

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
February 11, 2015

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, February 11, 2015, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bailey

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

Mr. Rhodes: Before I go to the roll, I'd like to just take a moment, an opportunity to acknowledge, we just had our annual report and did want to recognize our tremendous staff once again for all the great work they do, and certainly the tremendous Planning Director that we have here, Mr. Harvey. Looking through the Human Resources records, I have found that it happens to be, once again, Mr. Harvey's 29th birthday. He's had about 20 of those or so but nonetheless we'd like to wish you a Happy Birthday Mr. Harvey. And, in fact, we'd like to sing Happy Birthday to you. So with that... (everyone sang Happy Birthday).

Mr. Harvey: Thank you very much! That was unexpected. It was very nice; I liked the a cappella that was going on.

Mr. Apicella: And Mike, where's the cake?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, cake. So with that I'd like to ask Mr. Coen to please call the roll.

Mr. Coen: Yes sir.

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Are there any declarations of disqualification for any item on the agenda this evening? Very good, we'll move onto Public Presentations. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to speak on any item except for item number 1, George Washington Village... there will be an opportunity with public comment on that one... but may speak on any other item that you'd like to talk to. You can come forward and do so at this time. You will be addressing the Planning Commission as a whole. You will have 3 minutes to speak. We would ask that you state your name and your address, a green light will come on indicating 3 minutes, a yellow light will come on indicating 1 minute remaining, and then when the red light comes on, we would just ask that you wrap up your comments. Thank you very much. Mrs. Carlone.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mrs. Carlone: Ruth Carlone, the off-key singer in the back of the room. Just very briefly, I know it's not on the agenda, it was cluster development. We must have a groundwater study done. And where we are out in Hartwood, we're in the Piedmont Plateau; we're nothing but hard rock strata there. And the upcoming proposal for a cluster development out there, we have no rights whatsoever because they consider, or the state did, a by-right to have a cluster development. And we need help desperately. So, when you get ready to get more into the cluster, we have quite a few people that have something to say

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

about that. We have no legal recourse at all. We already have a low well and several of the other neighbors had drilled 3 times... one of them had drilled 3 times and only ended up with three-quarters of a gallon production. The other one next door, a marine and his family, was 1 gallon per minute. We're in a very bad area and we need help desperately to get something resolved about the by-right. We're not in the Urban Service Area so it may be years before we can get water brought to us. And we'll be ending up, if we have any lower wells that we have right now, then we'll have to pay for pump and haul. And it's really bad news. But anyway, just do that, think about that when you get ready to discuss it. Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Anyone else who would like to speak at this time?

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. Where's Waldo? Oh, I'm at the Planning Commission. Hey, greetings everyone. I was at the School Board meeting yesterday and they want me always coming over here and speak to you about some planning issues, especially the middle schools. Some of them were reciting things like Embrey Mill Middle School is going to be made in 5 years. I think you're the planners. I think you know about the 10-year CIP. So I thought I'd bring that to your attention. I also saw on your agenda you're discussing UDAs. I just want those of you who never were on the Planning Commission when UDAs were really discovered, the acronym means Undeveloped Downtown Areas forced upon Stafford County by Richmond. Now, let's see what other news I have in here. It's kind of interesting; we have all these elections going on. Did you see that the... any of you who are willing to take on the new Sheriff's position? We have the Clerk positions. Three Supervisors are up for election. Three School Board members. And one of the challenges that I was going to bring up here was, I always hear people talk about the 80/20 rule. But they really don't know it's based off the parade o' principal. And it's that law of the vital few and the principal of factor and it really focused on, you know, planning type aspects. So I think you've got some big public hearing or something coming up. I have no idea. I'll see it when it comes to the Board of Directors. But I do want to commend the Commissioners that we're starting to see some votes that are not always 7-0. Wow! Someone's figured out that the County has grown. Let's see... every 20 years... this is my 25 year anniversary... and what really is speculative here is we have all this expert advice in this County, but all we have is strong opinions. And strong opinions are subjective unless we can substantiate them with prime numbers. And I'll leave you with the number 17; because not only is it a teen magazine, but it's the age that I received my PHD without the internet. You know, that's a Public High School Diploma. And, of course, the cicadas who are buried throughout the County. They will come back in 2030, 2047, and of course, 2064, so we can celebrate the 400 year anniversary of our County.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward at this time? Alright, thank you very much. We'll move on from the Public Presentations back to the Public Hearings. This is a continued item for Public Hearing, item number 1, RC1400155, the Reclassification of George Washington Village. 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-

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

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) (January 14, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to February 11, 2015)**

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Zuraf: If I could have the computer please? Good evening, this item is a continuation of a public hearing for a project known as George Washington Village. This public hearing was initiated back on December 10th of last year, continued to January 14th, and again to this meeting. To provide a little bit of a background of the project, to refresh your memory, this is a reclassification from several zoning districts, A-1, A-2, R-3, B-2, and M-1, to one single district, the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development zoning district. The applicant is Augustine South Associates with Charlie Payne as the agent. The location of the project is highlighted in red on the map. The general location is to the south side of Courthouse Road, west side of Interstate 95, and north side of Ramoth Church Road. The area in total covers 1,051 acres. Since your last meeting, the General Development Plan has been modified. That was kind of briefly summarized at the last meeting, but we did receive a complete set of a new General Development Plan and I would like to go through a few of the changes for you. Before I do that, some of the things that I've not changed is that the project does still recommend approximately 1.5 million square feet of commercial development and a maximum of 2,957 homes. The overall design concept divides the area into several different neighborhoods; you have a kind of town center area in that location, and then several villages that make up the remainder of the project. Some of the changes that did occur from the last version, the dwelling unit mix has been modified. The number of townhouse units has been reduced from 322 down to 300 townhouse units. That is consistent with what is recommended in the Comprehensive Plan for this area. Concurrently, the number of single-family detached units increased by 22 units from 1,885 up to 1,907 units, and the number of multi-family units stayed consistent at 750. The location of the townhouses changed slightly. They're now... they're highlighted in green and they're oriented more so over towards the town center area. The town center is in red. So there's a slight adjustment there. In the lower half of the project, the residential units have been shifted to the north to maintain a 3,000-foot buffer from the runway of the Stafford Regional Airport.

Mr. English: Mike, question. The red dots along here, commercial property, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, those are commercial.

Mr. English: What is that... do you know what that's going to consist of... what will it be? Or is it just going to be like mom and pop places or nail places?

Mr. Zuraf: It's going to be likely service commercial uses for the surrounding nearby residents, but it has not been specified.

Mr. English: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: Also, down in the southern portion of the project, the 40-acre park complex did, with this adjustment, shift slightly to the west and fronts more so along Ramoth Church Road. And in that

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

adjustment, the applicant did include a 20-acre school site in the area where... it's not working today. So the school is the green box, yes, right there; that's the location that previously the plan did not identify a school site that is identified now. Also the Fire and Rescue site has been relocated to be located along Ramoth Church Road... yes, in that location where the pointer is. Previously it was located along Woodcutters Road. Also, in the adjustments, there was Austin Ridge Drive continued through the site and through the town center area and crossed Accokeek Creek in the location where the pointer is running, and would connect to Woodcutters. And so that second crossing of Accokeek Creek has been removed. Also, the lot layouts in general follow more of a traditional neighborhood development design with more of a grid network of streets. Previously, the layout was a little more a conventional subdivision in its design, so there was an adjustment that's been made in that manner which fits more in with the TND zoning district. Also, the connection to Kelsey Road to this site now is being proposed as an emergency access only connection through to the site. And the commercial uses that are in red located along Woodcutters Road, they're general location has been modified from the previous layout. This is just for reference if you need to go to the prior version of the General Development Plan. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission did have a few questions, and I'll go through those. They were questions about the Community Development Authority and the format and what shape that would take. The applicant has provided a sample, or initial drafts of the CDA documents that may end up being utilized for this project. And I'll defer to the applicant to kind of summarize that for you. There was also a question of how the transportation impact fees might be applied in this case, since there is also proffers involved in the CDA payments. Staff did talk to the County transportation planner and they noted that likely a portion or all of the transportation impact fees in the George Washington Village might be credited. But it would have to be determined that the capacity of what is built into the project's road improvements would need to exceed that needed by the development. So, if they build in excess capacity, there's a likelihood then that the impact fee requirement would be reduced to a portion or full credit. And this would also be determined at a later date as we get closer to when the project would be developing so we have a better idea of what the existing conditions are. And also, I'd note that this is a process that is being considered to being applied in the Embrey Mill development, because in that project they have a CDA. They, too, are constructing a portion of Mine Road so that's the process that's being applied there. Also, there was a question about the status of the CDA at Celebrate Virginia, and the status of payments there. Staff did talk to the Treasurer's Department and there are delinquent CDA taxes in the Celebrate Virginia project that total upwards of \$6.6 million. Their majority of that is from commercial parcels in the project. There are 10 commercial parcels that have delinquent taxes; \$9,000 worth of the total is only attributed to delinquent taxes from the residents in Celebrate Virginia. So the vast majority is from the commercial parcels. Also, staff notes that 6 of the 10 parcels did go to tax sale; the transfer of those properties to a new owner is not quite complete. But if that does officially go through and once it's final, most of those past due delinquent amounts would be written off. And that totals up to \$4 million.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Can you go back over it? It's gone through bankruptcy? It'll be written off for, what, the 6 million?

Mr. Zuraf: Four of the 6.6 million.

Mr. Gibbons: It's going to be written off?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. So, then there were questions also with the Fire and Rescue Service and what would truly be needed with this project, to serve this project adequately. Staff did reach out to Fire and Rescue

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

staff and they did conduct a little more detailed analysis. They looked at similar sized existing areas in North Stafford that may be equivalent to the extent of this project, and the equivalent call volume that they've experienced in these areas. And they did estimate that in addition of approximately a thousand calls or more per year would be experienced in George Washington Village at full build-out. With this, they feel that one full-time staffed fire engine and ambulance company would be needed to adequately serve the site. There would not be a need for a tanker truck, they said, since the area would be served by municipal water and sewer. They did request early funding for apparatus would be a beneficial thing in their case given their current needs. Also, dedication of land early in the process, at the beginning of the process, with phasing in additional funding for station construction at a later date as the project develops.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, can we find out from the folks in the Fire Department what it would cost to build the structure and to put in the necessary, I'll say infrastructure to get it ready to go? So, I guess, total turnkey costs to get it up and running.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. I think we've gathered kind of info before and that information is in the CIP, so we can pull that out pretty quickly.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. English: Mike, and you said there was going to be an additional thousand more calls a year after full build-out?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that's their estimates, yeah. And also, there then was a request to conduct another follow-up evaluation of the latest proposal and how the draft Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan may conform with this project. And the next slide... thank you. So, this slide overlays the draft airport compatibility land use areas over top of the General Development Plan for the project. And so just for orientation, the majority of the project is within the H-1 district that's in the kind of peach color shaded area. A portion also then is in the H-2 area and a little bit in the C conical area; also the H-3 zone in the upper northwest corner of the site. So, in general, the commercial uses in the town center area and other neighborhood commercial uses throughout the site are defined as being compatible uses in the Airport Land Use Plan. The residential development proposed in the H-3 zone is recognized and designated as being not compatible. These are areas closest to Kellogg Mill Road in the northwest corner of the site. The residential uses in the H-1 and H-2 zones are designated for additional review and that covers much of the remainder of the residential uses through the site.

Mr. English: Mike, could you put on there where the school would be relocated at in the H-1 area?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that's right where...

Mr. English: Oh, right through the green? Okay. And Fire and Rescue is going to be just up from that?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, the Fire and Rescue site is a little bit...

Mr. English: Right there.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: And the proposed public school site does fall under the public use category and is identified as under additional review in the H-1 zone. The additional review standards do identify public schools as being a non-compatible use in this area. Also, the active park located adjacent to the school, that's recommended for additional review. The additional review standards do include a list of features that are recommended to be incorporated into a project depending on the use that would mitigate the impacts and increase the level of compatibility. The last version of proffers did incorporate mitigation factors in a portion of the area that was within 2,500 feet of the runway. Given these modifications, those proffers wouldn't necessarily apply to the residential anymore and staff has not reviewed the latest proffers to see if there are new proffers that might fall under these additional review standards. So we'd have to look into that.

Mr. Gibbons: Mike, of all the number of units, how many units fall under this overlay?

Mr. Zuraf: Fall under which...?

Mr. Gibbons: The Airport Overlay District.

Mr. Zuraf: They all fall under it.

Mr. Gibbons: They all fall in it.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Some of them can be potentially mitigated through things like noise mitigation in the building design, notification and awareness practices, but some of it also though is also recommended as not compatible.

Mr. Gibbons: Wouldn't it be better to collocate the fire station at the airport so you could get two uses out of it?

Mr. Zuraf: That's something we can run that by the Fire and Rescue staff, because there is a... the CIP does identify a Fire and Rescue station in the area of the airport.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, this is a great slide. Can we get a copy of it?

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: Next slide please. Some other comments that staff would just like to make at this point, with the transportation impact assessment, at the last meeting we were still waiting for follow-up comments from VDOT. There was a meeting at VDOT last week where VDOT and planning staff and County staff and the applicant met to discuss draft comments that they had. There were going to be formal comments following. Some of the main points during this discussion is VDOT wanted the next iteration of the traffic study to address more so what the impacts are on road segments. The study itself looks at the intersections, but they wanted road segments addressed as well. There was just general discussion on some of the assumptions made in the traffic study. There was a request for the study also to clarify what specific improvements might be needed to bring any intersection of the road segments up to Level of Service C and also if an intersection is already failing without this project, what might be needed to not further degrade the project as recommended in our Comp Plan. Also, the applicant's wanting to know what the County and VDOT priorities might be for infrastructure improvements if they only have

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

a finite amount of money to offer. And also, the applicant is curious about how the funding for the interchange might be affected as to future designs. So, that's still being worked on. Other studies we've previously mentioned, the cultural resource study or perennial stream study has not been provided yet. We did just this afternoon receive a revised proffer statement; we forwarded that to you and provided it to you on your iPads. I think you have a paper copy of it too in front of you. And, also, as I sent to you earlier this week, the applicant did submit a new application to amend the Comprehensive Plan. This would be specific amendments to the George Washington Village UDA that would in effect permit residential development to the south side of Accokeek Creek where currently it's not supported. You received that earlier from staff. And with this application staff is aiming for scheduling this for a public hearing at the March 25 Planning Commission meeting. And, with that, I'll take any questions at this time.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please.

Mr. Gibbons: I was told there's 3 cemeteries on the property. Is there a Phase 1 survey being proffered?

Mr. Zuraf: I need to see the latest proffers. It was mentioned in the previous version of the proffers that that would be prepared in advance of any land disturbance, but I'd have to look at the latest version to find that out.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, I'll wait until you get a chance.

Mr. Zuraf: And the applicant is going to summarize the proffer statement for you guys.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Other questions for staff? Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Real quickly Mike -- when this came around 4:23 today, I've sort of been skimming it but I know... do you have the proffer statement? Just for the people here for the public hearing, and anybody who's excited and watching at home, I just noted that in number 1, the general requirements d, first is it my interpretation that what's in purple or lilac is new?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And d says, for the purposes of final preliminary subdivision construction and site plans which will supersede the GDP, proposed parcel lines, parcel sizes, building envelopes, footprints, access points, building sizes, building locations, public road locations, private driveway, road and travelway locations, inner-parcel connections, and there's more but people get tired of me. This, anything at the end would supersede. So, just so that people are aware, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but where either the school site or the fire station site or where roads were could be superseded farther along down the process. I know that's pretty common, but for many people who don't get involved in all of this, it is pretty clear that they could be changed later on.

Mr. Zuraf: Unless it's specified in a later proffer that the school must be located in this area or the road has to kind of follow this, which we'd have to review the rest to see if (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: Ascertain that. Thank you sir, I appreciate it.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions of staff?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, it's more of a comment or a request. We all got a lot of information, including the staff, at kind of I would say the last minute. We haven't really had a chance I think to go through it and staff did a great job at a prior meeting summarizing the issues and concerns that they had. I would ask that they revisit that list and advise as we continue this process, assuming we continue this process, if and where and how their issues have been addressed or not. And to add to that list any of the new stuff that's come forward, if that raises any issues or concerns. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Makes sense; very good. Anything else of staff? Applicant please.

Mr. Gibbons: I noticed mine was 4:26 so I know where I'm in in the pecking order.

Mr. Rhodes: He's got a faster system.

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman and other members of the Planning Commission, my name is Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer, and I appreciate your time this evening. Thank you for tagging along with us on this long journey of George Washington Village or what that is George Washington Village. We appreciate your patience. Someone had made a comment to me that, you know, Mr. Gibbons had been politely pressing us to get information in as quickly as possible -- which we did. The minute we left here we hustled as quickly as we could. But we realized that trying to make adjustments and addressing many of the concerns of staff and of this respected Board is like trying to change the direction of an aircraft carrier, to a certain extent. It's a large project, it's got many moving parts. You know, there's also an economic feasibility component to this. It's relevant... it's very relevant. So, when we want things a little more of this and a little less of this, or we want to facilitate or increase the speed of phasing, it all has financial impacts that we have to evaluate. And so I apologize for the delay in getting things back, but that's part of the process and part of the reality for a project like this. And just as a real quick reminder, and I think this is important because sometimes we get kind of lost and miss the forest but for the trees, is the fact that this is a unique and different one-of-a-kind project that's been before this Planning Commission. This is the largest rezoning project in the history of Stafford County. It includes, you know, 2,957 units. It's got 1.5 million square feet of commercial space. It's got significant infrastructure. It's going to have, you know, some folks who are going to be against it and some folks who are excited about what it can bring and what it can change. It can change the growth pattern and the development pattern of the County. The County has been in a somewhat inconsistent and some would argue adversely impacted development pattern for the past 20 years with urban sprawl. This is a project that, in many ways, derived from this Board and the Board of Supervisors as to the future growth patterns of Stafford County. And that's what we've tried to emulate here. Maybe not perfect in some eyes, but I think in many ways a great progress in moving forward. And a great opportunity for economic development and competitiveness which is really what I hear from our constituents almost every day. New restaurants. Jobs here. Get off the road. New investment. So that's what we offer. And Mr. Chairman, I will answer and address some of the issues... I think Mike did a great job going over the changes to the GDP. If you have questions about that, I can certainly answer those. In regards to the CDA documents, you may recall that at the last meeting we stated that the CDA approval is linked to this project. Without it, it can't happen; just from a financial development feasibility perspective. The flip side would be to have the County take the proffer money and build the roads. It's just not feasible for the County to do that; it's more feasible for the developer to do that. And the County has had success with CDAs. It's having success I believe at Embrey Mill. They most recently approved that CDA so I think the County has confidence in that process, especially if it's well funded, well operated, well managed, and has the kind of developer with the experience that we have to make that happen. So, I have submitted documents in that regard which are basically a petition and the formation of the CDA is something that internally Rysheda's office and the Planning

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

office will look at as we move forward, but we're tagging along because, as I have stated, it is key to the project. Whether or not the Board embraces it at this point in time, we thought it'd be important to bring it along with this process as part of the review process. If you have questions about that document, I'm happy to answer them but assume that you may not. And just quickly in regards... and I'll go through the proffer changes and I did provide a summary; I don't know if you've had an opportunity to look at them or not yet... but real quickly, just on the airport overlay, I know Mr. Gibbons had asked the question, you know, what does this impact. Well, it impacts all the units because it overlays above the entire project. But where it's not compatible is only with about 360 units. That versus... as compared to 2,957, so let's keep that in context when we talk about... 360 units are impacted as non-compatible with the airport overlay. The rest, in our opinion, are compatible. And Mike had mentioned there could be some mitigating factors depending on which overlay area. We'll take a look at that; we haven't really looked at that except initially when we looked about how far away we were from the runway... the runway centerline. As you may recall, we're 3,000 feet now which is consistent with the draft. And let's just also remember this is a draft. This is not etched in stone. I don't think this Board has deliberated over that draft yet and I know that the Board of Supervisors has not. And also, in regards to, I think I covered the CDA, I think I covered the airport overlay... I don't think you had any questions about either one of those; I'm happy to answer them. And for schools, just so you know, with the airport overlay, there is no area in George Washington Village with the airport overlay for schools. Nowhere. So, we couldn't put a school if you passed this overlay as it is, you couldn't put a school in George Washington Village. Okay. So that's basically the impact of the overlay. It would have to be north of Courthouse Road. Okay. I think I'm correct on that.

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

Mr. Payne: I'm sorry Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: Would you be willing to build one and lease it back to the County on an offsite?

Mr. Payne: Mr. Gibbons, we have currently proffered a site and cash for a school. We have not evaluated entering into a private/public partnership to build the school. I know that that's happened in the County on a couple of occasions; I think Mountain View was built that way.

Mr. English: Would you be open to it?

Mr. Payne: Mr. English, you know, I'm always open to finding positive solutions to projects. Well certainly... I'll tell you what, we'll take a look at it, including some of the transportation pieces offsite, about whether or not that would make sense for a private/public partnership. So we'll take a look at it and we'll tell you what we think about it. But, yeah, this is the kind of project where you can be creative we think, and we think we could also be very helpful to many of your interchange challenges. I know VDOT is looking to redesign that area. As I've stated before, and I'm stating it again, the town center doesn't happen without the interchange improvements -- it just doesn't happen. So, we're vitally tied to it. So I know there's a lot of concern about cash, you're going to come online, you're going to have all this impact. We're not going to come online until the interchange is in place. I mean, that's basically the restrictions we're going to have, certainly for the town center. So that's why we have proffered, in our most recent draft proffers, to go ahead and pay to build... of course, the County needs to obtain their necessary right-of-way... the realignment of Austin Ridge and widening of Courthouse from the realigned Austin Ridge to Mine Road. Which I know was a concern for the County as well. We haven't had those discussions with the County but it's part of our new proffer package, which I will go through now Mr. Chairman. I think you all have a copy of my summary and also red-lined version of the

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

proffers. And what I did was I red-lined it from the changes that we have made and proposed today versus when we had our first public hearing, okay. So I thought that'd be the easiest way to do it because that's really the only two proffer statements that have been submitted to you as a Board. Section 2, we've added language to relocate to certain transect zones, the similar uses. Mr. Coen touched on this a little bit about our language, and this is typical language that I put in every proffer statement and I didn't put it in this one for some reason... I think I missed it initially... but I put it in. Basically what happens is (inaudible), when you get to the site plan stage after you've done your RPA study, the CRPA studies which we have to do for this project, cultural resources analysis, ensuring proper setbacks, etcetera, where infrastructure is going to go. We think we know where it's going to go now but you never know until you get to the site plan stage. You have to make adjustments. So that's one of the reasons why it's there. Of course, that's all going to be consistent with what we've planned and proposed to you and have been approved, and the County has the final say on it, not us -- for any adjustment. And in regards to the transect zones, what we're saying is hey, we've run into an RPA issue or some sort of soils issue or whatever, we can't provide, you know, X number of units in this village area, we can move those to Y village area. But, as long as we don't increase the density, that's what we're saying we can do. And that's fairly consistent with the encouragement of the UDA. And it gives a flexibility under the P-TND. Under Section 3, we have provided a phasing plan. And this was in response, I think, to the Chairman and some others who had asked us to look at phasing this project. And we also took some of the staff's recommendation about capping residential units at 150 per year. So, what we did under phasing under Section 3, and this is two pieces so this is tied to commercial and then tied to what we can build per year. So, it's actually two levels here, although I've got it four tiers under the first level. The first tier is we can't build any more than 750 single-family detached units without 30,000 square feet of commercial. Again, it goes down for the second tier, a thousand for 75,000 square feet of commercial; 1,500 units for 150,000 square feet; 2,000 units would require... the 2,001st unit would require 250,000 square feet. And then we've got a cap that says we can't build... notwithstanding anything, we can't build any more than 150 units per year, single-family detached units. I'm specifying that for a reason. We can't go beyond 150 per year. That's a 10-year cap so after 10 years we can go ahead and expedite that. And I'll tell you the reasoning behind all of that. One, the reason why I didn't include townhouses and apartments is if we want to facilitate the growth of the town center which is where are commercial concentration is, you gotta have the townhouses and the apartments. You've got to have the flexibility to build them as quickly as possible. So that's why we didn't include them in the cap. And plus, when you're building an apartment building, you know, if you can get 150 units in it, you only get one building a year. That would be a little bit of a challenge if you're trying to facilitate the town center. In regards to the rationale behind tying the commercial, again, I think the County... our big point is, this project's going to generate a full build-out, about \$5 million annually in tax net revenue to the County. We believe you get a bigger bang for your buck by investing an infrastructure; that's what's going to attract the commercial users. That's what's going to generate economic development opportunities. That's going to require us to show you that when we have the residential component coming, we also have the commercial component coming. We truly believe that when that growth happens, that's where the concentration's going to be. So we responded to that. We've also done it in a way that we can actually afford to develop the project. In remembering that we've got to... we're issuing bonds here, financing the development of the infrastructure on the site, the more you front-load that -- and I'm going to get to that in a little bit -- the more expensive it becomes to do the project as you're carrying interest longer. It's just a reality. If the County had to build the road, it would be under the same circumstances; if they had to do it now versus 10 years from now, they would have to carry that 10 years of finance in debt equity... I'm sorry, in debt service.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Payne, before you go on... so remind me, or at least tell me where we are in terms of multi-family units.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Payne: Seven hundred fifty.

Mr. Apicella: The total number of multi-family units and townhomes would be about a thousand?

Mr. Payne: Three hundred; that's right, it'd be over a thousand.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So that, in conjunction with the 750, in theory you could build 1,750 units before you put in 30,000 square foot of space.

Mr. Payne: That is...

Mr. Apicella: A little more than half of the total density.

Mr. Payne: ... that's correct. If you're adding the 750 to the thousand...

Mr. Apicella: Right, I'm saying before the first... the way it's written, before the first brick of a commercial facility could be...

Mr. Payne: But the theory is, a thousand fifty that you're concentrating which is the most of that, will facilitate the town center commercial. It will actually make that happen faster. So, we're saying, if you allow us to do that, we're going to get faster to that 30,000 or fast to that hundred thousand if we're able to let those run their course, their normal market course.

Mr. Apicella: Again, so what you're telling me is you need 1,750 units before you can get to 30,000... before you can get the next unit in and build 30,000 square feet of commercial space. I hear what you're saying, but to me at first glance it seems like a pretty large number.

Mr. Payne: If you're looking plainly and saying, Charlie, I see that you could actually get to this number before you get to that number of 30,000, yes. But the market's going to drive... the market itself is going to drive that 1,050 is going to drive the commercial development.

Mr. Apicella: I understand, but I also see the other impacts associated with 1,750 units.

Mr. Payne: Well, remember, that I have 1,750 units, I can start then building infrastructure and providing all of the necessary financing that's required to build out the project. So, I can't come in... you don't come into a project and finance it with no value on the site. So, you've got to create value on the site to finance a project. I mean, we can look at this from a perspective of, you know, we really... this is a wishful process that we'd love to see you in; we'd be great if we could afford to do that. But that's not how it's financed. And it's because we're not saying to the County or the taxpayer, you build the infrastructure and then we'll go ahead and build everything else. This is the only way it can be done in a way we think that it's economically feasible and a timeframe that works for the developer, and also will benefit and bring along the components that we think are important to the project. And again, this is a work in progress open to comments.

Mr. Gibbons: I'd like to pick up where Steven left off. Of the 1,750, what value tax dollar is that going to represent?

Mr. Payne: From the residential component? I'd have to break it down, but our residential at full build-out pays for itself on the one point.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: No, I'm talking about to the first trigger. I'm going back to where you are Steven. What is the value of that before you get to the first trigger point?

Mr. Payne: Are you talking about commercial value?

Mr. Gibbons: The real estate value of what you're building to go to the first trigger point.

Mr. Payne: I haven't evaluated that. We've got...

Mr. Gibbons: Versus building 150 single-family homes a year over 10 years, what's the comparison?

Mr. Payne: We've got a fiscal impact analysis that shows that the residential, at full build-out, generates well over a million dollars, at \$1.3 and \$1.4 net positive tax revenue. I don't know what the breakdown is for 1,750. That's at full build-out for the 2,957 units. Everything nets out positive. What you're asking me about, I don't know the answer. We can take a look at it.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, how do I know if it nets out positive unless you give it to me? Because I don't think it is. (Inaudible) will give it to you but not strictly apartments and townhomes.

Mr. Payne: I understand that, but you're asking me about a segment of the development and asked me what that segment would generate. What we do in a fiscal impact analysis, you look at full build-out, you don't look at segments of developments. But, what we're saying is, and I think this is accurate, is that the townhouses and the apartments concentrated in the area they are will generate the commercial. I mean, that's the feeder for the town center. That's what happens in Stonebridge. That's what's happened in Reston. That's what happens in every town center project is they feed the commercial components of the town center. So, my bet is that 1,050 or 1,750 is going to generate a significant amount of commercial revenue, because it's going to generate commercial uses.

Mr. Apicella: If that's the case, then why isn't that a trigger point?

Mr. Payne: What is a trigger point?

Mr. Apicella: So, if a thousand and fifty multi-family/townhome units will drive the commercial, why wouldn't that be one of the trigger points before you could build more single-family houses? I'm trying to look for some balance here, so what I'm seeing is more than half of the density of this entire development would be in place, just in terms of the numbers that are presented, before the first... potentially before the first brick of a commercial structure is mandated to be built.

Mr. Payne: Well, I'm trying, we're trying to create a flexibility economic opportunity here. Applying rigid requirements to when the commercial growth is coming in, if someone can tell me when they think commercial growth is going to happen, I'm all ears. But you can end the project very quickly...

Mr. Apicella: I can tell you had a much smaller project, it didn't pass, but they had other triggers that were significantly less before they could go to the next level. And I want to say the first level was maybe 250 units -- don't hold me to it -- maybe 300 units, and that would have gotten 20,000 square feet before they could build to the next level.

Mr. Payne: Did they provide you sort of the economics rationale behind that? I'd love to have seen that.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Well, I mean, I would assume that they did some analysis before they would have agreed to that milestone in the proffers. And then they had additional milestones before they could go to the next level, and I want to say there were 4 levels to get to the 650.

Mr. Payne: Well, I again haven't reviewed that project or the analysis. I would be highly skeptical that they could come up with that kind of predictability without coming back to this Planning Commission for a proffer amendment. I'm sorry, I just find that highly skeptical. But I...

Mr. Rhodes: I did hear... if I could... I did hear that what I think I understood you to say is, what would drive you to build all the multi-family or attached would be the commercial, the eminent commercial or ongoing commercial development, one kind of feeds the other.

Mr. Payne: If you notice our plan, all the infrastructures are together.

Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mr. Payne: So you wouldn't just build one piece of it without building all the infrastructure (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: So, if we take that in reverse, I think this does go certainly a ways towards some of the commentary last time when we previously met about balancing out some of the phasing. And I can see where this is an effort to do that. So, I think as a logical evolution of that is the comment that Mr. Apicella is making, is there not or maybe think about, is there not a way to do a little bit of triggering in there -- because this subset is really for the commercial. I mean, there's a strong correlation. I don't think you think that there is independently the demand for a thousand units of multi-family or attached necessarily with no commercial. You believe they're associated so it might just be worth a little think about it if there is a way to tie it to make that a little bit of phasing, you know, not absolutely but you wouldn't go all the 1,000 and not have done anything. I've got to believe that there's building permits going on for the other, so I think that's what the comment is here. Let's think about... if you're really getting up to that point, you've probably got built... you're turning dirt over and you're starting to work the commercial, if you haven't already got it in place. So that would just be if you could think about some trigger in there with that one, because you've done it throughout on the others; I mean, that's clear and evident. I think that's what the commentary is about.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to get back at picking up on Steven is the public services that have to be provided for that unit is greater than if you have all single-family homes and the value of it.

Mr. Rhodes: And so you would certainly want the commercial tax base to be helping to support that.

Mr. Apicella: To offset it is what I'm saying.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, and I think that's what your tie was, you would want to see that some of it indeed is going on if you're going to a volume of the higher cost attached and multi-family. So, if we could just think about that a bit because you're not going to be at a thousand units and not have anything going commercial. And so if we could just think about what you think is a reasonable balance that's not too (inaudible).

Mr. Payne: Nor able to finance the CDA.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mr. Payne: I mean, that's the whole point of generating the rooftops, to help finance and generate the development of the infrastructure. I mean, again, we want to balance this and we want to respond to Mr. Gibbons' comments and Mr. Apicella's comments and create sort of a fair balance here but, the reality, economic reality is, is the project is being financed by us, right. So you've got to be able... you've got to be able to again attract the rooftops to generate the commercial revenue. I'm sorry, that's just a... that affects every project in this County today.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Payne, I appreciate where you're coming from and obviously you have to see this from your client's perspective, but also we have to look at it from all perspectives. And so while you're saying there's an economic issue here, I'm looking at it as a taxpayer issue. So those thousand units are going to drive costs to the taxpayers that they have to offset until the commercial comes into play to offset the impact on the taxpayers. And I realize that it will probably never be an equilibrium. But for the time until the commercial comes into play, the taxpayers are going to be shouldering the burden. That's my concern based on the numbers that I'm (inaudible).

Mr. Payne: We understand that. We're trying to change that dynamic. I mean, you're generating 18% of your tax revenue from commercial base today. You've got a problem now. So, and the problem is, you don't have a concentration of rooftops. You're not going to... I'm just going to tell you, you can go talk to any commercial developer, investor, I don't care who you ask; they're going to ask you where your rooftops are and where they're concentrated and what's their disposable incomes and where are they located near the interchange. Period.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I appreciate what you're saying. Mike has probably framed it pretty well which is I think collectively we're looking for some more, potentially for some more balance.

Mr. Coen: Early on.

Mr. Payne: Okay, so Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, we're past the phasing under Section 3 and we'll take a look at the earlier triggers and evaluating the town center component of that with the multi-family and the townhouses. Section 4, we've increased the cost on the issuance of the investment for the CDA. It's now about \$98 million versus \$90. And remember the core of that is about \$60.3 million and carrying the financing, the debt service adds the other \$38 million plus. It's cost has increased because we, one, have decided to go ahead and do some offsite transportation improvements, Austin Ridge realignment and also the widening of Courthouse as I discussed earlier. And we've also, as you'll see in our phasing when we start making dedications and paying cash towards schools, etcetera, we have to now finance longer, so that increases the cost of financing when you actually issue the bonds earlier in the development. So that's why the cost goes up. And again, a lot of this is, you know, the analysis that we have to run through with our consultant, Municap, when we have to make an adjustment to phasing or pick up another infrastructure. And again, we outlined under Section 4, I think the question was, you know, what's the breakup of each of the improvements, the value. We've done that under Section 4; you'll see \$24.9 million to extend Mine Road from the North Village to Ramoth Church. And then there are general improvements that we talked about, realigning Austin Ridge, widening of Courthouse, the construction of the installation of the 3 transit bus stops; it's about \$14 million. And then the shared mobile pass is a million, and then the capital improvements for Parks, Fire and Rescue, schools, cash, dedications, etcetera, is at \$20.4 million. So that's the breakdown. You may recall, staff had an estimate on the construction of extending Mine Road of like \$50 million. I think that's something that they have looked at for the County building it. The good news is, is that the CDA and a private

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

developer can build it quicker and cheaper too. So we didn't jump at the higher number just so we had a higher number for you; I think it's important to take that into context when you look at who's building it and what the cost is. And I'm sure you all recognize that. Again, the CDA is going to require the County's approval and we've talked about that process as well. Section 5 includes a description of the transportation improvements and what we predict to be the appears in which everything would be completed, including the addition of adding realignment of Austin Ridge Road and Courthouse, which adds I think about 7 or 8 million dollars to the project.

Mr. English: Mr. Payne, I've got a quick question here. On the CDAs, do you have kind of an estimate of what they would be?

Mr. Payne: What the bond rate would be?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Payne: Six and a half percent. Okay? Any questions on the transportation improvements? I think it's something you've seen before. We basically have added two projects.

Mr. Gibbons: But you're saying you will not start this project if the interchange is not in place.

Mr. Payne: I'm sorry, Mr. Gibbons, I didn't hear you.

Mr. Gibbons: I must have misunderstood it. You said you're not going to start this project unless the interchange is in place.

Mr. Payne: Well, we can't... the town center is the biggest impact. The town center would have the biggest impact. We wouldn't be able to build out the town center without the interchange and Austin Ridge realignment, I believe. Is that correct? Yeah.

Mr. Gibbons: You say two things trigger; you can't do this project unless you have the CDA.

Mr. Payne: We can start. We're going to build the initial infrastructure. So, we'll build the initial infrastructure from Courthouse into the site. We couldn't build... when you do that, you can probably get approximately 300 units or so, I think if my memory serves me, that will work from a transportation perspective. But when you get beyond that and you start building out the town center, we can't do it without the interchange improvements. Not enough capacity. So it's limited. But we're going to build the initial infrastructure. We're going to start the process by building the initial infrastructure -- without issuing bonds. So the initial infrastructure will be built from Courthouse into the site by the developer.

Mr. English: You said you can't build this to capacity if the interchange doesn't happen. So, if the interchange... I mean, so...

Mr. Payne: The town center? The town center component?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Payne: And that's the driver. That's the transportation driver. That's the traffic driver.

Mr. English: Right.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Payne: That can't happen without the interchange improvements. Specifically, the realignment of Austin Ridge and widening of Courthouse.

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm sorry to jump in, what would this project look like if there were no interchange?

Mr. Payne: It wouldn't have a town center.

Mr. Apicella: But you would have about 2,000 single-family homes.

Mr. Payne: Well, I don't think that's accurate because we'd still have to build the infrastructure to get out of Courthouse and also to Ramoth Church. So, I don't agree... I think it would have a significant impact on the overall project period.

Mr. English: But I don't think he answered the question.

Mr. Coen: But... well, then I'll try to be legalese. You said it could not be built to capacity. But, therefore, it is safe to go on the premise that should the interchange not be built, somewhere up to something it could be done. But it depended on whether or not it was economically viable to you to do all those other elements. But, it can't get up to the total number but it could get something.

Mr. Payne: Well, what answer do you want from me? I'm describing to you that we can't build the town center, which is a huge part of the economic component feasibility of the project. If we don't have the interchange improvements, it can't happen; it will have an adverse impact on financing and developing the rest of the project. That's the answer. It likely won't happen. The CDA won't be able to be funded to its capacity, which builds the infrastructure. It will have an adverse impact.

Mr. Rhodes: If I could... just, so I've heard a couple drivers; one, the interchange is a key component for the commercial particularly and the town center. Also, I think I just heard that certainly the CDAs are key component for building out the project, but that you could... so I think I had extrapolated from that that in the initial phase, before you would need the CDA and the bonds, you'd be able to do a portion of the road entering and probably the North Village, the 300 or so units there. So, before you get to really the CDA for the larger infrastructure and needing the interchange for the town center, I think what I heard you, the early phase that you could independently would really be just the two-laning in and maybe the North Village or something. And then after that you need to be able to have the economics that allow you to do the CDA and that really needs to be driven by can you do the... have some potential for the town center which is the interchange requirement. So, I think I heard, short of being able to finance and fund the bonds and CDA and having the interchange and the town center, you'd probably be about 300 units or so.

Mr. Payne: That's correct. That's the note I just got.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, maybe the trigger's got to be reset.

Mr. Payne: Let's not forget that we can build 462 units by-right today and... how many thousands of square, how many millions of square feet of commercial? Ten and a half million square feet of commercial and industrial without building one new road. So, the flip side is, we could do all of this and have a greater impact by not getting a rezoning at all and putting forward this project.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, can we park this until after because I want to come back to this. This whole thing of the financing, because I only got this at 4:26 and (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Well, we're just kind of getting updated on it. I know we're all going to have to digest a lot of this, I agree. Oh, yeah, that's fair; we do have public here. If we could hit some other major points, I think there are a few more questions. But you're right, we do want to allow the public the opportunity to comment. And we can certainly circle back with the applicant and staff.

Mr. Payne: I don't know if there's any other questions on the infrastructure improvements under Section 5. Section 6 again provides the proffer breakdown. And this again starts talking about phasing. The recreational component of this is well over \$9 million. I mean, we've included what that would entail. We would make the dedication of the 66-acre active park area, you know, at the 450th unit Certificate of Occupancy. And then final construction for the trail system which runs throughout the project will be after the 1,900th unit. The future school site, we will again at the 450th unit dedicate the site so that there be a 20-acre site. Again we need to keep reviewing this with the airport overlay in mind. That value of that site is about \$800,000 and we would, at that point, disseminate about \$6.5 million in cash. And then later we would disseminate as the project grew out \$1 million in cash at the 900th unit and then \$2.5 million at the 1,400th unit, for a total of \$10.8 million investment in schools. And again, most of that focused on the elementary school, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's desire for a new elementary school in that area. And then Fire and Rescue, the dedication of the land and the clearing has a \$308,000 value, and that's going to be done within about 5 years... I'm sorry -- what was the anticipated period of time on that? Yeah, when directed by the County. So whenever the County wanted the land and they were ready to construct the site, we would dedicate and clear the site. So that one can happen right away if the County is ready to go.

Mr. English: And you're going to try to work maybe possibly locating close to the airport just like Mr. Gibbons said? Maybe a two-fold? Or is that something that can be looked at?

(Inaudible - from audience)

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, it's pretty close now. Again, and the cash proffers, I think you've seen that before. The numbers are being readjusted based on the changes of the 22 units being reduced from townhouses and 22 units being increased for single-family detached. We've also included the language under Section 12 regarding the airport mitigation and making sure there were no homes within 3,000 of the centerline of the airport existing runway. And provide noise attenuation for improvements resident (inaudible) within 3,500 feet of the centerline. And we've also addressed the private well escrow that we talked about at the last meeting. About a hundred thousand dollars will be held in escrow for any of those 48... we've identified 48 adjoining property owners. I think the County identified 48. If any of them are impacted, we would have that escrow fee there to help them address those issues. I think I've covered everything Mr. Chairman. I know this has been a lot. And I know that you just got this information. I apologize for the delay. Mr. Chairman, we would be willing and open to defer your decision, if you so desire and approve, to the March meeting so that you have time to digest this and as we have a continuing dialogue because there's lots of questions and lots of requests already. It would give us more time to iron those out. I thought I'd share that as well.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Are there other questions for the applicant? We can circle back to the applicant as well. Thank you very much for keeping us focused Mr. Gibbons, I appreciate that. Because I kind of lost perspective, so I apologize to the public on that.

Mr. Gibbons: I doubt that Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: So, with that I'm going to open the public comment portion of the Public Hearing. So if there's any member of the public that would like to speak on this item, you may come forward and do so at this time. We just ask that you state your name and your address please, and then a green light will come on indicating 3 minutes. A yellow light will come on when there's a minute remaining, and then when a red light comes on we would just ask that you work to wrap up your comments. Thank you sir.

Mr. Arcularius: I am John Arcularius. I would like to point out that I am not one of the abutting properties. The abutting, when you start looking at what's online, we are talking about abutting properties. And those are the 48 wells that Mr. Payne spoke of. What we have is approximately 64 wells that are around the area of impact of this site. Mr. Payne said that he's allocating \$100,000; \$50,000 north and \$50,000 south of the site. Just taking 48 wells into consideration, at about \$3,600, that's 27.7 wells that you can repair with \$100,000. The math don't add up. If you take 64 wells, not abutting because those are only for the people who actually direct their property but the people in the area, there are 64 wells, the money really doesn't add up. I have two concerns; concern number one is contamination of wells and the second concern is those wells going dry. We keep talking about wells and Mr. Gibbons, in the last discussion or the last meeting we had, spoke of taking trucks and pouring water down wells. It doesn't work in an aquifer. Some of you are thinking, what am I talking about. We are on an aquifer. So if you dump 10 gallons of water down my well, now I've got a gallon, my neighbor has a gallon, and so on. If my well goes dry, my neighbor's well goes dry. To that point, if a well goes dry or a well is contaminated, who does the burden of proof fall under? Are those wells going to be tested before this project goes through? Are those wells going to be tested before it goes through and this project is a 15 year project? Are they going to be tested in 5, 10, 15, and 20 years after it? The next question I have is who does the burden of funds fall under when that hundred thousand dollars isn't enough? The next question I have is, is that money going to be... is there going to be a significant amount of money put in escrow to take care of that? And the last thing I would like to say is Mr. Payne stated that this is the largest project in Stafford County history. So where's the environmental impact study? Why hasn't it been given to the constituents and the taxpayers of the County? And how will it affect the Chesapeake Watershed and our wells? Thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Sir, thank you very much. Anyone else would like to speak can come forward at this time please.

Ms. Calender: Good evening, I'm Alaine Calender. I was thinking George Washington Village seems to be a bit of a misnomer wouldn't you say. It's not a village; it's a city. And it may be several villages put together, but it's an enormous project. The impacts are going to be tremendous. And I think that, first off, you should resolve the airport compatibility issue. If that's not the place to build houses then, you know, the project should be denied early on rather than postponing and going over this for a period of months. Now I realize Stafford citizens, including myself, have said that we'd like an urban center for Stafford. I'm sure that's where this concept for George Washington Village came from; it will give a central feel to the County. And I empathize with you as Planning Commissioners -- you want to be fair. These developers and their attorneys come in and express a desire to work with the County to help build a thriving community. You are always polite to them and you always try to help them tweak their project plans so they meet regulations, as well as the desires expressed by citizens and our Board of

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

Supervisors. But I think too often you get so bogged down with the details and you hate to disappoint the applicant who has worked hard on the proposal and spent a huge amount of money on it as well. I'm sorry that... I just don't see this project working out. I've seen many projects come before you over the years and sometimes they sound great on paper and they never work out. Then we have projects like this that don't even look good on paper. So, I'm very concerned and as I listened to the presentation, I became more cynical about it unfortunately. One thing we need to consider is I-95 is overused as it is. It doesn't matter if we have some fancy interchange going in; we have a problem with transportation that this project, you know, it might help with some interior roads or something, but it's adding so much traffic through the residences and through the commercial, if that works out. I'm just extremely cynical about this County's ability to deal with transportation. And it's interesting... our landfill can't... Well, I lost my time. I ran out of time. But I'll just say it's interesting, the County doesn't even want to subsidize solid waste management and this type of thing is going to require subsidies from various places. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward?

Mrs. Arcularius: Good evening, my name is Shelly Arcularius. A couple of the questions that I've got concern Kelsey Road which is consistently referred to as Kelsey Lane by Mr. Payne. It might be nice if he got our street name correct. They want to put an emergency exit on Kelsey. What constitutes an emergency? If it's gated, who controls that gate? Is it going to go through our property or the property that they've already purchased from previous residents there? As far as the costs of a fire station, it's about \$4-5.5 million; that's the estimates that are coming in right now for Station 14 on Shelton Shop. Then you're looking at another \$1.3 million in yearly costs to man that unit with nothing but an engine company and a medic unit. If those don't go into play sooner than later, you're not going to have the emergency services to support the needs. And they anticipate... the County actually anticipates 1 call per every 10 residents, and they're figuring 3 residents per unit. So they can do the math there and figure out when they need to have Fire and Rescue in place. One of the things that came up in our neighborhood the other night, about 1998 there was a builder that was denied 1-acre lots in the same area. They went back and the County Board of Supervisors approved for a minimum of 3-acre lots. So, what happens now? All of the people that fought this before, we're back to the same spot we are now. And, as my husband brought up earlier, the environmental impact study. We keep hearing about the financial gains? What about the creeks that (inaudible) back there? We had kids go hiking over the weekend. You've got an active beaver dam back there. So you're just going to start displacing everything yet again? I'd be curious, if we're being compared to Stonebridge, has anybody touched base with Prince William County to find out how much their crime rate went up when Stonebridge went in? What's going to happen with the Sheriff's Department? When are they going to get additional personnel and resources? They're fighting now for their budget as it is. We need to be able to support them. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Ms. Viklund: Erica Viklund. I'd just like to follow-up on Shelly's comments about law enforcement. The impact of the proposed development on Fire and Rescue, there's been a lot of discussion about that; no resolution I don't think, but a lot of discussion. But I really haven't heard any mention of the impacts on law enforcement. In the United States, the average ratio is 2 sworn officers for every 1,000 residents. George Washington Village would bring approximately 9,000 new residents, and that's a pretty conservative estimate based on 3 people per dwelling. So right there, just to align with the national average, the County would need at least 18 new deputies, along with the associated vehicles and gear, just to accommodate that population increase. I don't have any data on the current status of the Sheriff's

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Department with respect to staffing, facilities, resources, or budget; so maybe they are in a position to handle the increased population and the potential for more crime. But as a resident, it concerns me that the additional pressure on law enforcement has not, at least to my knowledge, been explicitly addressed. Thanks.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Ms. Sigmon: Hi, I'm Susan Sigmon. A couple of things I wanted to bring up -- I have a question in regards to the Mine Road/Courthouse Road area. Embrey Mill, Westgate, Liberty Knolls, Augustine at Forge, development down towards Shelton Shop. How many units, whether that's townhouses or condominiums or single-family homes are currently under construction, right now have just recently been put up, or are a blank piece of land that are getting ready to go up? How many homes are we looking at right there, that we're talking about people coming in? And there's retail slated right here when you're coming off of 95 along Austin Ridge Road. What is the retail that is going in there? There are signs up that have said retail pads available, retail pads available; I haven't heard anything about what the retail is going in there. So we don't even know what kind of community stores are coming in there for us. You're talking about realigning Austin Ridge and Mine Road along Courthouse. What about the rest of the road? The high school's about a half a mile from Mine Road. How's that going to be affected? I know there was an article in the paper recently that said, bad deal crimps Stafford roads, and it talks about Courthouse and the funding and everything for that. So I'm just sort of curious what this is going to look like. The new plan calls for some units down on the end of Kelsey where the cul-de-sac is. It doesn't specify what kind of units those are. It's just some colored boxes and we haven't been told are those townhouses, are they apartments, are they single-family homes? Nobody has disclosed that to us. There's lots of new sets of plans and slides that have come out. Apparently everybody's getting them at the 11th hour. Still waiting for information from two meetings ago. Back in December we asked for an environmental impact study. The quote was, a project of this size is too costly and too much of a time issue to do a study prior to the request and the presentation that we're giving to the Board here. Still waiting on that to come through. My question is, how in good conscious, faith, ethics, and logistics can you propose forward movement and approval without this study? We were told homeowners were going to be responsible if our wells are contaminated or dried up to hooking up to public water. We asked information about how much is that going to cost per homeowner. Haven't had that given to us yet. And I'd like to know why the developer wouldn't be responsible for paying for this should it happen, why it should not be their responsibility. The developer wants to reclassify and have our housing zones reclassified to meet their needs. Kelsey Road residents and surrounding residents have not asked for this. This is to meet the developer's needs, not our needs, for our quality of life. We may not have slides, we may not have power points and presentations to give, we might not be an LLC or a corporation, but we are a community. And our input is valid and legitimate. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Mrs. Carlone: Ruth Carlone. Let me count the ways that this should have never been brought up this evening. It should have been denied, recommended for denial at the last meeting. I talked with the school today, the school office. They don't have the 3,000 in their budget this time. They had to eliminate 55 positions to bring down the cost in their budget. I resent very much these... on the school site about the occupancy, just grading the land, permit at the 1,500th unit. Where in the... oops, I almost said hell... but anyway, why are we allowing this to happen, to have them set up these goals? It may take forever to sell 10 or 15 or 20. But to get up to 1,500 to be able to get that school. What is the school going to do in the interim? We're doing a redistricting now. You know, hey guys. Then on the

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Fire and Rescue, it's at the 1,800th residential unit. You know, these people sit here and really look down on us and come up with these individual, I guess you'd call it (inaudible) when you can have... which are asking for what you need. And I'm probably not making too much sense. Also, the cash proffers will be fixed; there's no escalation in that. Please look over the evaluation criteria again and take to heart the previous statement that this should have been denied. Staff's recommendation was to recommend denial. Now, just having been here about 31 years and seeing these people come and go, you know, it's Christmas every day for them but we get Christmas once a year. I'm tired of supporting through them. We give up so much here of our quality of life so they can have a profit. There's much more in this, but like I said, we should not be here this evening. And there should be a continuation of the public hearing again because the usual tactic here is to bring up something at the last minute. And it's just prolonging a bad deal. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward?

Mr. Waters: Hi, my name is Jon Waters. And me and my wife have lived there for 25 years. It's been amazing; it's a great place to live. And in the late 90s another developer wanted to come in and put a bunch of houses behind me and my next door neighbor, Sandy Hunter's houses, and the Zoning and Planning Commission agreed with me and my neighbors that any land abutting our lots should be 3 acres minimum with 1 single-family house per lot. And I hope you'll abide by that decision in the late 90s so we can keep that. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you sir. Anyone else?

Ms. Moore: My name is Lorrie Moore. I've lived there for 23 years. I'm opposed to this project vehemently. I'm opposed to it for many reasons and 3 minutes is not long enough, so I'll just give you a few. Because their goal was approval, the applicant funded an economic fiscal analysis that a gentleman from GWU did. And we listened to it at the May meeting for the residents up at the high school. And he was very eloquent. He had lots of... it sounded really good and I almost started buying it because I thought, wow, this is really good for our County. And it paints such a rosy picture. But, what it does is it relies so heavily on the commercial aspect of this project that Mr. Payne was talking about. And great, if you can fully fill all those. But just because you build them, they don't always come! So, without knowing that all that is really going to transpire, we're running the risk of burdening our residents even further tax wise. What the applicant did not fund, study-wise, in my opinion, because of my opinion it would not recommend this project very highly, is the environmental impact study and you've heard about that enough probably. But one thing related to the environmental impact study is the well problem. We're very concerned. My property, unfortunately, does abut this project and I'm zoned A-1, although the chart on the application says we're zoned A-2, we're A-1. And so if I'm included in that hundred thousand, which I think it's divided for half and half of the project, 50 for half, 50 for half... okay, well if we're required to hook to County water if my well goes dry, it's \$6,900 to hook to County water. Then it's \$10 a foot... I was quoted by a plumber... a linear foot to run the waterline. It could cost at least \$10,000 for me to hook to County water. Who pays for that? Okay, so then that is 10 houses that it could potentially hook to County water, it's \$100,000. That's... there are even more abutting houses than just 10 houses. And then there are houses that are adjacent to but so close that they could be affected. It's important to know these things ahead of time and not afterwards. You measure twice and cut once if you're a smart carpenter. Basically, in his initial sales pitch, Mr. Payne told us that this would give us a sense of community in Stafford County. I like our sense of community the way it is. It's not high-end retail; it's genuine community. That's what we have in our neighborhood and that's what we enjoy in our civic organizations and our churches. So, that's why I'm opposed to it, in a nutshell.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Anyone else please?

Ms. Hamilton: Good evening, I'm Rebecca Hamilton. First of all, I pretty much concur with everything every one of my neighbors has said. And I'm going to try to avoid harping on some of the same things such as the environmental impact studies and such, but I am in concurrence as it my better half. A couple of things I just wanted to touch on real quick was the traffic assessment. When was that study done actually? How many current developments are in progress on Courthouse Road now? Homes haven't even been completed yet; forget about them being occupied. Even with the ones that have been completed, many of them are not occupied. Many of the retail space has (inaudible) to as well. It's available, but again, not occupied. If this traffic assessment was done... even if it was done 6 months ago, 3 months ago... it failed. And even the applicants themselves admitted the fact that they didn't really have any way to remediate that. Well now, let's fast forward a little bit. Let's look at all those developments are now completed; all the homes, all the townhomes, are now built and they've all been sold, and now they're occupied. And those kids are going to school. And those people are going to work. Let's redo that traffic assessment again at that point, because I can tell you right night, if it failed now it certainly is going to be a much uglier picture then. And that's before the GW project even kicks off. So, that's just something that we need to remember. There's so much already in progress that hasn't even been taken into account that's already been approved. Property tax impacts. We hear, and I understand what they're doing and saying, well look at this is all the revenue we're going to get with, you know, all these new units, all these new occupants, and all the property tax that's going to be flowing in from that. That's great! What about between now and 15 years from now, while those houses are still being constructed, before people have moved in, and what if they don't sell. Where's that burden going to fall? Us. None of us are happy with that outlook. Wells. I'm just going to reiterate that. And personally I have an issue going to County water. You know, there's a reason (inaudible) stopped putting fluoride in their water. Yeah, not for that. And the zoning, this was brought up back in December; it was never addressed. What about the zoning for all of our property? The majority, if not all of us, moved into our land because we like having an agriculture and a rural zoning. We have that lifestyle. There are horses, beekeepers, chickens, you name it. What's going to happen when they put all these cute little townhomes and apartment complexes right up next to us? I kind of have a funny feeling they're not really going to be too keen on our chickens, and us target-practicing in our backyards. I have a feeling that's going to change, and that's not right. So, I would just like it addressed because we brought it up in December and it was never answered. So, and that's our land, that's our property. Sorry for running over. Thanks.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Anyone else who would like to come forward? So, that will end for tonight the public comment portion, though the public hearing will stay open given the new information that has come in. But, Mr. Payne, would you like to come up and please comment on those items?

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission. Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer. I represent the applicant. You know, first and foremost, community matters. Public comments are extraordinarily important to the process. Everyone should have a word. Everyone should have an opportunity to express their opinion, and we respect that. Maybe not in the eyes of some of the folks who are on Kelsey Road or others who have spoken, we are good neighbors. But I think we are good neighbors and trying to be good neighbors. We established this well escrow we thought based on the probability *if*. We think the low probability that there would be impacts. Let's not forget that this project is going to generate about \$52 million in tap fees, in addition to the escrow funds that we're looking at; so there are significant amount of revenue being generated for utilities. And, of course, we'll have access easements to those adjoining property owners that want to hook up to public

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

water and sewer -- which is encouraged, by the way, in that particular area of the County based on the County's Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Development Plan. You know, look, this is the opinions of whether and how Stafford should grow or not grow. It's been going on for 300 years. Mr. English is from here, I'm from here. My family's been here since 1677... or 1720, I'm sorry.

Mr. Gibbons: You haven't aged at all Charlie.

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Gibbons. You know, the Falmouth Bottom was a village. The Falmouth Bottom was an urban area. It was an export/import. It was a center of commerce. That's where I'm from. It's not that anymore. The silt in the river dried up the port, so things do change. And the County has planned for growth. Whether fortunate or unfortunate, we're located in a proximity along I-95 between Washington, D.C. that's going to continue to grow. That's just a reality. I think this County has done an excellent job in planning for that growth. It's created these UDAs. It's trying to concentrate growth in certain centers near major road arteries and infrastructure and improvements. That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to facilitate that plan. This is a long term plan. I've heard several comments in public hearings where everyone thinks these units are online in a year. I mean, this is a 20 year, 25 year project. So, I don't want us to get overexcited or upset or irritated at the developer's counsel please because what we're trying to do is facilitate a project that we believe, truly believe, is going to have a positive impact, economic impact on our community, it's going to bring cultural resources, it's going to bring economic development opportunities, it's going to bring jobs, and may create an opportunity for folks to get off the road -- which we really desire. On some of the environmental questions that keep coming up, you know, we have to perform a Critical Resource Protection Area analysis prior to the development. We have said we will do that at the preliminary site plan stage. Same with the cultural resources study. There are no cemeteries on the site, Mr. Gibbons; I know you have asked that question. There are no identifiable significant cultural resources per se on the site, although I think some have been generally identified that we said we'd review and do a Phase 1 before the development occurs. All of those things have to happen before we can dig one footer in the project. I wanted to make sure I addressed everything that was raised. Again, schools -- I know we were... folks have been critical at saying you're not giving enough to schools. There's a choice you've got to make. You know, it's the same challenge we have with about every project. The infrastructure, transportation, and schools are your driver and cost drivers. Those are the greatest needs. We're concentrating that not because schools are not important. We think they are important. But we think with this mix-used project, which is unique, folks are just typically accustomed at looking at one... a housing project or a commercial project. This is a mixed-use project, so it has both components and a significant amount of both components. It's an economic project. It's going to generate revenue that's going to offset those impacts that folks perceive not being covered with our proffers. So, the investment's mostly in the infrastructure to help facilitate an economic development component to create that center. This is a wonderful community. To suggest that it's not... I've never suggested that it's not, today that Stafford's not. But it's got to create an economic cultural and civic center in order to, in my opinion, survive in the long term and be self-sustainable. I think for those of you who remember what happened in the past just 8 or 9 years during the great recession, we struggled internally. This economy struggled. We were fortunate enough that people who lived here have government related jobs, right. So they weren't laid off, so you didn't have a high level of unemployment. But folks who had construction jobs and service jobs and local management jobs, they lost their jobs. So, let's not forget that dependence on the federal government, especially when Virginia is 48th in the country in new jobs because we're losing federal-related jobs, you have to look forward in the future and understand that to be sustainable, you've got to have a self-sustainable economy. And Stafford has an opportunity to do that. It's pretty exciting, I think. And hopefully we'll look forward to that. The other important thing to understand is this is one owner controlling 1,100 acres. That's unique. You don't have that

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

anywhere else, especially in a high-growth area. So this is a unique opportunity for us I think to create a model, smart project, a project that's beneficial with one owner. If you think about just focusing on Courthouse Village and try to create a center over there, there's 130-plus properties you'd have to consolidate. It's just not going to happen. So this is a unique opportunity again I think, and hopefully near some new near-term infrastructure improvements at the interchange. There's been some comments or questions about our traffic impact analysis. I know a lot of times it kind of gets lost because, you know, I have a transportation study that's thicker than this binder just in and of itself; it's a 527 study that's required by VDOT. We have to not only look at current developments that are being developed, but also future ones that are not developed. So, we have to take that into account in our traffic study, which obviously impacts our project because we're looking outside of our project into the future. Kelsey Road, we responded to the individuals on Kelsey Road's concerns regarding cut-through or utilizing Kelsey Road as another outlet, which is why we had to cut off with only emergency access. We're required to do that by the Fire Department, so we have no say in cutting it off actually.

Mr. English: Mr. Payne, when you said... I'm sorry.

Mr. Rhodes: No, please.

Mr. English: When you said you have made contact with the residents on Kelsey Road, how did...

Mr. Payne: No, we responded to. The Kelsey Road folks came here the first or second (inaudible).

Mr. English: But you never sent them a letter (inaudible)?

Mr. Payne: No, no, no... we responded to their concern about the cut-through (inaudible).

Mr. English: (Inaudible) last public hearing?

Mr. Payne: Last couple, yeah.

Mr. Rhodes: And how would that... where would that emergency connection occur at?

Mr. Payne: It was on the map...

Mr. Rhodes: Was that land that you own?

Mr. Payne: We own it. It stops at our land.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. And this would be the typical knox-box right, that only the fire/rescue and emergency folks have an access to should there be (inaudible).

Mr. Payne: That's right. We've also... our current plan, as you can see, there are 1-acre single-family lots there.

Mr. Harvey: Computer please.

Mr. Payne: It's not working; Jeff, can you point it out there? That's the four lots there. And then here's the cut-off here.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Payne, while we're right there, could you just confirm, I think with this current proposal GDP, those are single-family homes up in the North Village?

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, purple is apartments and the green is the townhouses.

Mr. English: Mike, could you point out Zachary Lane on there? Or do you know? It's at the end of Kelsey. No, it's not?

Mr. Payne: We're not even impacting Zachary Lane. We're not accessing Zachary.

Mr. English: Okay, that's fine. Okay.

Mr. Coen: Just, while we have the map up there, while there's the four larger single-family homes, the road also goes down to what looks like a circle and then all those smaller ones also could go up that way as well, correct?

Mr. Payne: You're talking about to the south of there?

Mr. Coen: Yes, all those where Jeff has nicely put the arrow.

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, that's North Village.

Mr. Payne: That's North Village.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Payne: And I think there was a comment about Stonebridge. I don't know if folks recollect that area was fairly blighted before Stonebridge came in. So Stonebridge has actually added some real value, and competitive value, of course, attracting Wegman's and then several high-end restaurants. And a lot of that was driven by what? The apartments and townhouses that were built around it. So, that's in response to the public comments. I'll be happy to answer (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Payne, just to... because there was the new proffer agreement here, but just please confirm that I've got this correct. In the old proffer proposal, the first draft of it, you had the school site being proffered over at the 1,500th unit; now it's 450, correct? So it'd be at about... at your max build-out it'd be at about the 3-year mark, if you were on max build-out. And the fire/rescue site used to be at the 1,800th unit, but now it's just whenever the County asks for it, whether it's day 1 or any size in there?

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I'm trying to get to a couple of these things that folks had asked about. And then the water... I'm trying to remember how we evolved to the 48, but as far as your water escrow, whether

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

that applied to just 48 abutting or in some other mechanism applied to others adjoining, do you have a particular issue on that?

Mr. Payne: We could take a look at the others that are abutting to the abutting properties. The 48 number, I believe, came from the County.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I think we had cited that there were 48. So I didn't think that that was a real hard point necessarily.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, Mr. Chairman, when we had the gold course, that was a lesson on us. And we came up 14, 15 wells short because when you're dealing with the aquifer, the aquifer runs very (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Right. So I just didn't perceive that there was a hard-over point that it would only necessarily be for the 48. I remember we discussed it because we said there were 48. So I think there would be flexibility in that, how it applied to, to have to think about it. But I just didn't think that was a hard point, so I just wanted to address that. That was my perception at least. And then I would just make a general comment, just for awareness. The County has identified this area, as they're doing their longer term planning, as one of their development areas. One place that you would look for more growth. If we've got to deal with more growth in the future, where do you want to put that? And the County has, in their plans, said that it ought to be in areas that are closer to our major infrastructure, 95 and Route 1 and so forth. So just for everyone's awareness, it is the County that developed the plan that said it ought to be in these kinds of places where they're closer to some of the major infrastructure, just in fairness. And then the last point, if I could just ask Mr. Harvey, I know we had VDOT here and they talked about the Courthouse Road widening out to Ramoth Church somewhere between now and '18, now and '19, and I know a few things are slipping. So it could be a little later. Has anything major changed with that Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that's still in flux with the redesign of the interchange. I understand...

Mr. Rhodes: The Courthouse Road widening all the way out to Ramoth Church?

Mr. Harvey: As far as the timing of it, yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: Because it could be affected by funding if a part of the interchange project gets put on the County's widening of Courthouse Road. That would mean we may have to bump it out another year or so to collect the dollars to finish that project.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. But as it stood when VDOT briefed us, that was about an '18 or '19 completion, wasn't it?

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, okay. And now we're wrestling with some of the other things with the interchange.

Mr. Harvey: Yes. And Mr. Chairman, based on previous discussions, we'll have the Public Works Department here for your second meeting in March to talk about the updates.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Great! Thank you very much. Anyone else...? Yes please, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Cemeteries.

Mr. Payne: Mr. Gibbons, there are no cemeteries on the site.

Mr. English: Yes there is.

(Inaudible from audience).

Mr. English: Well, just to let you know, there's a cemetery... I live on Cedar Lane, and there is a cemetery... do you know which one? It's called the Ball Cemetery.

Mr. Rhodes: Could you come forward? I'm sorry. For our vast public crowd that's watching on TV, we need the microphone.

Mr. Troidl: There's one behind the townhouses if you go to your left... keep going... keep going... right there. There's a cemetery back in that area. The actual boundary of the property, that was excluded from whenever they did the...

Mr. Rhodes: So, it's just north of that?

Mr. Troidl: Just north of that; it's actually right along that property line. He's actually I think pointing right where it is.

Mr. English: It's close to the gas line?

Mr. Troidl: It is close to the gas line, exactly, yes. But it's out... the property limits of George Washington Village or this development actually don't include that. That was excluded from the property. The other cemetery, if you go to the north all the way over to Courthouse Road, over where the commercial is? Now go left to the other one... sorry... other way...

Mr. Rhodes: Other left.

Mr. Troidl: No, in our property... further north... just to the left... right there. There is a cemetery there as well. Again, the property limits go around that cemetery. Those are the two that we've identified that are outside of the project limits.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Is there any problem with doing a Phase 1 survey? What I was told again tonight, there's 3 cemeteries.

Mr. Payne: It's in our proffer; we're performing a Phase 1.

Mr. Gibbons: What?

Mr. English: He'll perform a Phase 1.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Payne: It's in our proffer, yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Please, Mr. English.

Mr. English: Now, one of my questions is about the wells. I'm very concerned about the wells. Of course, I live on Cedar Lane; this is probably going to back up. Don't have access to County water. If my well does go dry because of this project, there's a couple questions I need to be answered. I can't hook up to County water because there's no access. Are you going to drill me a well? And the other thing is how long is it going to take me and who's going to take up all... those are the things and questions I'm sure these residents on Kelsey want answered too. You know, how long is it going to take? Are they going to do the, what is it, drop and haul? And again, that's not going to work either... pump and haul.

Mr. Gibbons: That sounds better than pump and haul.

Mr. English: But that's not going to last either because like I said, you drop the water in the well, it's disappearing. There's a drill well and then there's an artisan well. Mine's drilled and it's only 90 feet. And a drill well is probably going to cost you about 10 grand if not more, so, again, I don't know if you've included Cedar Lane property and Courthouse Road because from the commuter lot to up past Rolling Road, there's a donut hole, I guess... there's no access to County water at all. So, you've got all those properties to consider. And I remember when they were building Augustine, they had the problems on Mountain View Road. So it affects properties that you wouldn't even think it would affect. So that needs to be really addressed as far as how that's going to work, that mechanism. And \$100,000 is not going to take care of it; if you had 40 wells go dry, I don't think it's going to cover it. The other issue that I have that is a great concern, and we could address it to the School Board, Ms. Kidby, is I want to know what kind of impact for the school... I want to know school impacts. And I'd like to hear it from the School Board Chairman and the School Board of what kind of impact this is going to have on them. So I do want something from them as far as the school's concerned.

Mr. Payne: They provided a letter, right?

Mr. English: I've never seen it, as far as from the School Board.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: And just to piggyback, and it's more for staff. But on the School Board, we did receive the letter from the Superintendent which on the back page sort of summarized what the School Board dealt with. But that seemed to be a very good process of getting the School Board's input on this project. So definitely, I think Mr. English is right of connecting back with the School Board. It just happened that this weekend I had some communications with Ms. Kidby on something and then this came up and the proffers came up. And she was very receptive to the idea of us communicating again to them. The last time they stayed to well after 11 o'clock to deliberate on this and give us their opinion and they were very receptive to that. I think the elements, and this again is more to staff, to try to get the impact from law enforcement would be good. I think that that's excellent. Several people brought up things from the Fire and Rescue, and I had received something as well and I will forward that out to people as well on the Commission. But it was interesting; it was almost the exact same figures as was being cited tonight about that. And then as lately, we've been asking what these new numbers, especially with the in-kind

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

proffers, to have staff, when they do their due diligence, to check that out. And I do want to commend staff because one of the things they were trying to do, as soon as information was coming to them in the last several days, they were trying to get in online so that the public would have access. And so staff has worked very hard on that because they believe in the transparency of it. Like some of the speakers, I was at the May meeting and it was all about transparency. That is sort of the goal is making sure that the public has input. And so I think Mr. English is a hundred percent correct in wanting to continue the public hearing so they can say it. In the redirect, Mr. Payne, you were talking about the same school sites and the \$10.8 million again where earlier there was talk about building a school offsite. But the figures we received of the elementary school, just building an elementary school is \$22.4 million. So that's a big delta between what you believe was economically viable for your project and what constructing a school, let alone what the School Board had said, which, just in case anybody didn't see our last exciting meeting, the School Board said they wanted no land for a school site. They wanted the cash proffers for the impact of this. So it may well be that they say the same thing again, but that's an awfully big delta to go into.

Mr. Payne: Do I respond to that?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Payne: And thank you Mr. English for your comments and concerns regarding the wells. We'll take another look at it. I mean, the thought was is that not all 48 would fail; we're hoping none would fail. So, we're trying to put a number, a dollar number that would make sense in the escrow account realizing that this project is a long term project.

Mr. English: I don't want to cut you off; can I make a statement to you Mr. Payne? Can you go back and maybe look at when Augustine was being built, what kind of impact that had as far as well loss on that property? That might give you some generalization as far... I mean, I don't know if you can go back and look, because I know that had a major impact when Augustine was being built.

Mr. Payne: We'll take a look at it. We'll talk to the County, Public Works and Utilities, and see what their history is with those particular issues.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Payne: But anyways, the point is, as I've stated before, we want to be good neighbors. We're going to take a look at it to see what we can do to help offset that, including good development practices and other to address it, and we'll do that. We've done it before, we'll do it again. So we'll take a look at it. In regards to schools, and I have stated several times, this project shouldn't be a shock to anybody. The County has planned for growth in this area; in fact, 4,800 units in this particular area of the County. I assume someone looked at it from a school capacity perspective and said, you know, we're going to either need new schools, we're going to need to do redistricting -- I assume they did. And the growth pattern was supposed to happen over 20 years. So everything I've said is consistent with that plan that the County has on its books. The school system's been a part of that, County planning's been part of that, this Board's been part of it, the Board of Supervisors... so it shouldn't be anything shocking in regards to this project. I think sometimes we get a little wrapped around the axle regarding when a project like this is going to be online and I've said several times that this a long term project. You're not going to get 2,957 units in 10 years. It's not going to happen unless there's some crazy growth pattern that occurs. I want to address, if I can just real quick, Mr. Coen's comments. We have been transparent. We went to the School Board, in a work session. We've had community meetings. We've been before

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

a work session of this Planning Commission. We've been before the Airport Authority. We've been very transparent. We haven't hide the ball at all. We've been very clear that we can't pay for everything. I wish I could give the wish list that the School Board has asked for, the school system's asked for. I wish I could. It'll never happen. It'll bankrupt our project. It'll bankrupt this project. It'll bankrupt any project. What we're looking at is a unique project in regards to how it will work from a tax revenue perspective and from a long term growth perspective. And from an economic development perspective. That's what we're looking at. And infrastructure is a key part of that. That's why there's \$40 million in infrastructure. And that's why we have \$10 million in parks and why we have \$14 million in schools, in Fire and Rescue, and park land. We are giving \$10 million in cash; you want cash, we're doing it and only dedicating (inaudible) \$800,000 in dedicated land. So, we heard you and we've come up with cash. And don't forget that of that \$20 million, we're only generating half the students. We're not generating a hundred percent of the students to build a new school; only half. So, just remember that when you take into context when a project like this comes online what the impact is. So that's the only clarification I want to provide.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Again, I appreciate the applicant's perspective and their attorney's perspective. I feel like I need to comment. It's not a surprise. Yes, we did identify this area as a potential Urban Development Area, which may be renamed at some point in time. I wasn't part of the Planning Commission when the UDAs were designated. I think some things may have gotten lost under the process of trying to develop the UDAs, but I certainly recall many times many Planning Commissioners, many Supervisors, and if the document doesn't say it itself, I think it's certainly implied that the construct of UDAs are that they're supposed to pay for themselves. Part of that paying for themselves is that the commercial is supposed to offset it. So, your point that we shouldn't be surprised is true. Nonetheless, when I look at what's being put in front of us, and I've said it all along, looking for the balance here, the concern is you're asking us to make a tradeoff which is not part of the discussion when this construct was put into place; that we would trade schools for roads or vice-versa. And that's the dilemma that I'm having and I, again, I think we've sort of implied it if not said it, I think it would be helpful if you went back and looked at trying to balance things out in a way that's, from my vantage point, fair that we don't have to make that tradeoff. Because, quite frankly, I'm going to have a tough time doing it. I appreciate what you're trying to do and maybe at the end of the day UDAs aren't economically viable, if that's the tradeoff that we have to make. But at this point in time, it's a tradeoff that's very difficult to put the burden on the taxpayers. This is not growth that was planned for per se, this is growth that's in excess of what's currently out there. Yes, we want to steer growth into these Urban Development Areas as it progresses over the next 10/20 years, but again, not on the backs of taxpayers. And that's kind of my concern and the line of inquiry that I had earlier.

Mr. Payne: I respectfully disagree. One, the UDAs specifically identifies a number of units; 4,600 or 4,800, or whatever number of units. Specifically identifies them as this amount single-family, this amount multi-family, and this amount t-- for the sole purpose of trying to determine impacts. And for concentrating that growth there over a certain period of time. I remember the committees that were formed. It was a long term process and it was on both sides of the isle. Whole comm... lots of many members, many leaders in the community, not just elected officials were involved. I remember the process. So, I hope we're not shocked by it. And then the tradeoff, I'm trying to figure out what the tradeoff is because you're not giving us credit for the potential economic development that we have put forward here on the net revenue to be generated by the project. None, in fact; zero. There's \$120 million cost estimate by staff in regards to this project. This project is providing \$98 million... no, wait a minute... \$98 million in proffers, if you will. Twenty-two million dollars of that \$120 would by-right,

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

period. So we're down to \$100 million. And you're giving us zero credit on the \$5 million net annual tax revenue generation that's going to occur at full build-out; zero. So, I don't know what the tradeoff is. I mean, you're acting as if that the developer has come to the table here and said you pay for it. Not even (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, the tradeoff is on capital costs, not operating costs. The revenue that is generated on an annual basis has nothing to do with the capital costs and everything to do with the operating costs. So, the person who talked about not having enough Sheriff's Officers -- well, that would partially be offset by the annual revenue provided by the commercial. But it doesn't pay for...

Mr. Payne: That's not true.

Mr. Apicella: It does not pay for the capital costs.

Mr. Payne: That's inaccurate. You need to read the fiscal impact analysis. It's not accurate. It's net of... it is net of operating costs. Read it.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: I have a question, it's for staff, nothing personal. I raised this last meeting and I was told by somebody I respect deeply that I wasn't very clear. So, I brought up the issue that we have a changing face of business in the country, particularly retail. That, and I think Mr. Gibbons mentioned this at our subcommittee meeting, a lot of the brick and mortar mentality of retail is changing. And so, what I had asked at our last meeting was to try to have staff talk to Economic Development to get their input in this. And then furthermore, in a conversation with a businessman this week who was talking about office space, the nature of office space is changing as well. And so, what I'm sort of looking at, particularly if we're looking at something that's long term, is this country shifting away from brick and mortar stores so that people are buying online and the whole nature is, and then therefore one of the premises of what we have done in the past whereas, I mean, the idea of a town center was really good; Reston, Shirlington, etcetera. Now that we're deeper into the 21st century, is that now passé? And I think the Economic Development people might be able to tell us if really we're looking at the old town setting where now people are going to malls and then everybody went to malls and now people don't go to malls -- is the country changing? And hopefully I articulated better this time. But, if the country is shifting, if retail and business is shifting, are we aiming at what is the future or are we just sort of looking at a status quo. And if, as the applicant is saying, this is over 20 years, are we really looking at what's going to be 30 years or something or are we locking up into something that's going to be antiquated right after this would be in full build-out. So, that's what I would like from staff if we could. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. English: One more question. Is it also, for staff, is it possible that we could get a status on Mine Road, that shopping center, what's going on with that as far as have they got any tenants or anything like that? They don't have (inaudible) but what's going on with that project? Because it looks like it's just standing still now with all the grounds cleared. I just kind of want to know what's going on with that. And I don't know if you can tell us or...

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English, I can't speak to specific tenants but the developer of the Austin Ridge Commercial project has a site plan in review with the County. It's close to approval. Their approval is

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

pending a zoning change on a portion of the property which has not been approved yet by the Board of Supervisors. But the site plan shows a series of commercial individual buildings, as well as a large anchor store. We believe it may be a grocery store but it's unspecified.

Mr. English: So it is moving... they are getting tenants?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: I actually think the Board is going to hear that on the 3rd.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: I believe it was pushed back.

Mr. Rhodes: The 3rd of March, yeah, I believe that's when they're going to hear it. Yes, Mr. Gibbons, please.

Mr. Gibbons: What I'd like to have done too is the Sheriff and the Fire and Rescue study on what it costs as you keep on growing. We need this for the UDA Committee too. So, in other words, if we grow by X amount of homes, what does it cost?

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. So, anything else for the applicant or for staff at this point?

Mr. Gibbons: I think he's going to make a motion, aren't you?

Mr. English: Yeah. Reluctantly, I'm going to... are you done?

Mr. Payne: I was just going to say thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission for all your patience, I appreciate it. And all very good questions respectfully. I appreciate and respect all of you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mr. English: Reluctantly, I want to...

Mr. Rhodes: I apologize. If I could just confirm one thing Mr. Payne. So, I thought I heard that at minimum you were going to agree and we would need that in writing, Ms. McClendon, for beyond the time limit?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, it's on the record so it's okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, and so just to confirm, you did agree to get to the next session is 11 March, the first one in March?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so you've at least agreed to that.

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, it's on the record. Thank you. I'm sorry.

Mr. English: That's alright, that's fine. Yeah, I'm just going to ask to delay this... I'm making a motion to delay this until March 11th for a final vote on this. Again, more information came in today at 4:20, 4:25 on us and I want to also leave the public hearing open and I want to be able to, if the residents want to see the new impact and the proffer of these, that they have access to that and all this new stuff that came in today.

Mr. Rhodes: So, a motion to defer to the 11th of March.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: And we have said that the public hearing has remained open.

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good.

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Coen. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Just that again with the information, I think that quite honestly some of us would be able to get through all this information. I'm sure staff could get through and answer loads of our questions. But I think the 11th is more for the public's input. I know many people don't like it and feel as though it's kicking a can down the road. To me, it is to make sure that we're doing due diligence and that you have an opportunity to do what you need to. So that's why I'm supporting Mr. English's motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Just a question for clarification. Do we need and will we get some kind of formal letter from the applicant authorizing us that extension?

Mr. Rhodes: I think Ms. McClendon said since it was on the record, the formal record of the commentary, we're okay, is what I understood. Thank you. Other comments? Okay, all those in favor of the motion to defer this to the 11th of March signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. Okay, thank you all very much. Thank everyone for their time and their dialogue; appreciate it and thank you. We are now going to move onto Unfinished Business. You wanted to give a brief update on number 2 Mr. Harvey?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Discussion on Cluster Development Standards within Virginia

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Discussion about cluster development standards, staff is continuing to work on that. We should have something back to you at your next meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. So 25 February?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. I would just share, I know Mr. Coen...

Mr. Harvey: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I misspoke; 11 March.

Mr. Rhodes: 11 March, okay, very good. This means no. I do know that Mr. Coen was mentioning that he had some interesting information that he thought was relevant to this discussion from Fire just on some of the impacts of burns and other things that he was going to share out. So, just would comment on that.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, also, an item of interest for the Planning Commission is that the Commission had, as part of one of its discussion items towards the end of last year, asked that the Board consider putting on its legislative agenda the issue of cluster development and having standards for cluster development. The Board did take up the Commission's request and put it as part of their legislative agenda. It was put forward as draft legislation by Senator Stuart; unfortunately, last week in the Cities, Counties, and Towns Committee of the State Senate, the bill did not make it through. It was passed by.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you very much. With that, we'll... yes please.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. Just one of the things that we discussed the last couple times we've had issues with clusters was the concern by the Fire and Rescue about setbacks and etcetera. So, I personally, and I don't know if it's the will of the body, think that it will be useful for us to get more input and look into codifying that. I know that in our last discussion there was a question of one time we do it and do we set a precedent. There seems to be valid reasons...

Mr. Rhodes: Twenty feet instead of eighteen feet (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: Right. And so, I think that it'd be good to get that input from Fire and then, if we need to, put it into the ordinance; do whatever we need to do that. So thank you sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Mr. Apicella.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I would just agree based on the notion that when we were moving the changes to the process, I don't think that we necessarily farmed it out to different County departments to see what the impact was. I think we were trying to provide some incentives and give some flexibility and a number was ultimately, you know, put into the draft. But we didn't really challenge whether that number would be necessarily problematic. And that's why I think it would be helpful to check with potentially other County departments to see whether the revised setbacks and their associated flexibility would cause some problems that we weren't aware of and the unattended consequences associated with those.

Mr. Rhodes: And, in fact, Fire has commented a couple times on it.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and that current 18-foot standard between buildings has been in our code for many years. But as heard on a number of occasions the type of construction materials used in modern homes has an effect on their burn rate and potentially affects other homes differently than they had in the past. So, this may be an outshoot of that.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Coen: Last week at the Board of Supervisors as part of their presentation about budgets and staffing and whatnot, the Chief showed a video clip of how fast a home will start burning and catch on, which was really disturbing and really, I think, made it clearer what we were talking about in theory the last couple times that we dealt with this issue. So, I don't know that we necessarily need to show it at this meeting when we go back to clusters, but I do think it'd be helpful if we got to see it because it really was telling. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. English: And a follow-up on you, Mr. Coen, it's that house that burnt up in Maryland. It burnt up in I think it was 10 minutes, before the Fire Department could even get there. And that was a huge house so I can imagine.

Mr. Rhodes: Anything else on that item? We will have a follow-up on the 11th, not the 25th... the 11th of March. Okay? Very good. I think we'll go onto item number 4, New Business, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance.

3. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas and 5-Year Update - 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) (In Subcommittee)**

NEW BUSINESS

4. Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Definitions - Consider authorizing a public hearing to amend the zoning and subdivision ordinances to create new definitions for uses listed in the zoning ordinance and to harmonize the definitions between the zoning and subdivision ordinances and state code.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ms. Blackburn's here to give the Planning Commission a recap of where we've been on this item and where we may go in the future.

Mr. Rhodes: In spite of the slow work of the subcommittee.

Mrs. Blackburn: Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners, it was almost a year ago -- February 18, 2014, at the Community and Economic Development Committee that the Board of Supervisors listened to and read about a draft document that we had received and put together in conjunction with the consulting firm, Clarion & Associates. And the staff had instructed Clarion to review the definitions, try to make them the same within the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance, try to have them mimic the State Code definitions, and that's what we have. And at the retreat this past spring, you all decided to take it on and to put it into a subcommittee. And July 9th you formed a subcommittee and the subcommittee has been reviewing these definitions. And the ones that you received in your packet were the ones that had changes in them. And you have received a couple copies of them over, and you probably have them electronically. And that's where we are. I know Mr. English had asked for group homes to be mentioned. Well, group homes are no longer really mentioned in the State Code. They are called Residential Facilities Health Department License, and Residential Facilities Social Services License. Now what we can do is, and we will of course double-check with legal, but to put in parenthesis, Group Home, so we can at least get people to that location. And I know, Mr. Apicella, you have asked about the rural home businesses and the home businesses concerning internet sales. And if you have any kind of language you want... oh, I know... any kind of language you'd like put in there, please send it to me or I will make some up and we will go from there.

Mr. Apicella: It's not a... well, it's not that I have specific language to offer as much as I think there's some still gray area that we may need to address. We may not choose to address it, but I think it's caused some potential issues -- at least in my mind. It's come up in the context of gun transfers, but I liken it to somebody who also sells vacuum cleaners and they put them online and they sell them online but somebody has to come to that person's house to pick them up. At the end of the day, it's still causing the same amount of traffic, noise, what have you, disturbance to the surrounding area, whether or not the original person was going to buy it at that house and then money changed hands. So I think we haven't really addressed that issue. And maybe we need to separate out gun transfers as a potential item from rural home businesses. I don't know what the right answer is; I just feel like we need to consider it and maybe try to find a way to address it.

Mrs. Blackburn: And that is fine. These, again, is a little smaller version than seeing the entire group of definitions and what's been changed and what hasn't been changed. And I do wish you all would just read through them, see if there is any that glaringly jump out at you. We did not take any of the regulations out of the definitions at this time. We will make that another step. This is just to make the definitions the same in both documents and to have them be the same as in the State Code.

Mr. Rhodes: And what is required to close this action when we're at that point?

Mrs. Blackburn: For you all to say this is great, this is a wonderful list, we're very happy with it. And we will have legal review them to make sure we have not... we've dotted all our i's and crossed all our t's, and then we will send it forward to the Board.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So, at some point, the intent is, once we are satisfied, is to then vote and agree and then send it back forward to the Board.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee. I'm sure it was a...

Mr. Rhodes: It was an impressively slow subcommittee with great patience from staff.

Mr. Apicella: I would offer, for potential consideration, if it hasn't already gone through what I would call internal clearance within other County departments and maybe other governmental stakeholders, that we might want to consider sending it down that path before we finalize these. For example, it talks about streets and different kinds of streets. VDOT might have an interest. Even though I think perhaps we've captured exactly the way the State Code has suggested, again, it probably wouldn't hurt us to run it by them. I think there might be some definitions that deal with Public Works kind of activity. So I don't think it would hurt to at least float it amongst the various departments (inaudible)...

Mr. Gibbons: That's what you call open government.

Mr. Apicella: ... before we take any action on it.

Mr. Rhodes: As long as we're not going to change it all after they do that. If we don't think we're going... how would we do that? If we didn't think we were going to make dramatic changes to waste all their time, how would we do that to make sure there's some visibility on it?

Mrs. Blackburn: We email them to them.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, we still need to hold a public hearing on it.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So we would first vote this for public hearing, having public hearing on it, then go back to the Board?

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? So, on your first blush, as you were looking at this, I'm not sensing that there was dramatic desire for massive change. So it would not be a waste of time to have others look at it to give us their refining comments. Other than the couple things that were commented on. Okay. So, if we could do that and see what their reaction is, and then we'll try and move this forward. Okay.

Mrs. Blackburn: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. With that, I'm at the Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing new to report today.

Mr. Rhodes: What??

Mr. Gibbons: Oh, birthday time.

Mr. Rhodes: Happy Birthday! He wants to get to his birthday party! Okay, very good. Thank you Jeff. County Attorney's Report please.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

Mr. Rhodes: What?? Oh, sorry. Committee Reports.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Coen: Yes Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: The... I prefer to call it the TGA subcommittee rather than the UDA subcommittee just because I like that term better... we met last Friday. We had all the members of the subcommittee there, staff was there, Ms. Bohmke was there for part of the time. Staff gave us some information that was excellent. We gave them an awful lot of work to do, which they will do a bunch of it and get it back to us for our next meeting which is next Wednesday. Just in brief, one of the items that we asked them to look into was a timeline. Some of the items that are on the list from the Board of Supervisors can be expedited rather quickly; some of them need more research, more work, or public hearings, so we thought a timeline would be appropriate. We also had a lengthy discussion, a good discussion about other elements of the Comp Plan, or even part of what hopefully will be TGAs, that people may want to think about or add to that may or may not be under the auspices of what the Board of Supervisors gave us. And the thought was that we could make a list of said ideas and then, when we send our presentation or our plan forward, we include them as, you know, these are things that we might think are worthy of looking at. And then they can let us know about that and their feedback on that. Tagging along that was the Airport Overlay District. The Supervisors... I hope I'm not stealing anybody's thunder... the Supervisors looked at it last week. They had numerous questions. They are slated I believe to look at it again next week. To-wit, they may well send it back to us after next week's meeting, but we did discuss that there is theoretically the possibility that they might take longer. And if that were to be the case, then again looking at a timeline, if that delayed that aspect from getting to them by June, we would send everything ahead of time and then send that as expeditiously as we can. Hopefully they would understand that any delay was due to their diligence in looking at it. The one aspect that sort of popped up in the discussion, and staff percolated it, was an idea of phasing. When we were starting to discuss the UDAs way back in the Comp Plan Steering Committee, we looked at the idea of phasing them rather than just saying they're here and then people come in with a plan and say, well it's in your Comp Plan to put it here so you have to put it here. We couldn't do phasing with UDAs because of the State Code. However, it is possible that since we're getting away from the UDA language and we're going to targeted growth areas, that we might be able to look at that aspect. And so we asked staff to explore that possibility since we may have that option. And so...

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: That's not in... I would just submit that's not inconsistent with our first reply after the UDAs were no longer mandatory. And December 12 we suggested that (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: And so staff is... that's one of the things that staff will be looking for into and then get back to us on. The one element that had a great deal of discussion was what was the growth numbers that we were going to start from? In the process of looking at the targeted growth areas and deciding that certain ones were going to shrink or be eliminated and you were going to shift some around, what was the starting number? Which I think the Commission will remember we had this discussion back last spring and there was a good debate of whether or not which numbers to use. Staff has generally used FAMPO I think from the beginning they've used the FAMPO numbers. There are other matrix out there that could be used. There also is you look at the sustainability and you base it on that. So there was some discussion as to try to come to this Board, see if this Board will go to the Board of Supervisors and ask them for a definitive preference of which number is the starting point. There are others that felt that since we've been using the FAMPO numbers in the materials sent to the Board and they have never come back and said we don't like those numbers, that it was sort of implied, we asked staff to look at it and see if the Board had ever actually said we prefer X or Y. So that issue is one that the committee felt was worthy to come back to this Commission to say, you know, do we want to go to the Supervisors and ask for more clarity or have they actually given us clarity and staff can move forward.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I thought you captured the numbers in your letter to them?

Mr. Rhodes: In our last input to them, we identified the... I mean, we've typically either looked at the Weldon Cooper or the FAMPO and we took the more conservative FAMPO because that's what we've been running with which is a good bit more conservative than the Weldon Cooper. We identified that, we identified do you want to use these numbers, do you want to use a range of these numbers, 10% below or 10% above them, and then we also asked if they wanted to continue as a planning construct for all the development, the projected development outside what's already planned for, already approved. Do you want to continue with doing 50% of it in targeted growth areas and the other 50% to be absorbed otherwise? And it was pretty specific and all that came back was continue with the way you've got it planned.

Mr. Apicella: I thought they did address the 50%?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, specifically.

Mr. Apicella: So, to me...

Mr. Gibbons: They never... I'm just interjecting as part of the committee... they never did tell us really what figure to use to go from the 50%.

Mr. Apicella: But the only range or variance would be the number or the 10% above or the 10% below. It would seem to me that just going with the number that you started with would be a reasonable construct to go with.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, here's what we looked at as a committee and we thought we were doing the right thing. We're trying to go back and staff says they can put it together and we've got a good staff, professional. What does it cost for growth? So, when you add 10,000 people onto or 20,000 onto it or 30,000, what does it cost you for the infrastructure? So the CIP reflects it. So, in other words, if we go up 50,000 people in 10 years or 5 years, this is the cost of... it's going to cost you for this growth. So

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

the Board has it in their hands maybe I can only afford 60,000 rather than 70,000 or 40,000 versus 50. Nobody in the past has gone back to figure out what it costs us to grow.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Gibbons, I appreciate where you're coming from and I think it's certainly a data point that is helpful to the discussion. But we're going to have whatever growth we're going to have. I mean, that's what...

Mr. Gibbons: (Inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: Yes. We know, at least in the previous period... I agree that it's the same number, but we have doubled in size every 20 years.

Mr. Rhodes: More than that.

Mr. Apicella: And it will be a little bit less going forward based on current numbers. We have to build a plan based on the people who are going to be here, not based on the cost.

Mr. Gibbons: It doesn't have to be double every 10 or 20 years.

Mr. Apicella: But it is whatever... I mean, FAMPO or Weldon Cooper or somebody has a number that they think we're going to look like in 10, 15, 20 years. That's the number. And we have to decide how we're going to accommodate that. I realize that the infrastructure...

Mr. Gibbons: We ought to decide what we want to have, not some planning agency telling us.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, I would... so I would just throw out that if you look, every decade since 1950 we have grown between 40 and 65%. Every 20 years we have grown between 107 and 149%. No matter which window you pick in there. The FAMPO numbers that we had that we proposed up to the Board are a growth in 20 years of only 70%. It is hugely less than anything we've ever experienced. It's the FAMPO numbers so it's a consistent basis, but I would just highlight, just for awareness, that it is significantly less than anything we have historically ever experienced. It's not just a little, it's huge... it's 50...

Mr. Gibbons: We took that. We agree with it. As an elected body, the elected body in this County should say, with some relevance, of how you can afford to grow. And we didn't do this in the past. We're behind in infrastructure. We're behind in services. We're behind in bonding. Everything we're behind the 8-ball in. What can we afford to grow on an annual or a 10-year basis? It might not be 70%. It could be 40%.

Mr. Apicella: So, do we close the gate at 40%?

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know how we stop it at that point. Recognizing costs is certainly important...

Mr. Gibbons: Put a toll road in, that'll do it.

Mr. Rhodes: We have one now. Recognizing costs is important, but also planning I think is all the more important to plan for where would it cause the least impact, where could you best absorb the growth when it happens, which is the construct of what we're trying to do with TGAs.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'm with you a hundred percent. It reminds me of the college where the guy puts the sidewalks where the planner thought it would be best and then...

Mr. Rhodes: And watch for the path, yeah, that's right. Where they really walk.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman...

Mr. Rhodes: All I was going to say is that, because I'm scared of the lowness of the FAMPO number, just personally. So, the FAMPO number's anywhere between... from our lowest point of growth to our highest point of growth in our history, it is either 50% lower to 100% lower. I mean, it's a lot.

Mr. Coen: And one of the, quite honestly, staff's point and I'm sure Mr. Harvey or Mr. Zuraf will correct me if I'm wrong or if I'm slightly inaccurate or totally off base, is that the construct, and this is what you told us last spring, was to plan for that and if it comes in below that, we're sort of okay. And since we've had a period of slower growth the last couple years, that sort of has worked for us. This is why personally I thought the idea of trying to do the phasing is sort of a combo between the two because staff had said that in looking of where to shift the numbers in our TGAs, we would look at certain sustainability. So you would do that and then we could look and say well we're going to move those numbers to a TGA but the sustainability of that area cannot handle it till this time, so we'll try to phase it that way. So, I thought... my personal opinion, is to use the FAMPO numbers and then to keep pushing towards doing some type of phasing as sort of a way to deal with it and address the fact that, as Mr. Gibbons was pointing out, you can only sustain a certain amount so we need to keep that in our mind. But I think that's a way to deal with it.

Mr. Gibbons: The other thing, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Bailey brought up two good points. She wanted to look at the County and see where we had done master zoning and it didn't do what it was supposed to do. Like, for example, around the airport never grew in 15 or 20 years. Then you take the Celebrate Virginia down on 17; it never materialized. So her point was we ought to take a look at what we've done in the past and are we doing the right zoning for the area of the County.

Mr. Apicella: I appreciate the hard task that you guys have and I really appreciate the very short window of time that you have to get this done. For better or worse, the Board gave us... we asked and they answered... gave us very clear direction. And I guess I would respectfully suggest that maybe caution, you've got a box to work within and a very short window of time. I think we, as a body, collectively, need to get something to look at by what, the end of March. So, you may want to think about how much more you can put on your plate beyond the scope that I think the Board has given us and in immediate term, you guys, to accomplish in what is a relatively short amount of time. Plus, I mean, the staff already has other things to do. This is on top of their regular work. So tasking them to do things beyond, what may be beyond the scope, while good information and helpful in the long term, and maybe something we want to do as a follow-on, may impede the progress that you guys need to make in the short period of time. Just my thought.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Harvey: I have a suggestion, and haven't spoken to the other staff members but at the next committee meeting, we will pull back out the study that was done for the current Comprehensive Plan. They did a fiscal and economic analysis of the plan and how growth has occurred in the County. And

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

it's sort of a snapshot of I think it was in 2009 if I remember right, and it had fiscal generation numbers for single-family homes, townhomes, and apartments. So, we can use that as a starting point. I know the Board had instructed the Commission to take a look at the ratio of single-family homes to townhomes to multi-family homes, and maybe you can use that fiscal analysis with those ratios that you're working on to try to have a positive on the balance sheet so to speak. I think that may get towards addressing some of Mr. Gibbons' concerns.

Mr. Gibbons: But Mr. Chairman, 80% of what the Board gave us is administrative. And we can get that back to them pretty rapid. And a lot of it is just ordinance changes and wording. So, if we get it back to them, I asked a couple Board members over the weekend that if we got back to you the majority of what you sent down, and we needed more time on the long range, I think they'll entertain it.

Mr. Rhodes: I was thinking I think similarly, which from what I was hearing here, is that they gave us a pretty specific list of questions. So that ought to be the core of what we're attacking. We're hoping they'll refer back to us the Airport, the great Airport Plan work. But that's probably going to be a separate piece in it. So if they kind of send to us or they give us a signal, yeah, we like it, go for it or we don't like this aspect of it, I think that's going to kind of be a separate complementary piece of work. So, again, we're staying to the core of this. I think the only added piece we might be putting in here, but I don't think it's problematic, is just this phasing concept. And that's just consistent with... it doesn't have to be the same but it's a consistent logic that we've applied to all the inputs we've given to them. So, just adding that into the construct of what we're doing ought not be too, I don't think too problematic. I just think we stay focused right on the specifics and what's in their tasking to us. And then, like the airport, we should suggest to them that we should do that even though it's additional to what they said, I think as we go along we ought to be tracking what are the most impactful other things we might suggest back and submit some things. How about we also do...

Mr. Gibbons: For example, Mr. Coen is right, like tonight. It's \$22 million for an elementary school. That's all we paid for Brooke Point and Colonial Forge is \$22 to \$28 for a high school. And if the elementary's gone up that much then the high school is what, at \$80 now, \$75 to \$80? Have we factored in all these, like an apparatus like the ladder truck, we used to pay \$3 or \$400,000. Now they're in the, what, \$8 or \$900,000 range? It's the CIP thing that worried us, not that we're trying to be an alarmist, but when you have growth, the cost of growth today is (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: Again, I agree with you absolutely. I kind of talked about that during the project that was in front of us, and I still say that, whether we call them UDAs or TGAs, they're supposed to pay for themselves. And this is good information for us to figure out. When we get a TGA with a certain number, what is that TGA going to cost?

Mr. Gibbons: You're right.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, but I still think we've got to deliver here's where we think the TGA should be and what that number should be (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I think that's a core thing and then I think we ought to find... because there's only so much bandwidth outside that. And that's this next couple month window. But outside of that, what are the next 1, 2, or 3 things we also... because they gave us a task and said this is all we want to see you come back and modify the Comp Plan with. But if there are 1, 2, or 3 things either to modify the Comp Plan or to complement the Comp Plan that we think we ought to focus on, as we're doing this

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

let's identify those and then we'll figure out how to work with staff to work them in the plan and also submit those forward subsequent. Okay.

Mr. Coen: Which is sort of where we came down as well. So is it safe to tell Mr. Zuraf to use the FAMPO number and move forward, if I'm there. Again, quite honestly, some of the preliminary numbers they had already done, which was excellent. And so this way that connects (inaudible) which is sort of what staff had indicated they would like to go forward. But, again, we just wanted to make sure that everybody was okay with FAMPO.

Mr. Rhodes: That makes sense to me.

Mr. Gibbons: You know, Mr. Chairman, the good thing about it is staff's got a handle on it.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh yeah. Great!

Mr. Coen: Thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Great, great! I really don't have anything else for Chairman's Report other than Happy Birthday one more time. So, we've got TRC. Does everybody have their stuff for TRC? Everybody good? You've got your times? You're all good to go? Okay, super. I'd entertain a motion for approval of the December 10th minutes.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

5. TRC Information - February 25, 2015

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 10, 2014

Mr. Gibbons: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: A motion by Mr. Gibbons. Seconded by Mr. Coen with his thumb. Any further comment Mr. Gibbons? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Anyone else? All those in favor of the December 10th minutes signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None? I'd entertain a motion for the January 14th minutes.

January 14, 2015

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: So moved by Mr. English. Seconded by pointer finger... that's a good finger... Mr. Gibbons. Any further comment Mr. English? Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? All those in favor of the January 14, 2015 minutes as they are written and presented to us signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. Anything else we've missed? Very good.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.