all of those jurisdictions and basically what they did as far as bonus density goes, why they were able to do it; for example, some of them just because you had open space. You have to have more lots. Two that were in particular of interest that actually had some real design standards was Amelia County and Dinwiddie, and I provided that information to you all. A follow-up to that, we were requested to get in touch with Dinwiddie County, which we have done, to ask a few more questions of how they did what they did. And we have not heard... I've heard back that they're working on getting it back to us, but we have not received the information as of yet. They did have a 2 hour delay and I know they had worst weather in the last couple days than we did. As soon as I get that information, I will forward it onto you. And do you have any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Questions? Not really directly related, but looking at the layout for Shelton Knolls, didn't they used to have two entrance/exits off of Shelton Shop Road? Did they convert one to a cul-de-sac or was that always only one access to Shelton Shop?

Mrs. Blackburn: I think that was always (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Always one? Okay. Well, they've got potential inter-parcel connectors that could go to the east. They've got the one that's going to the Shelton Woods to the south. For some reason I just thought there were two, so I was a little surprised. Okay. Sorry, that was not necessarily germane to this. Mr. Apicella.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Just a process question. So, if we wanted to consider either adopting performance standards and/or eliminating bonus density, what would be our path forward? How would we proceed?

Mrs. Blackburn: Well, as far as it would require a bonus density change would require an amendment to the code and we would go through that process to request that the Board be interested in this.

Mr. Rhodes: We'd ask the Board if they wanted to refer to us to modify the ordinance to advertise?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, and the Commission could sort of draft an initial version to send to the Board for their further understanding of what you're asking for.

Mr. Rhodes: That'd probably be the best way forward, that we get staff working on something we kind of think looks good, send it to the Board to consider if they want to refer it to us, and authorize. Folks like that idea? Okay. Anything you need from us Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: If there's any thoughts that the Commission has as far as what sort of bonus density and/or what sort of performance (inaudible) maybe interested in having included in a draft.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, quite frankly I like a hybrid of the two that we have from Dinwiddie and, I'm sorry, what was the other county?

Mrs. Blackburn: Amelia.

Mr. Apicella: Amelia, Dinwiddie I think goes closer to, and it's still not clear to me whether what they're doing is permissible and that's something I think we to potentially research, but it sets... I don't want to use benchmarks... but it sets certain parameters that would allow developers to achieve greater or bonus density based on the amount and type and contiguous nature of the open space. So, my preference would be to go in that direction if my fellow Commissioners are of the same mind.

Mr. Rhodes: Other thoughts?

Mr. English: I think it's a start.

Mr. Gibbons: I think they're being overrun (inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, it sounds like everybody agrees.

Mr. Apicella: I think the only other point I would make is, because I believe we... the County has adopted a legislative package and is this one of the issues that was pushed forward to allow us to I guess somehow prescriptively establish standards more so than may currently be allowable under the code?

Mr. Harvey: The requested legislation would give the County some additional wording and emphasis for having a consolidated open space area, but not necessarily have any other performance standards.

Mr. Apicella: So, again, my only concern is I've looked at Dinwiddie's ordinance; I'm still not sure that it's necessarily in compliance with the code. And my thought is, if we can't get there from here, then

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

our other alternative to present to the Board is to eliminate bonus density unless and until the legislature gives us that capability. I'm just going to add that to the conversation.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. We can add that into the correspondence communication going back. Okay. So, as you can develop something, we'll bring it back and we'll chat on it.

Mrs. Blackburn: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Thank you very much for that. And we're onto Planning Director's Report.
Mr. Harvey: Happy New Year.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule
- 2014 Annual Report

Mr. Harvey: Happy New Year! Thank you Mr. Chairman. Congratulations on your reappointment.

Mr. Rhodes: Woohoo!

Mr. Harvey: I have two items of business to discuss with the Commission tonight, the first item being your Planning Commission Meeting Schedule. Staff has put together a draft based on the normal meeting cycle of the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month. You will note that there are, right now, no proposed breaks in the schedule, so that would be for the Commission to decide how you want to adjust the schedule as initially proposed. Once you adjust the schedule, you can vote to accept it as your official schedule for the year and we will post it online and take appropriate measures.

Mr. Rhodes: Historically, if there has been a meeting that was going to hit very proximate to Thanksgiving or Christmas, those were ones we would question whether or not we wanted to retain on there, and we happen to have ones that do that again this year. Yeah, and then the other thing historically has been how we approach the summer to give a little bit larger windows for staff to take off, everybody take off and try and work some things. Prior precedence before last year had been that you'd work a couple in a row, but there was concerns last year that that gets too big a spread in the schedule and causes too much to back up. So, last year I think what we did was we did the first one in July and the first one in August we dropped out as another approach. But we can certainly entertain any thoughts folks have.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, again, I would start with the one closest to Thanksgiving and the one closest to Christmas, and recommend that those be... those dates be removed from the schedule. And the July 8th obviously is very close to July 4th and kind of what you were talking about, if we were going to alternate, then that would likely mean that maybe the 12th we'd also drop off. So, I don't recall what we did in June, if we had two meetings in June or not.

Mr. Rhodes: We did have two meetings in June this year. We actually had to mess with one of them, didn't we?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Commission cancelled its second May meeting in order to accommodate the retreat.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: The retreat, yeah, that's what we did.

Mr. Harvey: So, the Commission essentially had three meetings in June.

Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mr. Apicella: So, just to kind of summarize, my recommendation is to remove July 8th, August 12th, November 25th, and December 23rd from the schedule.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so our motion in order to say we're going to adopt a schedule is to adjust the schedule first, and before we adopt it, to drop July 8, drop August 12, drop November 25th, and drop December 23rd. Any other suggestions?

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I keep checking... Mike Zuraf double-checked with me... but in March the 12th that's written on the piece of paper is a Thursday. So either we're meeting on a Thursday or it needs to be the 11th.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep, you're right. It should be March 11th. Okay. Other clarifications? Okay, so everybody good with that which is correcting the typo on March, dropping July 8, dropping August 12, dropping November 25th, and dropping December 23rd, if so say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Okay. So, with that, then with that modified schedule now that we have just said we want to make as our schedule, we just modified the schedule. Now we need to approve the schedule? Or can we just say we approve the schedule? I think we can say we approve the schedule.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I believe you approved the modified schedule.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, that's what we did by golly!

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, also Ms. McClendon pointed out to me that November 11th is Veteran's Day which is a federal holiday. Unlike most federal holidays, that holiday typically does not occur on a Monday; it occurs on the actual day. So, again, we would probably need to consider scheduling a different date for November since we already cancelled the 25th.

Mr. Rhodes: How 'bout November 18th then? What do folks want to do? Just right in the middle of the two? I mean, that's right a day after the Board will have met but it's just a quirky month. Is there a motion to modify our just recently adopted calendar to drop November 11th and add November 18th?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. English: I make a motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. English. Second?

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Coen. Any further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen? 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? Nope; there we go, we have modified our recently modified agenda. Schedule rather. Any other items? I note that February 11th is close to my daughter's birthday... oh, no, okay. Very good.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, continuing with my report, I've included in the mail-out a draft of the Planning Commissions' annual report from last year. As you recall, state code requires the Commission to provide an annual summary of its activities to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis. I've taken the liberty of drafting the annual report in a similar format to last year's report. You notice overall there was a slight reduction in the total number of meetings. However, I believe that the workflow was a bit intense. There was also a reduction in the total number of applications. But when you look at the number of Committee meetings that occurred and the in depth issues that you got into last year as a Commission, there was a lot of work accomplished. Even though quantitatively it may not look like there was as much work as the previous year, but qualitatively I believe there was.

Mr. Rhodes: So is there a particular deadline that this has to be submitted? I know it's required to be submitted, but is there...?

Mr. Harvey: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So, are folks... do you want more time to kind of read through it, mull over it? Are you good with it?

Mr. Gibbons: (Inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Apicella: Where is it?

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: It's on the agenda items; it was in the electronic.

Mr. English: It says Annual Report.

Mr. Rhodes: After item 7. Okay. Would you like to just... we can defer a session then we can finalize.

Mr. Apicella: Do we mind?

Mr. Rhodes: It's okay if we do it next session, right? Okay, so if any last things come to mind, we'll close this out next time. Okay? Alright. Cool.

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much Mr. Harvey; appreciate it. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you Ms. McClendon. Happy New Year to you! Committee Reports; gentlemen?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Airport Joint Committee

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Subcommittee met and had our final meeting on December 18th. We unanimously approved a compatibility plan, a matrix, and associated Comp Plan amendment changes. This follows over 6 months of effort by the staff and the Subcommittee. I believe, and I hope Darrell believes as well, that the final product was well-researched and vetted. It incorporated information and approaches recommended by several primary sources on noise, airport noise and safety issues, and as well incorporated model compatibility language and examples from other states and jurisdictions. I also think, and it was stressed as we were considering this effort, that the whole process was open and transparent; all the meetings were publicly announced albeit not as well-attended as I might have thought they would have been. We held a public briefing and an open house on November 6th. The public was given an opportunity to provide comments during all of our meetings at the open house and as well they were invited via a couple of advertisements to submit comments, and that comment window was over several weeks. The recommended package incorporates several comments that were provided, or addresses several of the comments that we received. Throughout the process, I remarked and I feel strongly that the staff did excellent, excellent work here and they really did a great job; provided really solid support. Going forward I think the staff and members of the Committee would like to brief out the plan at our next meeting, or the following meeting if that works better. At that point, the Commission can decide how to proceed, either to send the package forward to the Board to get further guidance and direction, or we could work internally to amend the product as part of a Planning Commission public hearing process. But we can decide that after it gets briefed out.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Mr. English?

Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015

Mr. English: Yeah, I would just like to say that staff was the backbone of this whole Committee report, this report, and we spent a lot of hours there but they did the work and it was an excellent job on their part. They need a raise Jeff.

Mr. Rhodes: Put Jeff on the spot, good job. I'd like to... certainly I think there is no lack of appreciation and respect for the work of staff by any member of the Planning Commission. And it always shows through, their efforts. But I'd like to also thank our fellow Commissioners who served on this joint Subcommittee to work on this, kind of churn through it, and really drive it to a good quality product and looking forward to working on the proposals that came out of that. So thank you gentlemen.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have the Commission send a note to the County Administrator and Board Chairman on that. I've been to a lot of meetings but quality really comes out every time.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes: Here, here; will do. Okay, very good. Chairman's Report -- I'd just like to... already talked about the 20th of January and the Board going to discuss the work session at 5 o'clock, the UDAs in the future and where do they go and what do they become and how do we guide those forward. So if someone is available or interested to attend, I think that'd be a pretty positive thing. Just let me know. Secondly, just wanted to highlight about just the privilege it is to work with you. I like the dynamic that we have here among the seven of us. It's very positive. It's a pleasure, the respectful way that everybody works towards issues. I just want to thank you for that. It's just a privilege to work with you and certainly, as everyone has said, it's just a pleasure to work with our great staff. So what do we need? What committees do we need to address now, Jeff? Does ARB just stay the same till she hides from us or how does that work?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Commission members that are on the various Boards and Commissions such as the ARB and Parks and Rec representative, they would stay the same unless the Commission made a change.

Mr. Rhodes: Or unless they screamed? Okay, got it. Anyone with concerns about what they've been doing?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, it's not a concern; I hate to throw this out there. But at what point would it be appropriate for us to revisit the Comp Plan?

Mr. Rhodes: Don't even say those words.

Mr. Apicella: I think it's a 5-year maturity date, so I'm not saying we have to talk about it tonight or make any decisions tonight, and I know the UDA's going to... how that progresses is largely going to influence I think to a great extent what if any revisions should be made. But I think it's something we need to think about and keep in our hip pocket.

Mr. Rhodes: You mean all the tweaking we do doesn't count as an update?

Mrs. Bailey: Evidently not.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Harvey, what are your thoughts there?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the code requires that the Planning Commission re-evaluate the Plan every 5 years. It doesn't require any action be taken, but as we've discussed and the Chairman alluded to, the issue of what to do with the UDAs would have a significant impact to our Comprehensive Plan. So, that would be potentially the impetus to update the plan, provide fresh data like population projections and other information that's included in the Plan such as capital facilities are in the planning process versus what's been built in the last 5 years, and those types of things. So, certainly this is an opportune year, as the 5th year, to refresh the document.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Are we best served though to have some folks step aside and be a committee to work on that with you? Should we do it as a whole? What would you propose?

Mr. Harvey: I guess part of that would depend on the extent to which the Commission wants to make changes. If we're getting into a significant readjustment of land use and transportation and utility infrastructure, we probably do need to have a more in depth view which would take more time, probably beyond the scope of what's available for the Commission as a whole. But if it's more so find out what the Board wants on UDAs and if it's not very intense, then possibly we can come back and, like I said, refresh the document and bring it back to the Commission as a whole on a periodic basis.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Thoughts of other Commissioners?

Mrs. Bailey: I think that makes sense that we get the direction of the UDA (inaudible - microphone no on) that might trigger any other items that might need to be looked at.

Mr. Rhodes: And then if we need to dive further, we'll create a committee.

Mr. Apicella: I wonder if that's something that folks might want to bring up? I don't know how participatory the meeting might be on the 20th, but maybe give a sense to the Board that this is something that's also in their wheelhouse and they might want to think about giving us some direction as well.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Just to confirm, so we've got ARB, but what are our other members where we've got folks?

Mr. Harvey: We have a representative on the Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Rhodes: Parks and Rec and that's, right now, Mr. English?

Mr. English: I would like to step aside and let Mr. Boswell (inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Rhodes: Would you like to do that Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: I'm on that Commission anyway (inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Anybody got any issues with that? That works. We don't have to nominate and vote, right, we just decide?

Mr. Harvey: I believe, Mr. Chairman, it's the prerogative of you to assign Committees and members.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: But we work with consensus here, okay. And is there one other? I'm trying to remember. Because we do the TRCs individually by our district.

Mr. Harvey: That's correct. And Mr. Apicella sits on the BZA as an alternate, but not as a Planning Commission appointee. However, he is on both bodies which is permitted by code.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, can you say that again please?

Mr. Harvey: But there are periodically, Mr. Chairman, committees that you establish or meetings that you attend by virtue of being on the Commission. For instance, last year you had attended several meetings with the City of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County regarding the City's Comprehensive Plan update.

Mr. Coen: Don't we have that Waterways Committee?

Mr. Harvey: There was a committee recommendation; that committee hasn't met yet.

Mr. Apicella: Let's not leave that because I actually happened to be sitting next to Mr. Milde, was it last night or the night before? I can't remember. And it sort of came up; some folks were talking about Economic Development along our pristine waterways. So I mentioned to Mr. Milde that we actually thought that we created this subcommittee but it was just an issue of trying to get us together at a convenient time. I don't know if the Board has appointed members to it but I don't think we should lose sight of it. I think it's still a good idea and maybe something we should...

Mr. Rhodes: But really we're just waiting on them?

Mr. Apicella: We are waiting on them. But I think maybe, if Mr. Harvey can (inaudible) the Board and see if that's something...

Mr. Gibbons: You know, Mr. Chairman, Stafford has the most shoreline of anybody in the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Rhodes: I was surprised by that; I remember hearing that. So, could you move them along Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: I'll do my best Mr. Chairman.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. TRC Information - January 28, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. TRC -- do we have what we need for TRC? Does anybody have one? Everybody got their time? Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, and you should thank the reporter for being here. She's always diligent.

Mr. Rhodes: I know, she's great.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. English: Put her on a committee.

Mr. Rhodes: I'd like to let you know that you need to get my permission in writing to use my name... no.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, one thing that it's sort of a tag-a-long to something that Mr. English asked when we had VDOT come and present to us. They gave a presentation on one project, which was the Courthouse Road project. And then I think it was the next week that before the Board of Supervisors they had somebody present an update on everything that was going on in the county. And that might be, since we talked about having quarterly addresses by VDOT, that might be the way to go for those quarterly ones. It's not just a specific project but to let us know what else is going on on 17, 610, etcetera.

Mr. Rhodes: How long was that presentation?

Mr. English: Forty-five minutes, wasn't it?

Mr. Coen: I don't think it was quite that long. It wasn't as long as ours, I don't believe. But it may have been about maybe a half hour.

Mr. Gibbons: You say Mr. Apicella wasn't at the meeting then?

Mr. Apicella: There is one other thing I'd like to bring up and I think is important to all of us, which is the extra 10 days that we talked about. And I think, Mr. Chairman, you and I mentioned it in our meeting with the then Chairman and Vice Chairman. They seemed to be receptive to the idea. I don't know where that is but I would not like to lose that thought. I think those extra 10 days would be very helpful to this Planning Commission.

Mr. Rhodes: If okay with everyone, what we'll do is we'll do a very short little communication memo to the new Chair and new Vice Chair shaping that same comment, because the Vice became the Chair and so hopefully there's a memory there, but just to restate that and remind them that it is within their authority. Okay. We'll do that, very good. And Mr. Harvey, since VDOT was going to... were receptive to coming back anyways, if you could just express to them that if they could do a larger kind of a macro view of what's going on, that would be great.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I believe that what Mr. Coen was referring to is that typically during the County Administrator's Report at Board meetings, they have the Public Works Department come and make presentations. And VDOT does come but a lot of times they do what we call pothole patrol. So I guess the question would be, what type of information are you looking for? Are you looking at information regarding construction projects or more so problem areas in the County?

Mr. Rhodes: I think it's more construction projects.

Mr. Harvey: If you wouldn't mind, I'd like to work that through the Public Works Department and, if necessary and where needed, they can invite VDOT to help us out. Because the County right now is currently involved in a number of projects where we are the administering agency.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. No, however you believe is best to present it. Just get an idea of the infrastructure capabilities that are going on and the potential that's coming in the future I think.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 14, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, based on the discussion, we'll try to have that on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Rhodes: Wonderful; thank you very much.

Mrs. Bailey: It would also be helpful to know about the other projects in our surrounding regions that would have an impact on ours, one way or the other. I mean, whether or not for the funding, if Spotsylvania has something going on versus Stafford County and if there's any impact at all to that.

Mr. Harvey: We can certainly provide that information. The Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, FAMPO, they have the region-wide project list and they put out a document which is the constrained long range plan which looks at a funding for a road project for approximately 25 years. We can provide the Commission of that data.

Mr. Rhodes: Can we get a copy of that?

Mr. Harvey: Sur.

Mrs. Bailey: (Inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Harvey: We'll pass that information along.

Mr. Rhodes: Anything anyone else has? Anything we missed Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Not that I'm aware of Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Ms. McClendon? Stacie? Anybody?

Mr. English: Stacie's going to be a new grandma.

Mr. Rhodes: Are you really? Congratulations! That's really super cool! On that wonderful note, we are adjourned.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.