

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
March 25, 2015

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, March 25, 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, Coen, Bailey, English, Boswell, and Gibbons

MEMBERS ABSENT: Apicella

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

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any Declarations of Disqualification regarding items on the agenda this evening? Hearing none, we'll proceed into the Public Presentations. Mr. Harvey. I'm sorry... if there's any member of the public that would like to speak on any item this evening, except for item number 1, the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment for George Washington Village, that there will be an opportunity to speak when that presentation occurs, if you'd like to speak on any other item to the Planning Commission as a whole you may come forward and do so at this time. I'd ask that you state your name when you come forward and your address. Once you do so a green light will come on indicating there are 3 minutes available to you. A yellow light will come on when there is 1 minute remaining, and then a red light will start blinking when we would ask that you start to wrap up your comments. Anyone?

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. It's W-A-L-D-O... where's Waldo. Two hundred twenty-three days till Election Day. Today is the 5th anniversary of the signing of Obamacare. Now let me educate y'all: 57 Democrats voted for that, Ted Kennedy was one of them and then he passed away; 2 Independents caucused as Democrats, that's 59 votes, and Arlen Spectrum who's a Republican who also passed away was the 60th vote. Simply amazing. Sounds to me like one of those decisions that feels good, but really does it do good? No. My prescription rates have gone up and I am now a senior citizen. You know, last Planning Commission meeting I was, uh, out of touch and I heard my name used in vain. Someone came up here and said, Paul Waldowski. I know Ruth Carlone didn't mean any harm; I happen to see her. But it was kind of entertaining. I won't talk to you about item 1; I'll use that for my time at the Board of Supervisors. But one of the comments that came out was these, uh, 10-year increments of what's been happening in this County. Well, let's give you the stats, okay? Let's go back to 1960 where we only had 16,876 people. And then, in 1980, there was 40,000. So it increased by more than double. Now, if you want to use your 10-year number, in 1970 it went from 16,000 to 24,000. In 1990, when I moved here, there was 61,235 people. In 2010, there's 128,961. And then I found in Wikipedia, which is just an estimate because the Bureau of Labor statistics is just a swag anyway; they're a scientific wild academic guess. Aw, I tricked you there, huh? Thought I was going to use some other word.

Mr. Rhodes: One minute remaining.

Mr. Waldowski: It's says two minutes on here.

Mr. Rhodes: They just started late.

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Waldowski: Oh, excuse me. Well, let me go to George Orwell then. If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear. You know, most people don't want to hear what I've got to say because some of you would rather run on fear instead of doing what's right. You know, common sense is not common; it's realistic. Let's be realistic. You know, Ted Cruz just announced, and he's the first 40 year old since I was a kid from John F. Kennedy who said, I'm running for President and I hope to earn your support. Well, his idea of abolishing the IRS is very similar to mine. I want to abolish two Planning Commissioners. I want to make sure that we have people on the Board of Supervisors who are elected with 51% of the vote. That means you win with 50% plus 1 like you did in the Garrisonville District. Can't buy the election.

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

Ms. Callender: Good evening, I'm Alaine Callender. I just thought I'd take a moment to mention that today I realized that you start your public hearings at 6:30 instead of 7:30. They used to be 7:30 some years ago. And I realized that as I was rushing to grab a bite of dinner and waving at my husband as I was leaving the house and he was coming in. So, it may be a good time for you all to meet for public hearings, but I'm not sure that it fits the schedule of many of the families and commuters in the community. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, that will end the public Public Presentations. Mr. Harvey.

County Transportation Construction Project Update By Chris Rapp, Director of Public Works

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The next item on our agenda is a presentation regarding transportation construction projects in the County. This presentation is going to be made by our Public Works Director, Chris Rapp.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you sir.

Mr. Harvey: Could we have the computer please?

Mr. Rapp: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members. Thank you for inviting me here tonight. I want to run down through our construction projects that we have going on. The first one is the Poplar Road Safety Improvement Project. This project is actually just about to get underway. The Board approved construction... the construction contract on March 3rd. The contracts have been prepared and we're going to have a Pardon Our Dust meeting tomorrow night with citizens. The construction will actually begin mid-April. The Truslow Road Project, that's another one that's about to get underway. The utility relocations will begin the end of this month and we're going to have a Pardon Our Dust meeting for that one at the same time tomorrow night for citizens as well. We're still working with some landowners for right-of-way acquisition.

Mr. Rhodes: Could you... on that last one, could you just remind what the scope of that one is, on the Truslow?

Mr. Rapp: Yes, it's between Berea Church Road and Plantation Road.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rapp: You're welcome. The (inaudible), that has been under design for quite some time but we're actually looking forward to presenting this to the Board of Supervisors in May for consideration to approve the bid on that for installation. Mountain View Road, the construction continues on that project. The contractor is working on water line installation and they're excavating for the permanent roadway.

Mr. Gibbons: Can I ask you a question?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: When are we going to get done... when is it going to get completed before we start the extension?

Mr. Rapp: The extension, the phase 2 has started already. And this slide right now is phase 2 and that started... the contractor is locating utilities to start the water line relocation and they've put in erosion control measures and they've cleared. And then we're starting the acquisition process on the Poplar Road and Mountain View intersection. There are 10 parcels that'll be affected and we are getting the offer letters ready for those property owners. Brooke Road safety improvements, property acquisition is underway. Staff held a meeting for the property owners at a local church on February 23rd to assist with questions on the project. Staff has met with several property owners onsite to go over various questions pertaining to their specific property. And we've reached agreement with some property owners and we're still working with others for the right-of-way and easements. The Garrisonville Road PPTA Project, staff has met with VDOT to discuss the right-of-way. Also, there's traffic signal plans that need to be worked out. And then staff also met with one developer along Garrisonville Road that has submitted a rezoning to try to help coordinate the road project with their rezoning.

Mr. Gibbons: Can you tell me the status of Onville Road? Do you know what that is?

Mr. Rapp: Onville Road...

Mr. Gibbons: I know they had to rebid it.

Mr. Rapp: Yeah, that's right. It's under rebid right now. It has not closed yet. It's being rebid as we speak and it has not yet closed. So we're waiting for that to close and then we're going to look to see who bid the project.

Mr. Gibbons: Can you give us an update when that closes?

Mr. Rapp: Yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: And this one here is Onville to Eustace?

Mr. Rapp: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Gibbons: But it was supposed to tie in with the expansion and it didn't.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rapp: Right. Centreport Parkway, this one we revised plans. We've resubmitted to VDOT. We're hoping for a quick turnaround so we can put that out for bid.

Mr. Coen: Just, without too much detail, just what's entailed, what they're going to do at that intersection, just so that people know.

Mr. Rapp: In this one... I apologize, I've been here a couple months... and this one I just, I don't know all the details on this one; I apologize.

Mr. Harvey: I could speak to some of those, Mr. Rapp and Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Harvey: Centreport Parkway is mostly in the state system for maintenance except for the last several hundred feet on the northern section where it intersects with Ramoth Church Road. The current alignment follows an old roadbed which was privately maintained at one point in time. The Airport Authority and the County work together for maintenance of that right now, but our intention is to reconstruct the road to make it straighter. It's going to be relocated a little bit further west on Ramoth Church Road and it'll also include turn lanes.

Mr. Rapp: Thank you. Enon Road widening, VDOT has provided comments and we're working on to revise the plan and resubmit to VDOT. And we do anticipate holding a public hearing to present those plans to the public in July. The right turn lane at Route 1, heading south onto Garrisonville Road, a public hearing was held for that. We received no comments. We have a partial 30% plans that we've submitted to VDOT. They've agreed to traffic signal improvements at the intersection, and we need to submit a letter to the Commonwealth Transportation Board requesting movement of the fence. But that one is proceeding along nicely.

Mr. Gibbons: That's a million and a half dollars to build a right-hand turn?

Mr. Rapp: That includes light signalization as well.

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

Mr. Rapp: Possibly, but I do know there's some extensive amount of work on the... they're going to have to redo the signals at the light. And then the intersection improvement at Route 1 and Courthouse Road -- our consultant has done some preliminary plans and layouts. And we met with the staff... or the staff of our engineer, Bowman, a week or so ago to go over the preliminary layout. And then Telegraph Road safety improvements, we sent out letters to the property owners that would be affected. This was to increase the clearance zone. We try to have a 12-foot clearance zone and there were trees, fences, and some other obstacles that were identified by VDOT within that clear zone. And we sent letters to the property owners asking if we could move their trees or if they could move their fence. And we had a very positive response back, and we're putting out a quote for tree removal and we hope to be doing that very soon. So that project is really coming along. And then this is a VDOT project, but I included it on here. It's winding down but it hasn't quite finished yet, so there's several things listed there that need to be done by the contractor. And that completes my presentation.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, could I...

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Going back to Route 1, the right-hand turn.

Mr. Rapp: Yes sir?

Mr. Gibbons: Are we going to end up with 2 lanes now?

Mr. Rapp: Two right turn lanes, yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: Two right turn lanes?

Mr. Rapp: Yes, and that's one of the reasons why there's an extensive amount of work on the signalization.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, sir, thank you.

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

Mr. Coen: Just a couple quick questions, some of which came up today, primarily by students. But the work on 17; do we have any idea about the completion dates for that? I know Mr. Harvey gave me a generalized date. But, for example, are there any dates of for example up to Sebring is going to be done, beyond Sebring? Do we have anything that we can tell people?

Mr. Rapp: And that is a VDOT project, but what I would like to do is I have a meeting next Wednesday with VDOT, it's a monthly meeting, and I'll be glad to ask what questions you'd like me to when I meet with them face to face. And so, if you want to send me some questions, what I'm hearing now is you want some intermediate dates and I'll be glad to ask them for that.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, great. Any other questions?

Mr. Gibbons: You know, Mr. Chairman, Route 17 reminds me of the Shirley Highway -- it's always under construction.

Mr. Rhodes: It keeps growing. Wonderful! Thank you very much.

Mr. Rapp: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: We really appreciate you staying late to do this, thank you.

Mr. Rapp: No problem. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: With that, we'll move onto our Public Hearing. The one item we have for public hearing is the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, George Washington Village. I would just highlight, we do have another George Washington Village related public hearing item that's still open, which we will meet on in a couple more sessions. So, in fairness, let's make sure we keep kind of our focus on... that we bleed over between the different types of items, but it'd be unfair to those that are not able to be here for the second item to have a lot of discussion on that one since it is an open item. But, this is COM15150540. Mr. Harvey.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. COM15150540; Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment – George Washington Village – A proposal to amend Chapter 3, “The Land Use Plan,” of the Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030 document, dated December 14, 2010, and last amended on February 24, 2015. The proposed amendments would make modifications to the type and location of development recommended within the George Washington Village Urban Development Area (UDA). (**Time Limit: May 24, 2015**)

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission -- Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. This item is a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the George Washington Village Urban Development Area. The first part of the request would... first, it's an amendment that is proposed to Chapter 3 of the Comp Plan, the Land Use Plan chapter, modifying the type and location of development recommended in the George Washington Village Urban Development Area. The specific change is it does include some suggested name changes to sub-areas in this Urban Development Area. It would change the George Washington Village South area to George Washington Village Central, and George Washington Village Business Campus to George Washington Village South. This is an image of the future land use map focusing in on the area of the George Washington Village Urban Development Area. The Urban Development Area is the entirety of the three areas circled in red. It's the light purple shaded area. So you have three sub-areas: the George Washington Village-Embrey Mill sub-area to the north of Courthouse Road, which is located in this area, that is not affected by this change. The George Washington Village South sub-area is the location where the applicant is proposing to call that area George Washington Village Central. And the Business Campus to the bottom or southern portion would be named George Washington Village South. So, to continue on with the requests of this amendment, in the proposed George Washington Village Central sub-area, the proposal would be to reduce the number of single-family dwellings from 2,400 to 850. And then in the George Washington Village South sub-area, delete the recommendation for 8.7 million square feet of commercial development and within a 500-acre area recommend commercial and industrial development within 3,000 feet of the Stafford Regional Airport runway centerline. And beyond that 3,000-foot buffer, recommend a mix of uses with up to 1,550 single-family dwelling units. So, basically what this is doing is moving 1,550 units, single-family units, from the South sub-area and moving it into the area that's currently known as the Business Campus area. The 8.7 million square feet of commercial that would be reduced, some industrial and commercial development would still be supported but the majority of the land use would be single-family detached units, 1,550 units. And for reference, the 3,000-foot line I mentioned from the airport is generally in this location. So, this is the 3,000-foot area where no residential would be permitted. The airport is in this location and the areas outside of that 3,000-foot buffer could support the single-family units. It could also support commercial development as well. This application was submitted in conjunction with the George Washington Village zoning reclassification. And staff does note that the request does focus and staff's review focuses on the merits of changing the future land use of the entire area and does not necessarily reflect on the recommendations of and the issues associated with the rezoning case. The applicant is Augustine South Associates with Charlie Payne as the agent. The land use plan in general designates several Urban Development Areas and each Urban Development Area has specific recommendations for the amount and type of development that's recommended. It generally consists of a mix of residential units, apartments, townhouses, and single-family units, mixed in with commercial development as well,

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

typically around a town center. The George Washington Village includes more detailed recommendations as well, just like the other Urban Development Areas. It happens to break up the Urban Development Area recommendations into the sub-areas as I've kind of mentioned already. The Embrey Mill sub-area, that is pretty much consistent with the already approved plans for Embrey Mill, which include a town center and a mixed use area, higher density multi-family and single-family units and townhomes, and so that highest density portion of Embrey Mill is in that sub-area. There are no changes to that area. The South sub-area, the middle area of this UDA, recommends currently a maximum of 3,450 dwelling units, including up to 700 multi-family units, 300 townhouses, and 2,400 single-family homes, and 1.6 million square feet of commercial space. The Business Campus, the southern sub-area, includes and recommends 8.7 million square feet of commercial office space only. The main purpose, as I mentioned, is the reallocation of the 2,400 dwelling units... actually it's 1,550... well, 1,550 of the 2,400 dwelling units to the south of Accokeek Creek. I have a table here that provides you kind of a summary of it does identify the proposed George Washington Village project, the number of units that are proposed in that project as it relates to areas north of Accokeek Creek and south of Accokeek Creek. And these are single-family detached units. What is the second column identifies what the Comp Plan recommends for single-family detached units presently. And then the last column, what is recommended for single-family units as part of this Comp Plan amendment. There are existing... as part of our evaluation, we looked at a lot of different factors. There are existing environmental constraints topography and natural resources included in that need for planned infrastructure and existing land use conditions that limit the ability for the 2,400 units to all be constructed in the current area as recommended in the Comp Plan. And just to add onto that, staff does note that in looking through, in re-evaluating that middle area, the 2,400 single-family units could not necessarily be fully accommodated in the sub-area unless the development pattern is at a higher density than kind of what has been proposed as part of the concurrent George Washington Village rezoning project. In addition, full build-out would require redevelopment of several current existing rural residential properties and neighborhoods that are in place. And staff notes that these areas may not redevelop for many years to come. So, that makes it difficult to accommodate all those existing units. Continuing with the evaluation, looking at commercial development potential in the business park area, under this proposal it would greatly reduce the amount of planned commercial development in this Urban Development Area. With the issue of access and proximity to Interstate 95, it currently does not have good access to Interstate 95, but there are plans in our County Transportation Plan for the extension of Mine Road and the extension of Woodcutters Road which would increase access to this area and improve access to Interstate 95 from this location.

Mr. English: Mike, that would just put more traffic on Courthouse Road though, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Ultimately yes, for the portion of traffic that would be going to points north. Some of the traffic might head to the south and either continue on south on Centreport Parkway or potentially out towards Route 1.

Mr. English: Right, okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And the issue with future potential for commercial development, the applicant in their application has indicated that they've been unable to successfully market the property due to the distance from the interstate. Staff does believe there may be long term potential for commercial development in this area. In looking at current zoning, this lower business sub-area does include a significant amount of Light Industrial and Urban Commercial zoned land currently. It's on property known as Augustine South. That was an area of the commercial portion of the larger Augustine development. This area was zoned to Commercial Industrial zoning back in the early 1990s. With land

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

use and growth patterns, this area currently is characteristic of large lot rural residential uses and undeveloped land. The area currently lacks road and utility infrastructure for higher density development required for more intense use. And with the growth pattern, the UDA is on the fringe of more intense development which is moving south from North Stafford. Currently, we know a lot of the growth is happening along Courthouse Road and in close proximity to this site. You have many active residential developments (inaudible) not far away. As mentioned, Mine Road and Woodcutters Road are planned transportation improvements to be extended through this Urban Development Area, ultimately creating a new north-south arterial road. That ultimately will provide access through from Garrisonville Road to Route 17 and provide an east-west connection to Courthouse Road. And then also, with all this additional traffic potentially passing through this area, and the proximity to more population in the future, the site might be more viable as a location for commercial development. Currently, in the amendments as proposed, the amount of commercial development is unclear. As stated in the amendments, it doesn't specify the amount of commercial as it currently does. And staff does suggest that should be established in the plan amendment. The applicant did look into that issue and did provide staff with an email. They've estimated potentially 550,000 square feet of commercial in this... I forgot a zero... 5.5 million square feet of commercial, in addition to the residential units. That was the estimate provided by the applicant in response to this concern from staff. With visual impacts, large scale development is proposed under the current plan and proposed amendments which may have similar impacts. Residential development might be less impactful in regards to adjacent land use compatibility. Taller commercial buildings and associated parking may create additional visual impacts. With noise impacts, commercial uses may generate more noise. If it's an office park, noise impacts should be minimal during nighttime hours. If it's industrial uses, there may be additional noise impacts from trucks and larger machinery. Looking at impacts associated within the Stafford Regional Airport, this Urban Development Area is in close proximity to the Stafford Regional Airport. The current recommendation for office development in this area, in the southern portion of the UDA, is in part a product of the proximity to the airport. Staff notes that the... and you can see in the image the flight patterns over the site. They're currently not operational but is aware that the airport would have the ability to open the traffic pattern in the near future...

Mr. English: Excuse me Mike... I'm sorry... in the future when they plan on opening that, is that an airport question that I need to ask?

Mr. Zuraf: We looked into that and the airport staff indicated that they could have that northern pattern opened as early as late summer.

Mr. English: This year.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. English: Wow. Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Airport operations, in general, generate potential impacts related to exposure to aircraft noise and safety with respect to both people on the ground and occupants of aircraft. To address this, we have as you're aware developed a draft Airport Compatible Land Use guidelines. Those have been developed as a potential amendment to the Comp Plan. We'll be scheduling that public hearing for next month. And just to point out, the guidelines recommend various levels of compatibility for different uses in different areas around the airport. The staff report that we've provided highlights how the guidelines might apply in this area. Just to point out, in portions of the area small lot residential development is identified as potentially compatible if certain conditions of development are met. Also, the guidelines

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

also note that in some areas small lot residential would not be compatible at all, regardless of what's done. The previously noted 3,000-foot residential use setback from the runway, that recommended amendment would be consistent with the guidelines that are proposed in the draft document. Also, regarding amendments to the Comp Plan, we're currently working through amendments to the Urban Development Area; that's in committee currently. It recommends changing the name of Urban Development Areas to potentially Targeted Growth Areas. That includes slight modifications in the amount of development recommended. It does not necessarily recommend adjustment to boundaries. This George Washington Village Urban Development Area is still recommended to remain. In the staff report I noted that there has not been discussion of modifying the Business Campus area, but as we kind of gone through the work for the committee, we noticed the issue of being able to fit the amount of residential development in that central area. So we're evaluating if the residential development from that area could fit in that southern area. So, that's one of the issues being explored at the committee level. With some of these other issues, community facilities, staff did not see an increase in community facility impacts as the proposal does not increase residential units that are recommended; it just spreads them out. The natural resources that we'd see mainly similar impacts, there would be less impervious cover potentially with residential development. Otherwise, though, the intensity would leave to a lot of the same amount of land clearing and impacts on natural resources. With groundwater impacts, this location is within the groundwater recharge area which is a transition area between the coastal plain and piedmont geological regions. And in this area, it leads to a higher probability of groundwater contamination potential, and that could be higher with commercial development than that of residential development due to greater amounts of impervious surface. With cultural resources, staff sees that there would be probably the same amount of potential impacts. We would evaluate any proposal the same way and make sure that any cultural resources are handled appropriately. So, in summary, we've identified several positives with this request. It would add areas to help achieve protected amounts of residential growth in this Urban Development Area. The residential uses... some residential uses may be determined compatible with the airport plan if any development proposals meet conditions also that are recommended in that airport plan. There will be lower impervious impacts with residential development in this area. The extent of development impacts is similar between current office and proposed residential uses as far as overall impacts to the environment and natural resources. The potential reduction of future noise and visual impacts on existing residences; it does not increase community facility impacts above what's currently projected. It does remove incompatible office buildings from a portion of the area. What this means is the draft airport plan does discourage taller office buildings from some of the zones, I think the H3 zone which covers a portion of this Urban Development Area. So that would remove that potential incompatibility. Some of the negatives of this request, as noted, there would be more commercial development potential that may exist for the Business Campus Area in the future. Some residential uses in portions of the area would be incompatible with the draft airport guidelines. It does reduce the area for potential current commercial development in the long run, and the amount of commercial development in the Business Campus sub-area is unclear. The positives aspects outweigh the negative aspects and staff notes if the Planning Commission is inclined to support the amendment, that the following additional language be included; that a specific amount of commercial be designated in the southern area and to also encourage development conform to standards in the Airport Compatible Land Use Plan. And I believe you did receive two emails from the Stafford Regional Airport Authority with additional comments from them on this request.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Questions for staff? Mr. Gibbons, please.

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

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Gibbons: Now, we're moving 1,500 homes... furthestmost away from the airport... we're moving 1,500 homes closer to the airport in this application, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Gibbons: And the staff recommends that that's alright?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, as long as it's compatible with the guidelines established in the Airport Land Use Plan.

Mr. Gibbons: I mean, why in the world would we move 1,500 homes closer to an airport?

Mr. Zuraf: We're basing that on...

Mr. Gibbons: Can you overlay what they were going to do... do they have the layout of the residential?

Mr. Zuraf: I did include that slide at the end.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, can you overlay with the airport what this is if you have a chance?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't have the... well, I'll have to do that, yeah.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, any questions? Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just a couple real quick ones, Mr. Zuraf. If memory serves me in our presentation about road work for Ramoth Church and Centreport, all they talked about was the intersection. And you all were very kind enough to give us the CIP. And trying to look through that while listening to you, I didn't see in the CIP anything specific about widening Ramoth Church in the CIP, whereas this would actually with the additional homes would be openings onto Ramoth Church which would add to it. But in the near future we don't have it on our CIP to actually do it.

Mr. Zuraf: That's correct, it's not on the CIP.

Mr. Coen: And then, I understand correctly that as it currently sits, this has no water and sewer on it so that whatever wants to be put there would have to put the piping or whatnot to get there.

Mr. Zuraf: There's a trunk line that runs down Accokeek Creek, but it would have to be upgraded for additional development to serve this area.

Mr. Coen: Okay. The reason why I asked was because one of the elements that was raised was that there didn't seem to be any interest by business to go there. But in your experience, would it be that if a business had a choice between going to say somewhere on 17 or Route 1 or up by the new Corporate Center where there already is services in water and sewer, or a parcel where there's nothing, they're more likely going to go to where there's something because that would be a more logical place to go to.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Zuraf: I think that's a fair assumption.

Mr. Coen: Okay, I just wanted to make sure I understood. And then lastly, the language of the UDAs when it's a state code, didn't allow any community, let alone Stafford, to actually designate one area to be more we want it to be commercial versus we want this one to be residential. Just sort of if you create a UDA, this is the language you must use, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Right, it more so established densities that you had to have.

Mr. Coen: Right. But I mean, so that if technically if we had wanted to when we were the steering committee and then if the Planning Commission had wanted to or the Board of Supervisors had wanted to, say, that this UDA was a commercial one, not a residential one, they couldn't do that under the UDA language because that wasn't allowed -- if memory serves me. I think when we had another parcel in this general area, we asked that same question. It was, that question, that language, that's part of the reason why we would love to change it to a different language is because it gives us more flexibility of what we want.

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to look at the old language because... so your question is... you're asking...

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Coen, if I could interject please. The state code does not limit localities on how they set up their Urban Development Areas. So Stafford County could have, under the scenario which you described, have an Urban Development Area that was all commercially based as long as they met the density thresholds. But the concept of Urban Development Areas is they'd be mixed use type of constructs.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Harvey: So, you could have a scenario similar to what we currently have where you have an area for residential and you have a n area for commercial, but they're supposed to be integrated and work together.

Mr. Coen: Right. And then, sort of with that in mind, when they did this UDA they put the residential in one area and they targeted this area to be more commercial and business oriented, as sort of exactly what Mr. Harvey was saying, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions of staff? Mr. English.

Mr. English: Yeah, Mike, when staff recommended some of their negatives and positives, did you guys know that they were planning on doing a flight plan, I mean a flight change, flight pattern change before this came about?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, we knew there was always that that potential could occur.

Mr. English: So, you took that into consideration?

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions before the applicant comes forward? Very good, thank you very much. Applicant please.

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission, my name is Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer and we represent the applicant. I want to thank staff for his diligent report and analysis and recommendation obviously was from conditions for approval. I'd like to just go through a few things outlining obviously the reason... the reasons for this request: one, the initial staff report, there was a negative if you will having units, residential units south of Accokeek Creek in the UDA, the George Washington Village UDA Business Campus Area which is currently designated for just industrial and commercial only. To address that, we obviously filed this Comp Plan Amendment. The reality is, and obviously taken from the perspective of planning when the UDA and the Comp Plan was put together and where the growth is to be, I think we all recognize the fact that the growth is going to be here. And this is where the County wants the growth to reside. There major utilities expansion, there's major road arteries and expansion, and etcetera. When we obviously went to evaluate the site, the topography of the site, the RPAs, the wetlands, etcetera, and where we thought the commercial would be more viable, obviously north of Accokeek Creek near the interchange, and that's not any big secret. I think you see a lot of planned commercial development at Embrey Mill, at Westgate, etcetera, near that interchange; it makes a lot of sense. It's very visible, it's got a new interchange system coming in, etcetera. That evaluation and what we could fit from a residential perspective within the confines of the Comprehensive Plan simply did not fit. So in order to get the density obviously to work in a consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, we had to move, as we all know, the residential, about 1,500 plus units, south of Accokeek Creek. Now in doing so, we wanted to make sure we were good neighbors in regards to the Airport Authority and its most recent overlay and land use plan that it has put before the Planning Commission and soon before the Board of Supervisors, in that regard, to ensure that we were compatible. I think we're pretty close to being compatible. Mr. Gibbons had asked a question about moving units closer to the airport, but the big key to the airport's concerns is regards to being within 3,000 feet of the runway centerline, which we moved our units north of that. And also with the overlays, actually the incompatibility piece isn't closer to the airport, it's actually northwest of our site. And also in regards to the school, in regards to where the school location is. In fact, I don't think within anywhere in George Washington Village according to the airport overlay we would be compatible within George Washington Village. So, I just want to sort of set that sort of ground floor, if you will, as to what we were looking at in trying to implement and to make this work. Obviously, as staff has noted, the Comp Plan has planned for George Washington Village both central... for the central area, 3,450 units as I just stated that doesn't fit within that particular area given the constraints I just discussed. The George Washington Village does encompass about 60% of George Washington South and George Washington Business Campus; I just want to make sure that we're clear about that as we know about a thousand and fifty acres. We'll talk about the single-family units... obviously we're not talking about the townhouses or the multi-family which do fit north of our site within the town center. And as we have stated, we've got north of Accokeek Creek... well, for the whole site we've got about 1.55 million square feet of commercial plus an additional 350,000 square feet, so over 1.8 plus million square feet of commercial potentially planned north of the site. With this Comp Plan proposal, we can still provide within the confines of our overall commercial plan about 250,000 square feet of commercial. And the remainder that's not George Washington Village, our estimate is about 5.5 million square feet of commercial can be developed in what would be designated, if this is approved, George Washington South which is the old George Washington Business Campus. So, in our opinion, you're still

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

maintaining that very good balance. We're just moving the retail and some of the commercial components north of that area in order, in our opinion, to attract a more viable project. I think it's also important to note that when this was initially evaluated in regards to the Comprehensive Plan, I don't know all the specific details but I imagine looking at the fact the properties were zoned M-1 and B-2 in that particular area of the campus, the Business Campus Area, what's the maximum square footage you can get on that kind of acreage and I'm sure that's why the numbers were fairly high. Typically they are fairly high when you're doing a fiscal impact analysis like that for a Comprehensive Plan. So my point is there may be a little fluff there. I don't know if they've looked at the topography or any other constraints in regards to that 8.7 million. In addition, my client has lots of experience with owning property obviously in that particular area. Since 1999 there's been very little, if any, interest. One of the major issues is obviously visibility, infrastructure, and the fact that the market... the markets have changed. The United States of America, its industry, its evolution, has come from manufacturing, hard manufacturing to more technology based health care professional services and communications. So you're not seeing the massive large manufacturing facilities that you have seen in the past. We think the airport's an important part of the economy in Stafford County. We again want to be good neighbors. We're all kind of located in the center. I wasn't around when they planned to put the airport where they put it; I'm not going to disagree with it necessarily or criticize that decision, but it is where it is and it's located... it happens to be located where the County has planned high growth. So we have to be good neighbors and I think we have taken those steps. Some of the benefits, I think, we should pass along in regards to this proposal. As I've stated earlier, moving much of this commercial to a more visible area of the interchange and our development off Courthouse Road ensures a viable commercial development opportunity for George Washington Village UDA, by moving the commercial uses near the I-95 interchange and Courthouse Road area. Obviously, this is becoming the center of our County. It ensures that planned growth will occur within the UDA near major road arteries and future planned utilities, and will discourage greater urban sprawl. The County has suffered for many, many years to urban sprawl impacts. And this Comp Plan was created to address those issues. Remember, our project is a down zoning from a traffic impact perspective. This Comprehensive Plan amendment, and I think our application, will reduce the overall transportation impacts to the interchange area. I think Mr. Coen had made a statement about utilizing Ramoth Church Road. Without Mine Road extension or Woodcutters extension, if these projects which are zoned M-1 or B-2 by-right were to develop, they would have to provide very little improvements to Ramoth Church Road. The County, the taxpayers, would be required to make those improvements. With George Washington Village and the Mine Road extension and Woodcutters Road extension, that would alleviate the impacts to Ramoth Church because it would be a point, a travel point for businesses and/or these residential users to utilize this area. The other point is, that would put much more pressure if there was growth, commercial growth, along this area as planned, without improvements, where utilizing Ramoth Church, if you had to go north you'd go to Courthouse. You're putting much more pressure on the interchange without improvements for relief as being proposed in the George Washington Village project. This will also ensure our synergy of growth at the approximate center of the County as I've noted which will have a positive ripple effect in my opinion on the future growth of the County, including the Courthouse Redevelopment Area which has significant challenges in developing over time, including the efficient accumulation of properties and avoiding piecemeal development. Again, one of the unique opportunities of George Washington Village is not only the infrastructure improvements that we are proposing, but also the fact that one owner owns a thousand plus acres of land in your UDA. This will ensure the near term construction of Mine Road extension and Woodcutters, as I've stated, by allowing us to develop residential units south of Accokeek Creek, ensures a more competitive mix of mixed use development along the I-95 corridor again allowing us to pursue commercial development near the I-95 interchange versus pushing it all south of Accokeek Creek. The proposed plan will have less of an impervious area footprint and thus less of an environmental impact that we've heard many speakers talk about the fear or concerns about

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

impacts to their wells, develop 10 million square feet of commercial property will cause... will have a significant impact and create many, many square feet, millions of square feet of impervious area which will have runoff impacts, etcetera, to the environment. Ensure the expansion of utilities within the immediate area which will spur economic development. Again, the ability to mix use a project and grow a project as a one-unit development if you will, will allow the investment stream to occur and allow the expansion of utilities and infrastructure. Consistent again, we believe, with the Stafford Regional Airport overlay, and incorporates again the 3,000-foot buffer. And again, it does not increase the proposed density for this area for County services and impacts pertaining to the site. I want to make sure I answer Mr. Coen's comments and Mr. Gibbons' comments, but I think that's it Mr. Chairman. I'm happy to answer any questions anybody else may have.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Questions for the applicant? Yes, Mrs. Bailey.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Payne, with the readjustment of the single-family homes, and they'll be further away, 3,000 square feet... they'll be past that... any idea where the first single-family unit, how close that would be to the airport? I mean, are we talking 3,001 or are we talking about 4,000 or any idea at this point?

Mr. Payne: There will be a setback from that 3,000-foot line. That's to the property line, so we've got... you know, obviously where the home would be located. We've also proffered sound attenuation measures and improvements in those homes as well that are within 3,500 feet from the airport centerline I believe. So, in addition to buffering a way, we're also going to provide the sound attenuation materials and requirements.

Mrs. Bailey: So, it's possible the single-family homes could be right at the 3,000-foot mark.

Mr. Payne: I'll have to take a look at that. Possibly their property line could be, but they're outside the recommended guidelines in the overlay.

Mrs. Bailey: Right, I understand. Just wondering how close to the 3,000 they would be.

Mr. Payne: We'll take a look at that. I don't think there's a lot of them but we'll take a look.

Mrs. Bailey: And those are all single-family homes?

Mr. Payne: Single-family detached.

Mrs. Bailey: There's not a mix of the townhouse and multi-family?

Mr. Payne: No ma'am.

Mrs. Bailey: What size lots are those?

Mr. Payne: It varies within our plan. A quarter acre on average.

Mrs. Bailey: They are a quarter acre?

Mr. Payne: Yes ma'am.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mrs. Bailey: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for the applicant? Very good, thank you sir.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: And now I'll open it up to public comment. If any member of the public would like to speak on this item, item number 1, the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment for George Washington Village, you may come forward and do so at this time. When you do, I'd ask that you state your name and your address. Once you do so a green light will come on indicating that you have 3 minutes available to you, a yellow light will come on when there is 1 minute remaining, and then a red light will start blinking and then we would ask that you wrap up your comments. Thank you.

Ms. Calender: Hello again. Alaine Calender. I'm concerned for many reasons about the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. I would ask that before you vote, to consider whether you fully understand what you are voting on, and do you know what ramifications may result from an affirmative vote. That question comes to mind because, as a citizen, as I read the documents you're considering, more questions arise than are answered. The Planning Commission has had an opportunity to ask some questions and get some answers tonight; however, the citizens don't have an opportunity to do that. It would have been nice to have had some information sessions. And I think that would be an important thing to consider. I'm reminded of the sessions that were held as the County considered where to locate the Urban Development Areas. And I'm reminded that the UDAs are being looked at again in subcommittee. I wish that work would be completed before you start messing with the George Washington UDA. It seems that the Airport Compatibility Land Use Guideline should be part of the Comp Plan before you start changing the George Washington UDA for just an individual developer. If change is to be made to the UDA, it should be to downsize it, to make sure residents are not negatively impacted by their location near the airport and to take greater steps to protect the natural environment. I don't agree with the approach that they're going to come so plan for it. My approach is let's not over build. It impacts property values for current homeowners. Why would people want to come here if traffic is always backed up, and with a congress that wants to downsize the federal government, don't count on having so many people having jobs with the government or government contractors and thus having a need to live here. I think Mr. Payne made some good comments tonight. But I think we must delay or deny. We need to keep in mind the impacts of this in terms of traffic on our inadequate roads, more schoolchildren in overcrowded classrooms, degradation of the environment, the need for higher taxes to fund the infrastructure, and services that the development would bring, etcetera, etcetera. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come forward and speak at this time?

Mr. Waters: Hi, my name's Jon Waters. And I'd just like to say that several times Mr. Payne has stated that this whole subdivision, the town center and all that stuff, can't really happen or exist with the exchange, the interstate exchange. Well, it hasn't happened yet. And there's no guarantee that it will happen. So what are we going to be stuck with if this all gets developed and the interstate is a flop? That new proposal they've got out, that might work in Louisa County, but I don't think it's going to work in Stafford County. This is Interstate 95 in Stafford, the worst highway in the country. So, I mean, you've got to take a hard look at that interchange. If it flops, we're all going to be stuck here with no place to go.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you sir. Anyone else? Okay, seeing no one else come forward, we'll end the public comment portion there and we will... applicant? Any further rebut?

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer. I represent the applicant. Again, it's always good to have the public involved in this process and I appreciate and respect their comments. You know, I think this is maybe our 5th or 6th public hearing on this matter, not to mention all the other prior community meetings and hearings that we had. In all honesty, I really haven't heard anything from the public, in my opinion, that would be fatal to a project like this. I think the comments have been more of caution, we know we're going to grow, let's do it in a smart way. And I think we've planned it that way, and hopefully we've done so respectfully. And just backs for the Comprehensive Plan components and just some thoughts to came to my head while folks were speaking, and I'll just reiterate them real quick, I think much... one of the main reasons under the current Comprehensive Plan that south of Accokeek Creek be a UDA for George Washington Village Business Campus, was all commercial or industrial because it was already zoned that way. So I think that was the main reason for that, so I don't think there was an in depth study as to sort of future marketability issues or potential impacts and constraints of the site., so, including north of Accokeek Creek which we have discussed in our Comprehensive Plan request amendment. This is, again, a downsizing if you will of what could be built out. So I think that's important to know certainly from a traffic perspective. And, again, the proposed density, even with the Comp Plan amendment proposal, is less than what has been proposed from the George Washington Village perspective is less than what's been proposed in the Comprehensive Plan. So I want to make that point clear. In addition to that, we have I think with this proposal maintained the commercial footprint that was envisioned within the George Washington Village UDA. Again, we think that you can still develop 5.5 million outside of George Washington Village. I'm talking about our project within the George Washington Village UDA which we have designated as south in our proposal, and we can do 250,000 square feet south of Accokeek. And again we're focusing a good portion of the retail, not necessarily industrial components of this, to the northeast... I'm sorry, to the north of Accokeek Creek at the interchange. And we do hope the interchange happens. We feel very confident that it will; I think Stafford's future depends on it. And also I think with the ability to create this mixed use environment, you will ensure in the short term the necessary infrastructure including the extension of Mine Road. That is key. That is key to not only George Washington Village success but it's key to anything south of George Washington Village towards the Centreport. So, with that I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have. I think it's important for us to express to you how much we have appreciated your patience through this process. I know we've got at least another round of this. I think this has been a great process for due diligence. I think there's been wonderful questions. I think the Planning Commission has challenged us to push our project in the right direction. And we're... I think we're getting there and I want you to know how much we appreciate all that you're doing.

Mr. Rhodes: Anything else from the Planning Commission for the applicant? Okay, thank you sir.

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: I'd like to ask Mr. Harvey a question if I could.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Coen: Jeff, has there been any recent meetings or discussions pertaining to the interchange since that was raised by some of the public and the applicant himself?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Coen, VDOT's continuing to work on the new interchange design. In fact, myself, several staff members, and Mr. Payne and his applicant and their staff met with VDOT representatives last Friday to talk about this particular project in relation to the interchange design. Some of the discussion went back to what was the basis for the original interchange design and the inputs to the transportation model that backed up that design. It came out that that previous design was based on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan which existed before we had Urban Development Areas and as much growth plan for this vicinity. So, VDOT, through its consultant, will be going back and revisiting some of those assumptions and they're going to be looking for more inputs from the applicant on their project specifically. VDOT will be going through another public hearing process on this redesign. It probably would occur sometime this summer. That would be after they've done their due diligence on background traffic.

Mr. Coen: But do they... since they looked at the older plan, did they have any view of how this newer plan would impact what their design was for the interchange, the new one that was brought up by one of the members of the public?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Coen, my recollection was that the George Washington Village applicant's transportation engineer projected that if you look at the Comprehensive Plan build-out over the design horizon for the interchange project, which is if I remember right 2040, that the initial VDOT diagram shows two lanes in each direction, which we may need three lanes in each direction to accommodate this future planned growth. And that's something that VDOT's going to be evaluating. Also, there was some discussion about maybe ways to change some of the ramps to make them operate more efficiently.

Mr. English: You wouldn't have like a graph of that, do you? Or are they just in the early stage of talking about that?

Mr. Harvey: Well, the interchange design is... you can find it on the VDOT web page, and it lists the timeline to construct the project, the budget they have, and also they have a video that shows you how the diverging diamond interchange is scheduled to work as far as from a driver's perspective.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. Okay, very good. Anything else? This is in the George Washington...

Mr. English: Yeah. I'm making a motion to defer this to at least April 22nd. There's a lot of moving parts to this thing I need to keep looking at. And we haven't even seen the compatibility land use plan heard yet, so I'm asking to defer it to at least April 22nd.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, a motion to defer to April 22nd. Is there a second?

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Second to the 22nd. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Boswell? Any other member? Mr. Coen please.

Mr. Coen: Just a point of clarification. Is it for the 22nd or further beyond?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: No, right now it's for the 22nd.

Mr. Coen: For the 22nd period.

Mr. English: Yeah.

Mr. Coen: Okay. All right; thank you sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, great.

Mr. Gibbons: I have a question.

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I thought there was a good question... you're going to have the other one being discussed on the 22nd and this one's going to be discussed the same night?

Mr. Rhodes: It doesn't mean we have to act on it. We've got time through till May on the time limit though.

Mr. Gibbons: But he'll take another 20 or 30 minutes as long as it's on the schedule.

Mr. Rhodes: We're going to be busy all the next meetings. We've got public hearings all through them. Okay, all those in favor of the motion to defer to April 22nd signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Very good. Thank you all very much; appreciate it. And we're going to move onto Unfinished Business now, item number 3, which is Discussion on the Cluster Development Standards in Virginia. Mr. Harvey.

2. RC1400155; Reclassification – George Washington Village - A proposed reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural; A-2, Rural Residential; R-3, Urban Residential – High Density; B-2, Urban Commercial; and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts to the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, to allow for the development of a planned community. The project is proposed to include up to 2,957 residential units and up to 1,550,000 square feet of commercial floor area, on Assessor's Parcels 28-87; 29-32, 29-36, 29-38A, 29-39C, 29-81, 29-82 and 29-83; 37-63; and 38-1, 38-1A, 38-3, 38-4, 38-4C, 38-55, 38-58C, 38-58D, 38-66, 38-69, 38-70, 38-70A, and 38-71, consisting of 1,051.59 acres, located on

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

the north side of Ramoth Church Road and south side of Courthouse Road, west of Interstate 95, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: April 22, 2015) (History: December 10, 2014 Public Hearing Continued to January 14, 2015) (January 14, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to February 11, 2015) (February 11, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to March 11, 2015) (March 11, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to April 22, 2015)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. Discussion on Cluster Development Standards within Virginia **(History: Deferred on February 11, 2015 to March 11, 2015) (Deferred on March 11, 2015 to March 25, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Erica Ehly will be giving this presentation.

Ms. Ehly: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. If I could have the computer please; thanks. The Planning Commission requested information regarding cluster subdivision provisions in order to review the County standards at the meeting held on November 11, 2014. Staff presented findings at the January 14, 2015, meeting where the Commission requested that staff draft language for cluster regulations that would discourage open space in cluster developments from being shaped in such a manner as to eliminate the possibility of using it for agriculture, recreation, or conservation uses. Staff presented three options to move forward with that request at the meeting on March 11th, which generally included codifying standards that would apply to all subdivisions; option 2, codifying standards for the administrative approval of cluster subdivisions with increased density; or imposing standards as a condition of approval in a Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission requested that staff move forward with option 3, which included drafting language to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan to create guidelines that could be utilized to recommend certain conditions during the review of Conditional Use Permit applications for cluster subdivisions with additional density. Currently, as the Commission is aware, in the R-1 zoning district, a cluster subdivision with additional density is permitted as a conditional use up to a density of 2.25 dwelling units per acre. The potential impacts of the increase in density in these subdivisions are very similar to those that are a result of a zoning reclassification, which include an increased demand upon public facilities and potential impacts to the surrounding area. The potential guidelines would be included within the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan as proposed Policy 1.2.12. The draft language included in the staff report is related to areas of potential concern as a result of an increase in density. The guidelines would include a recommendation to restore the cleared natural resource area through increased landscaping requirements in open space, buffer areas, and yards; recommend the retention of viable areas of existing agricultural uses and natural resources; recommend that clusters with increased density be located in areas of the County where public facilities have the capacity available to absorb the demand of additional density; recommend the mitigation of additional demands upon public facilities where capacity is inadequate; recommend that environmentally sensitive areas are preserved to the greatest extent possible within open space areas, including wetlands, floodplain, alluvial soils, slopes greater than 25%, designated trees, and significant tree stands; recommend that open space is a continuous land mass that is not fragmented by the development of the subdivision; and include airport compatibility land use standards for those cluster subdivisions located within the airport impact overlay district. Those compatibility standards could include (inaudible) of a minimum of usable open space, clustering developments away from aircraft traffic patterns, locating dwelling units at least 3,000 feet from the runway centerline, noise mitigations measures and buildings standards, and disclosure notices where applicable. And, finally, include military land use compatibility land use standards as requested by Quantico for cluster subdivisions that are to be located near military installations, to encourage land use compatibility with military facility operations, encourage real estate disclosures and sound

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

attenuation measures if located within applicable Quantico Noise and Range Compatibility Zones. This request was not included in the staff report as it was recently received. Also, information was provided in the staff report as requested regarding the minimum separation requirement for residential structures in the Virginia Building Code, which is a minimum of a 5-foot side yard setback before fire suppression measures are required. As the Commission is aware, Fire and Rescue recommends a minimum of 20 feet between structures, and the cluster ordinance currently allows for 18 feet. This recommendation from Fire and Rescue for additional distance can be incorporated into the draft language if the Commission so desires. And so finally, if the Commission is in agreement with the draft language with any changes or additions discussed this evening, staff can bring back guidelines in a final form to potentially move forward with the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Rhodes: Great. Questions for staff? Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: (Inaudible) would like to make a motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, I think there might have been a question here.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Chairman; sorry Mr. Gibbons. Just two... one really quick question on one of the slides, it talked about doing something to the greatest extent possible. I guess it's just from listening to lawyer-ese for, you know, a year and a half now. Is that phrasing (a) normal for our Comp Plan, and (b) who makes the determination to the greatest extent possible? I like having weird questions.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Coen, if I may.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Harvey: Again, this is a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to be a general guide, so it would typically not be as specific as an ordinance requirement. So that's why often times you see a word such as encourage or to the extent possible and those kind of things in the language of the text. With regard to the... I'm sorry Mr. Coen, I forgot the second part of that question?

Mr. Coen: I mean, who would determine what's the greatest extent possible?

Mr. Harvey: Oh, yes. Ultimately, that would fall on the Board of Supervisors in their legislative capacity when they review a Conditional Use Permit for a cluster development. But also, two, if it's a by-right development staff would fall back on these policies and in cases where there's staff review, we would make that determination.

Mr. Coen: Before you go to the motion, and I don't know about the rest of the Commission, I just sort of feel that often we have the applicant come in and push... point to a line in our Comp Plan as sort of when it benefits them sacred. And, so my concern is that if it just says to the greatest extent possible, they may be the ones that they want to determine that the greatest extent possible is to do X. And so, I don't know about others but I'm just a little leery of making it that broad. I understand that ordinances or whatnot would go further, but we hear this often that somebody comes back and says, well it says in the Comp Plan X so you must do this. And I just think we should be for-warned and for-armed. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. English: How would you recommend to language that Tom... Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: That's a good question Mr. English. And I wouldn't go on Wikipedia to find it because it's interesting, anybody can go on Wikipedia and change the information. Teachers do it all the time. But that's why I think staff, if they would sort of think about that. And if they come back and say, this is the best, then I'm fine. I just really am leery that we're going to face something down the road and they'll just throw this up at us.

Mr. English: I hear ya.

Mr. Rhodes: We were careful, I think, to be careful with things like shall's just because it is a guiding document. But that's always a fair consideration. And I heard the one item there that if we were so inclined they could work in the language on the 20 feet that the fire department would like versus the 18, and that would allow us to be fairly consistent with that one and not have to deal with those in the future. Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I want to make a motion, and I think we recommend option 3 to be translated into a Comp Plan amendment. But staff would come back with the amendment, right?

Mr. Rhodes: With the 20-foot language? Is that... we don't actually technically need a motion here right?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'd consider this as a directive. We will draft the proposed amendment and bring it back to the Commission (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So, but to confirm, everybody's comfortable with option 3 as Mr. Gibbons is suggesting and the 20-foot language be incorporated in there to be written as text language for amendment?

Mr. Coen: I'm comfortable with that. I would add the sprinkler language just because we keep hearing from the fire department that they would feel comfortable with saying something. And I understand that this would be a guide. But in watching that video that was before the Board of Supervisors on how fast any house will (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: No, I understand. But why don't we lobby the state to change the code? That's where it ought to be changed.

Mr. Coen: Granted. But at least if we put it in here that we think it, then when they come to us we can at least use it. That was one of the questions when we were doing the 18 versus 20; it was, well, it's in your language that it's X so...

Mr. Gibbons: I apologize Mr. Coen. I misunderstood (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: No, no... that just where I was coming from.

Mr. Rhodes: So, but in addition to the 20-foot setback, was there other language you're suggesting? Or are you just reinforcing the 20-foot?

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Coen: That's my personal opinion and I've said this before, so I'm just being consistent, is I like the 20-foot and the sprinklers as a recommendation that... Mr. Harvey, if I'm correct, that this would be a recommendation, it's not an order. But then if somebody comes in with a cluster, it sort of we can say, we really think you need to have the sprinklers if the fire department says they want it.

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Coen: So that's where I'm coming from. I may be out alone on this or may be up on the ladder by myself, but that's sort of where I'm coming from.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chair, I'm just curious about the feasibility of a 20-foot setback. I'm not really sure that that is something that can be done in all situations.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, 18-foot right now is the minimum. So it'd be adding 2 feet.

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: It certainly could on site plans impact a lot or two.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, for clarification for the staff, it would be acceptable to include the request from Quantico in the draft document as well?

Mr. Rhodes: Could we see that again? Computer please.

Mr. Harvey: Computer please.

Mr. Rhodes: And, so what's staff's thought about this additional standard? It's just kind of reinforcing a portion of what's in our Comp Plan, right?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chairman, yes. The... it's kind of clarifying and implementing the recommendations of the JLUS plan and also the section in the Comprehensive Plan which identifies those range and, you know, the operation area... the noise and range locations in Section 3.4 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gibbons: I think we've already had this JLUS study.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah. So everybody okay with that? Okay. And again, obviously when you go to public hearing, if you have more items in there, you can always go backwards but you can't add in after public hearing. Okay. Yes?

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. Staff will take this as a good direction and we'll proceed to finalize a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, coming back for (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, this Commission never directs; it always asks the staff.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Item number 4, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Definitions. I think the only thing hanging out here is the one item of the one person who's not here tonight. But anyways...

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

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

ordinance and to harmonize the definitions between the zoning and subdivision ordinances and state code. **(History: Deferred on February 11, 2015 to March 11, 2015) (Deferred on March 11, 2015 to March 25, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, please recognize Susan Blackburn to lead the discussion for staff.

Mrs. Blackburn: Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners, I'm Susan Blackburn. And this is about the amendments to the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance definitions. This was started back in February of 2014. Staff presented the draft document and findings to the Community and Economic Development Committee. They reviewed it and sent it to the Board in April of 2014. The Board approved Resolution R14-92 which gave you all the task of reviewing the definitions and making any changes that you deem necessary. This was discussed at the Retreat last June and in July the Planning Commission created a subcommittee to work on the project. That was done with reviewing the definitions, incorporating it into the draft documents, and in February of 2015 the documents were presented to the Planning Commission. And at that time, the Commission instructed staff to make sure that we had circulated it to all the departments that would use it, and we did that, and we incorporated all their additions and changes. And at the last meeting in March, the Planning Commission questioned some more research to be done concerning retail sales. Well, retail sales appears to be a very interesting topic in the economic world. And I looked at the various ordinances that you have been given. A couple of them do talk about retail sales. Many of them deal with actual uses and how those uses are dealt with in home occupations and home... they call them employment and businesses and various things like that, which we also have in our code various stages of the allowable business uses in the homes. So, in a quick rundown, Prince William allows for mail order as a home business. And that use is actually approved by the Zoning Administrator. Spotsylvania County allows retail sales from a dwelling as a home enterprise. Caroline County allows for profit businesses with no limitation to retail sales and that is done as a special use permit. Hanover County allows retail sales as a home occupation with approved special exception. And Henrico County does not allow for it at all.

Mr. Rhodes: So no help.

Mrs. Blackburn: Pardon me?

Mr. Rhodes: So no help.

Mrs. Blackburn: Well, with any of these ordinances... well, two of them, Spotsylvania and Prince William, they actually listed a definition for retail sales. But many of them actually had as I stated regulations to help mitigate the impact of such uses, and that may be an option for the Planning Commission at a later date. Our next step, hopefully, in working on the, particularly the Zoning Ordinance, is to try and... well, is to take the regulations out of the definitions and put them into the special regulation section of the Zoning Ordinances. And it may be at that point in time that, working hopefully with another committee, that we will be able to discuss exactly what kind of commercial uses we feel is most appropriate to be conducted out of the home. And it may be that retail sales is really not the issue at all, that it be the amount of traffic. One of the counties only allows for shipments by FedEx or UPS once a week to their house. So, that may be something that we deal with at a later date. Do you have any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Questions of staff?

Mr. Gibbons: (Inaudible - microphone not on) in a position to make a recommendation.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: I would just... I do know that Mr. Apicella, on his way out of town, had just asked if there was any other great ideas and ways of finding and making magic out of this. And so just expressed that he just felt like there was something there but certainly said if it's the will of the body that this is just...

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

Mr. Rhodes: Well, he was asked but if we feel like we're really there, he also said he would certainly acquiesce to the body but he was trying to think of another way to address his concern. But he doesn't have a secret either; he doesn't have a way in mind necessarily, something magical to happen.

Mr. Gibbons: Why can't we put it in a draft and send it out and let everybody comment by the next meeting?

Mr. English: I think that's already been done, right? We've already drafted it.

Mrs. Blackburn: Excuse me? What do you want to put into a draft and circulate?

Mr. Rhodes: I mean, you've gone around to staff. I think it's all there other than the, is there any other way to constrain a lot of car traffic from somebody who's doing a home business, which was Mr. Apicella's thing, and I don't know that we've come up with any more than...

Mrs. Blackburn: And he, in this particular situation that he was discussing, it had to do with the term retail sales.

Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mrs. Blackburn: And as I stated in the staff report, it may be that retail sales is not really the concern. It is the foot traffic to the houses and that may be something that we can address when we get into the regulations of what actually a home business is.

Mr. Rhodes: So yeah... so I think, so he, what I just wanted to share was he just expressed, you know, if he were here, he'd say is there not something else we can do? But that said, he would also say I'm just one person and I'm just really wrestling with this but if everybody feels like we're ready to go forward, then let's go forward. And does anybody else want to hold up? We love you Steve.

Mr. Gibbons: We can always address it at a later date.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, yeah, I think we're (inaudible). Okay, so the other option is to go ahead and vote this for public hearing, right?

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: I'll make that motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to vote for public hearing by Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. English: Second.

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

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Okay, I'm going to tell Steve Bob did this. Okay, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Okay, very good. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Blackburn: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you for your patience with this one. Thank you very, very, very much. Okay, with that we are now onto... bop-ba-bop-ba-baaa... we'll go to Planning Director's Report, right?

5. 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

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

✧ Cemetery Ordinance

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please note that the Board of Supervisors referred a proposed change to the Zoning Ordinance regarding cemeteries to the Commission. So, if the Commission so desires, you can authorize a public hearing tonight or we can come back at a later meeting and explain the proposed change in detail. Just to give a general synopsis, our current ordinance regulates situations where there are land development projects and they find existing cemeteries. It says that you have to create a buffer around that cemetery and leave the area undisturbed, and the buffer would have certain plantings required. But there would also be a requirement for a fence to be built around the cemetery. But those regulations only apply with land development projects to have Property Owner's Associations or Homeowner's Associations. So the Cemetery Committee and the Historic Commission has noted that often times we see cemeteries in more rural settings on individual properties that end up becoming on parts of peoples' lots. So they wanted some more regulations in a similar fashion that could apply to situations where there's not an HOA. So in that

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

particular case, there would have to be an easement set up for the cemetery and the cemetery would be protected like I described earlier with fencing and buffers.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So we can motion this to public hearing or we can come back and have further discourse on it, but it's the recommendation of the...

Mr. English: I think it's kind of cut and dry so I'm going to make a motion that we just move it to public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to advertise this for public hearing by Mr. English. Is there a second?

Mr. Coen: I'll second.

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

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: I was reading the language from the Supervisor. So that when it comes to us for the public hearing it'll be fairly straightforward because in here it says significant historic and/or archeological sites and cemeteries through... I mean, it'll be fairly specific the language they're talking about, so it's not up to somebody to decide whether it's significant or not?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Coen, to be specific, it would apply to cemeteries. As far as other cultural resources, it would have to be something that's located in a historic district that would have that further regulation. It's the only other type of zoning category that we have that regulates those types of features.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion to advertise this for public hearing signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Very good; wonderful. Mr. Harvey?

◇ Historic Preservation Awards Nominations

Mr. Harvey: And, Mr. Chairman, continuing with my report, the Historical Commission has asked for guidance from the Planning Commission. It's preparing its nominations for its annual awards presentation for historic properties for historic preservation. So, if the Commission has any items that they want to put forward to the Historical Commission tonight, please let me know. If not, you can

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

contact me individually and I'll send that forward to them as well. In particular, if you can think of activities that have occurred over the last year that you think (inaudible) on the purpose of historic preservation or if someone did a really great job in preserving a historic structure or feature.

Mr. Rhodes: Speak now or very soon, or forever hold your peace.

Mr. English: Mr. Harvey, did they have any... do we get to look at any suggestions or do you have anything to look at on that?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English, we don't have a list of projects as per se. The Historic Commission's looking for individuals in the community to give them a potential list.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Might I suggest, I don't think we have one tonight doesn't sound like, but I think the window is closing. It's got to happen very soon. But could we possibly get a list of those that they recognized the last couple years and maybe that'll spur something in your mind and you can get something just direct to Jeff if something does jump in your mind. So, if possible, if it's readily available, he'll get us a list of the past couple years those they've recognized that might spur something in your mind and then just get it straight back to Jeff. Okay?

Mr. Coen: And didn't we send them a list of different ones, some of them who were selected and some weren't last year? I mean, for example, the 350th group didn't get it last year but, I mean, the 350th was an entire year project so some of those on that list could well be worthy of it, that we could nominate them again.

Mr. Harvey: Certainly. That is a good idea because the work of the 350th Committee, you know, they did do a lot to bring to the attention the history of Stafford County.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep.

Mr. Harvey: And some of the historic (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: There ya go... good job Mr. Coen. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Well, actually, I give all credit on this idea to Mr. Gibbons because I know he was an instigator and a major force on this.

Mr. Gibbons: That's why I'm abstaining.

Mr. Rhodes: He's always an instigator. There. There's our recommendation. Thank you sir.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: And thank you Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, continuing on with my report, I got some feedback from Mr. Coen with regard to wanting to give the Commission a copy of the Capital Improvements Plan. It's currently being proposed, which would be considered for a public hearing with the Board of Supervisors as part of

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

the overall County budget for FY16. The CIP has a 10-year window associated with it, as far as a funding of capital projects. Capital projects are physical construction of basically County-owned facilities or public facilities such as roads that the County will construct and give over to VDOT for maintenance. He also asked for a little bit of ideas of the rationale that went behind the projects that are listed in the document. The document includes not only just the listing of what the project is, but gives a general description of it. And you can glean some of the background of maybe why it was important. And the request also was, well how does this relate to growth and proffers. Looking at the rationale behind the CIP, overall the County has policies that deal with our debt service limitations; in other words, how much debt the County can go into in the future and still maintain a good fiscal posture and keep a good bond rating. Because the bond rating relates to how inexpensive we, or how expensive it is for us to borrow money. So the better bond rating we have, the cheaper it is for us to borrow money and therefore we can afford more projects. So, the debt service limitations are spelled out in there as far as what the policies are. Also too, one of the strategies that the County has is for certain capital projects we're going to use cash instead of financing or borrowing. So those are some of the things that get taken into account with the projects. Obviously, on cash projects, we have certain limitation on how much we have available, so they tend to be more of the smaller projects rather than the larger projects. We have projects that are all listed there that give also a 10-year window of operating costs. That's always a question as to, you know, we built this great building but we have to put people in it to man it, whatever it is, a fire station, a school, government building. And that has significant costs and over the long term cycle of that building, those costs are going to exceed more than likely the cost to actually build the building. So, the CIP breaks it down into major categories such as Fire and Rescue, and if you look at the rationale behind a lot of their requests, there is life cycle replacement time periods for fire apparatus as well as equipment. And those are things where over time vehicle wear out, resuscitative apparatus wears out; you have to replace it. And those are big dollar items and therefore they're qualified to be on the Capital Improvements Plan. They also have a new training facility which adds a lot of capacity to their current training program, as well as adds convenience. Because right now for some of our training, the fire department has to go out of the County to receive it; therefore, they're taking units out of service when they have to do that and it affects overall fire coverage during those time periods. There's two upgrades to existing stations listed in there; Station 9 and Station 14. They will be bringing those stations up to more modern standards that can accommodate overnight sleeping arrangements for 24/7 operations and things of that nature. There is one new fire station in the CIP, and that is directly related to growth issues and also response times issues. They have a policy and a goal that they would try to get to a location in 9 minutes... I think it's 9 minutes or less 80% of the time. There's some sort of formula that they use and they see as growth occurs, more dense traffic, more dense development, response times tend to slow down. So that generates the need for a new fire station. Also, some things that we have in the CIP are generated by other regulations. For instance, we have to consider revamping a bunch of our radios because of the change of FCC regulations. So that's a significant capital cost to the County that isn't necessarily related to growth, but it's related to what the state or federal government tells us we have to do. On information technology, we have replacement of voter equipment to get more modern. And they are scanner types so it minimizes some of the potential errors in tabulating voting. Planning and Zoning is participating in one of the projects for moving into the next generation of our field with online application submittal and online permitting and planning, to where people can submit in the cloud a plan to the County. We can review it, post comments, and they can see it simultaneously as that's happening. Parks have a number of additions due to new growth. Embrey Mill Park Phase 3 would add more ball fields. There would be more ball fields added to Duff Green Park, as well as Patawomeck Park. But also significant dollars in the CIP will go to renovations of existing facilities. So, as we think about proffers and we think about growth and development, some of the things in our capital budget are directly related to growth; others are just because (inaudible) get old and worn out and have to get replaced. With regard to general government, there is a proposed

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

animal shelter new building, which is a replacement and expansion. So if we were to collect proffers for an animal shelter, we could but we could only capture for a portion of that cost for the area that would be more expansive than we currently have. Again, a lot of that is dealing with our current demands and situation as well as what we'll see in the future as far as growth. As we have more people move into the County, there's more pets that are brought here and more issues that we have to deal with from animal control side. There's also a courthouse addition. We've recently been told that there's going to be another judge coming to the courthouse and there's another potential judge's slot available as well. So, as we have more judges and more courts have to operate, we have to have space for those courts so people can have their justice done in a timely manner. So we'll be looking at a potential building addition for that as well. There will be one new library in the CIP, as well as renovation to Porter Library. The renovation to Porter Library is trying to repurpose the space to be more compatible with the current needs of the library. We have... with libraries today, there's less fixed shelf space than we had in the past because of all the electronic books and things of that nature. But there's been an increased need for meeting space and use of computers. So, that'd be in part of those renovations as well. There's trails in the CIP; specifically, the requirement for the Route 17 widening, the federal government said that we had to accommodate pedestrian bicycle access. So part of that will be a trail to run parallel to Route 17 throughout some of the neighborhoods. Also, there's the Belmont/Ferry Farm Trail that we've been working on for a long time. We'll finish the project throughout this CIP cycle. Regarding stormwater management, the federal government requires us, as well as state government, to retrofit a number of our stormwater management ponds to reduce our pollutant load into the Chesapeake Bay. That costs a lot of money, so we have to program those renovation and retrofit costs into our Capital Improvements Plan. Regarding transportation, you had a briefing on several of the projects here tonight on things that are currently underway. Overall, there's 24 projects within the CIP and those projects are brought about by priorities of the Board of Supervisors. But some of the background behind some of those are studies like the Youth Driver Task Force. Mr. Rhodes, you were on that group a number of years ago. And that identifies...

Mr. Gibbons: I was too.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Gibbons, thank you. That identifies a number of places where you've got safety concerns in our roads, and we're finally moving forward with completing some of those projects. Also, we have projects on the list that are due to impact fees, and that's directly related to new development. With impact fees we studied what roads were going to be impacted by future growth. And we collect fees for those new development projects in an effort to fund the road construction. And then also we have service districts where we collect special taxes to help widen the roads, like Garrisonville Road, as well as Route 17. With regard to other issues, the schools have a significant chunk of the Capital Improvements Plan. As we know with all the growth and development occurring when we have new houses, it brings more school children. There is a number of schools being proposed. Particularly, there's 10 projects of note; 3 which are rebuilds of existing schools to add more capacity. Also, there's 3 additions and one renovation, as well as 3 new schools in the CIP. There's also, due to the increases in the schools and students and buses, the Fleet Services division needs more space to be able to handle all that capacity. So that's also in the CIP. And there's other general maintenance things that are really expensive like heating and cooling systems, computer systems, things of that nature, which fall more under maintenance. And then finally, utilities are in the CIP; public water and sewer. A lot of those deal with upsizing due to our projected growth in our Comprehensive Plan. Some of them deal with maintenance because our utility system starts to age and pipes wear out and pumps wear out and they can be very costly. So those items are in there, as well as new water tanks and other things.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. English: Quick question about utilities. Is that a self-supporting agency? I mean, why would they be in the capital improvements, am I right about that, the monies that they get from utilities, does that stay in the Utilities Department for that type of thing? Why would that be in the capital improvements? Is it just because it's part of the budget?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. English, the Utilities Department has a separate enterprise fund. The Utilities Department is regulated by the County government, the Board of Supervisors. So, as part of the budget process and the capital projects, that's rolled into the overall County's CIP. But it has a separate funding source, so it's not paid for by tax revenue, it's paid for by water and sewer user fees, connection fees, those types of things.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: And there have been some changes in the utility projects this year. Specifically, they've sat down with Economic Development and took a look at where are our priority areas or where we would want to have growth occur. And that's based on our Comprehensive Plan, in part our Urban Development Areas. So you'll see in the CIP some additional projects that pick up Centreport area or support the Centreport area and also the Courthouse area too. Those were the two areas where Economic Development said we needed to take a look at our infrastructure to help bring that non-residential type development here. So, that's a synopsis of the CIP. As we know, it's getting ready to come up for public hearing. If the Commission has some comments that they want to forward to the Board, I'd be glad to take those, compile them, and (inaudible).

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I have one...

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Gibbons: And it came out in the committee that Mr. Coen chairs. The CIP has a fiscal constraint into it because it's constrained by the amount of money you can borrow. So, if you've got the plan and you don't know what the fiscal constraint is, it's very hard that when you start doing zonings you might want to need one or two more high schools or something. But you're constrained maybe that you can't do it. But that's what was asked for out of the committees; what is a constraint on the plan? You only have so much borrowing capacity. So is your plan in line with the constraint? Or you pick and choose.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that concluded my report.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: That's the question I have to go forward.

Mr. Rhodes: You did comment, Mr. Harvey, about... I can't remember the phrase you used... you didn't say business rules, but funding... doggone it, what was the term you used? Funding rules associated with to keep your bond ratings in a certain range.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, we have debt limitation policies.

Mr. Rhodes: Debt limitation policies, yep. And where are those? Are those presented in here?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman. They are discussed under 273 gets into those about the percentages of the assessed value that we can borrow up to... assessed value of real estate in the County... and things of that nature. So it sets essentially ceilings of how much money you can borrow or how much money you can use towards debt service for new construction of capital facilities.

Mr. Gibbons: But it'd be nice to have that in some sort of a table. So when you're looking at a game changer, you know what you're looking at.

Mr. Rhodes: So these are based on limitations of general fund debt service expenditures shall not exceed 11% of operating budgets or 10%. So, they're based on operating budget and based on assessed valuation of taxable real property. So, if we could get just for the last year, those couple of numbers of bases, then you've got a sensing of where you stand. Is that something we can acquire?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, we'll check in with the Finance and Budget Office as to what those percentages work out to be versus what is proposed.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thanks. Maybe that'll help.

Mr. Gibbons: And then the other thing, the other evening Mr. Sterling asked for something I thought was a good request, is to break out where the monies were coming in. You know, what comes in from the federal government and what comes in from the state, what comes in from real estate, so you have a (inaudible) of where the money's coming from.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. When they get that, maybe we can look at it then. Okay. That was a great rundown on this Jeff. Thank you very much for putting that together. Okay, County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Committee Reports.

Mr. Coen: Yes, just the Committee about the Comp Plan met last week. What we asked, there's a lot of information that needs to come to the Committee and so we asked staff if we could get some of it for tonight's meeting so that you'd be able to look at it, digest it, so that you're not getting everything at one time.

Mr. Rhodes: Appreciate it.

Mr. Coen: And so, after... if Mike will sort of give us an overview of what he's given us and then I'll sort of tell you sort of the path ahead of what we need to do that we've sort of outlined on the Committee. And that at least will give you an update.

Mr. Rhodes: Great; thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you received kind of an unlabeled package of information as black and red text. This information, the first, just to kind of summarize what you have, the first page is a

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

summary of the original kind of Board comments that were provided to us based on the latest input provided by the Board with a response as to how we're doing as far as compliance or completing each task. The next two pages provides a summary of our latest Targeted Growth Area allocations and then the effort to accommodate 10 years' worth of projected growth in the remaining TGAs, which in this we ended up we have one less TGA, one of the other TGAs is at a lower density, and the projected amount of number of units is greater than the current 10-year projection. So, we have more units to fit in less space and you can see the rundown for each TGA. The first set of numbers are the latest proposal and then the column on the right provides the current UDA numbers, so you can compare what areas are growing and what areas are shrinking.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Zuraf: Then with those latest numbers we've been working through a summary of public facility impacts based on these numbers. And this, where it says summary of public facility demand change, this is a kind of a balance sheet of how the latest projections compare to our current UDAs, the specific amounts of growth. And so you can see where school impacts might be, and this is on an overall basis... well, actually not overall but per TGA, which areas are adding additional students, what areas are, you know, their change in I guess the percentage of fire and rescue demand or libraries, transportation, vehicle trips, and utility demand changes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Then, with the same projections, we look at the general fiscal impacts that apply to the residential and commercial growth that's projected based on, and this is assuming total build-out, so we use the multiplier information of the per dwelling unit and per square foot multipliers based on the 2010 Fuller Study for our Comp Plan and plug those numbers in to get the balance of that impact. And the last set of pages, the public facility demands, where it starts with Courthouse UDA Existing, these are basically... all the remaining sheets are the worksheets for those public facility demands on an individual basis. So each area you're going to see the specific demands for the current UDA that's existing, and then you go to the Courthouse TGA Proposed and you have that for each of the TGAs. So, that's the summary of that information, where we are now. And then during the last meeting's discussion...

Mr. Coen: Okay, well, I'll let you finish.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. And then you also, I don't know if Mr. Coen handed out, this is our current Courthouse Urban Development Area Small Area Plan because the real thing to move forward with these TGAs is to develop small area plans in all of these locations so we can get more specific land use recommendations and the Committee wanted everybody to kind of just see what a Small Area Plan looks like.

Mr. Rhodes: Super. Great; okay. Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: So, just to let the full Commission know, we're still looking towards on April 8th coming back here with the information that is still outstanding, which I'll get to in a moment, and then with the idea that in theory we could ask for a public hearing on that night. If the Planning Commission feels that they would like to absorb it, digest all that additional information, then we could ask on the 22nd ask for when we would like to have a public hearing on this in May. So that we still would be on the timeline that the Board of Supervisors asked us to give. What the Committee sort of had asked for, and

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

staff has done a phenomenal job with it, with basically sort of letting us know what the Board of Supervisors asked us to do and what we're done with already so that gives us an idea. The next steps that the staff and the subcommittee will be doing is looking at the continual text adoptions and changes; we have to have our public hearing about the airport overlay so we can work that into the plan. Staff is going to look at the idea of phasing, that we've sort of raised over time about can we phase in this growth in these certain TGAs over time, to sort of do what Mr. Gibbons was addressing earlier... how can we best address it... to get some more information on the small area plans. The envisionment is not that we would try to have for when we go to the Board of Supervisors small area plans for every one of the TGAs, but to sort of say this is what we're envisioning and have it in there so that way staff has time to work on them and move forward with that. And to sort of revise these charts, which I was (inaudible) to get into and then Mr. Gibbons' issue about the bond availability and how that would work in with all this. If you look at... and Mike, I don't know if you want to address it... and we don't necessarily need feedback now; we meet again next Wednesday afternoon, but with the George Washington Village TGA, there's a question about some of the square footage moving and changing and whether or not we need to do certain options to handle the numbers that are in that area. And after Mike talks, you may well say what our options are; but if not, I'll add into that. Thank you Mike... and Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, when you do see that summary of the Targeted Growth Area changes, that was the big change areas at George Washington Village where the change in units and reduction in commercial development reflects the movement of residential units down south of Accokeek Creek. So that's the biggest change and somewhat in line with the issue that was discussed tonight. So, that would be one of the ways of accommodating all those units. Otherwise, if there is not a desire to, you know... if there's a desire to kind of keep that southern area as it is, as it stands now as all commercial...

Mr. Rhodes: You can't physically fit them all above, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Right. We'd have to increase densities kind of into other areas and then maybe even look at recommending that units do be placed outside of these TGAs and try to be absorbed into suburban areas.

Mr. Rhodes: Which would be getting outside the 50/50 planning construct.

Mr. Coen: Right. So, the three options that really we have, almost regardless of what we do about moving units south of the creek, is do we decrease the amount of commercial that's slated for that particular TGA? If you decrease the commercial, then you could theoretically increase the residential. So that's option 1. Option 2 is...

Mr. Rhodes: But you change the cash flow (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: Right. There's always a domino that goes one way or the other. And correct me, I don't think all of them would fit underneath the creek either. So it's sort of we have to come up with a construct anyways regardless of what was brought forward tonight. The second option is to shift them to another area. And, you know, if you're talking about a certain number of units, you put 10, 20, 30 in one and 50, 60 in another one, or all in one, all in another, or do we just alter the mix so that if in theory we were envisioning on here small families are X amount and townhouses are Y and multi-family are Z, are you going to just alter that and make it Z plus 10 and, you know, single-family a little bit lesser? You change the combination of those, and that's sort of what we would like to get some feedback from you all by Wednesday so that we can... see if you have a feeling, otherwise we'll make the decision and bring it to you (inaudible).

*Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: And then on that latter point, that's... while it recognizes the challenge, it also, in itself, goes a little against the guidance you got from the Board which was to minimize those higher density items.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. Yeah, there was the one goal to keep the units as much as possible (inaudible) single-family detached and we tried that and even trying that we still have...

Mr. Rhodes: Hard to fit.

Mr. Zuraf: ... yeah... increases.

Mr. Coen: And to a certain degree, I mean, no matter which option, there's going to be an impact. And so, to a certain degree, we go forward and say well this is what we think of all the options; this is the best. The Board could certainly say they like one of the other options, but they at least will understand that there's only certain things they can do and this is sort of what we're stuck with.

Mr. Rhodes: I think the fascinating dynamic on all this is that this is also absorbing just 70% growth in the next 20 years which we've never been anywhere near that. We've always been about 50% greater than that. So it's a very conservative growth projection in the next 20 years and that we wrestle with how to absorb that. Okay, very good. That's great work! You guys are really rolling along and the fact that you're actually a little bit ahead of schedule, if you will, potentially, depending on (inaudible), that's wonderful. It gives us great opportunity to be able to talk about it on a tight timeline. So I thank the Committee and the staff for the great work.

Mr. Coen: Staff is phenomenal.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah they are. Thank you very much. So, the Chairman's Report, just two items. One is I would just share for awareness; Economic Development Authority has reached out to the Board and to us just with some comments and concerns they have on the County Sign Ordinance. I'll meet with the Economic Development Authority and they might want to propose that one member from the Board and one member from the Planning Commission meet with them just to talk about some possibilities in more detail. I share that only for your awareness, in case you might be interested, should that develop. Second item, I would just highlight for awareness. We talked about this a little bit before. You'll see it on the future schedule but, as you go forward, the next four or five meetings, we've got a lot of public hearings to fit in there. So they're going to be... we'll try and stay targeted and focused. We'll work through them but they'll probably be a bit longer nights. I mean, there's just a lot of things to cover.

Mr. Gibbons: Or shorter questions.

Mr. Rhodes: Or shorter questions, yes. A lot of things to cover in the next few months. So I just raise that for awareness as we're planning and working through this. I just want to (inaudible); there's just no way to shift them around. We're going to have four to five items on public hearing it seems like every session for the next several months. So with that, TRC... they're both mine. Thanks a lot. And we don't have any minutes to approve. Is there any other items? Anybody? Please, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly and I don't want to belabor it but today we had Student Government Day. And it would not have been possible if it hadn't been, particularly for the great assistance that we

Planning Commission Minutes
March 25, 2015

received from Mr. Harvey and Mr. Zuraf and the planning staff in giving us information, even during our mock meeting to get us information. So I just wanted to let them know the students really appreciated all your hard work and you really deserve praise for that. So that's it.

Mr. Rhodes: Wonderful. Anyone else? Anything we're missing/forgetting? Mr. Harvey? Ms. McClendon? You guys always keep us straight. We're okay?

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I've got one. The staff has been so outstanding and right on top of things. Is there any national awards that the Board of Supervisors can recommend them for? Some NACO awards or...?

Mr. Rhodes: We can check. We'll pursue anything we can find.

Mr. English: They prefer money I'm sure.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you very much. I just think they ought to be recognized.

Mr. Rhodes: That's fair. I couldn't agree more. We can certainly ask. Okay. Folks, with that we are adjourned.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. TRC Information - April 8, 2015
 - Liberty Knolls West - Garrisonville Election District
 - Embrey Mill Section 1 Townhouses - Garrisonville Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41p.m.