

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**May 13, 2015**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, May 13, 2015, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes: Are there any members that would need to disqualify or declare anything on any item this evening?

Mr. Boswell: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: I think everybody's well aware; item 2, I have a similar business in the north end of the County.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Thank you very much Mr. Boswell on item number 2. Any other member?

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, not a declaration but I did speak with the applicant's representative for item number 7 on the agenda this evening.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Just for clarity and transparency there was a discussion on item number 7; thank you.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: I went by and spoke to the applicant in number 2.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Again, while not a disqualification, certainly just for transparency clarification of a discussion in item number 2. With that we'll move onto Public Presentations. If there is any member of the public that would like to speak on any item except items number 1, 2, or 3, so if you'd like to speak on any item on the agenda other than 1, 2, and 3, or any other topic, you may do so at this time. There won't be an opportunity to talk on any other item other than 1, 2, or 3. We will have a separate public comment session on items number 1, 2, and 3. But any other item, any other topic, on the agenda or otherwise, you may come forward and speak at this time. When you do, we would ask that you state your name and your address. A green light will come on indicating that 3 minutes are available, a yellow light will come on when 1 minute is available, and then a red light will begin blinking when the time has expired and we ask that you wrap up your comments. Anyone? Yes sir.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Hornung: Good evening. My name is Philip Hornung. Sherry, good to see you tonight, and gentlemen. I would like to, I don't know if you would say officially present to you tonight, a proposed economic development initiative. It involves replacing the proposed Centreport, George Washington Village, and Courthouse Targeted Growth Areas with a Central Stafford Business District. I think, at your last meeting, the decisions you made about the airport, about George Washington Village, and the amendments to the Comp Plan that you all are taking up later, really changed the landscape in Stafford County. And sitting at that meeting afterwards, I said, listening particularly to the public and comments of the Commission, there is I think a better way to go about looking at managing these three growth areas. And I went to work and put some stuff together, a proposal that I think you all have those official documents now. And I just want to thank the three members of your Comp Plan Committee, Bob, Sherry, and Tom. You took the time to give me an opportunity to put some stuff together and talk to you about the idea. You didn't have to do this. And I was very appreciative of it because I couldn't present to you or discuss with you in 3 minutes; it just couldn't possibly be done. So I'm very grateful for the time you took with that. And so I'd like to officially just give that to you tonight. There are some items in the agenda tonight that are related to this, and my recommendation, on page 36, is that this project, because there's full and complete vetting before the County adopts a proposed 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment update. I'd like you to consider that. I don't know what the Committee is going to present to you, but I think this is crucial and the timeframe for this is extremely short to get some direction. Maybe you might want... if you present that to the Board to get some direction. But once we make the move on the amendment thing, it's a 5-year update, we may have set some things in motion, which makes this not possible. I'd just like for you to think very hard. I think it's a great opportunity as in economic development. And the only other thing is that the last two pages, those of you who got all this, I took a breakdown and did an analysis of the Cummings Research Park. The last two pages I just broke down some of the stuff that was there that's pertinent I thought for your discussion. Once again, I thank you. And I also want to thank the staff; Mike and Jeff have been extremely helpful. Thank you so much.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much Mr. Hornung. And I will just note for the record that Mr. Hornung did provide a 39-page document, which is good. It was very understandable, comprehensive and easy to follow in the pre-reading. And there was an advertised meeting that occurred on Monday evening, which the, I believe, a couple members of staff and at least four of the Planning Commissioners were able to attend where this was discussed in detail. I'm sure it will be discussed further this evening. So thank you for that. Is there any other member of the public that would like to speak on any item except for items number 1, 2, and 3 on the agenda this evening? You may come forward and do so at this time. Seeing no one come forward, I will close the Public Presentations and move on to the Public Hearings... well, actually before I do so I would just like to highlight two things. One is for the Planning Commission and everyone's awareness, item number 6, there were essentially two items that we had asked of the applicant at our last session; one was to clarify and put into writing some uses which we can certainly discuss when they present. The other one was about an item of some comments from VDOT and clarifications on where those stood. The applicant is still trying to meet with VDOT; they have made a good faith attempt but they haven't been able to do so, and so they've asked that this be deferred to the 27<sup>th</sup> of May so that they can close out that portion and be able to present back to us as much information that we had requested as possible. So I did accept modifying the agenda. So they will be coming back to us on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May and will not be presenting this evening.

Mr. Gibbons: That's item 6?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Item number 6 on the Embrey Mill Commercial, yes sir. And with that, I would also just call out because it has been a point by the Planning Commission that the first week of May of every year for almost the past 30 years has been Public Service Recognition Week. It is an opportunity for local communities, governments, and other entities to recognize and acknowledge the public servants and support them at both the federal, state, and local level. With that, I know of the great pride and respect that this Planning Commission has had for our staff, so I would just like to thank and acknowledge our staff for the tremendous and professional efforts that they always provide to not only us, but the Board of Supervisors, the applicants, the citizens of this County, they just do a tremendous job. So I wanted to take the opportunity with Public Service Recognition Week to make sure and thank them for their great efforts. With that, we will move onto the Public Hearings. So, item number 1, Mr. Harvey?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP14150456; Conditional Use Permit - Stafford Lakes McDonald's - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a drive-through within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 44-56. The drive-through is associated with a restaurant use. The property is zoned B-2, Urban Commercial and consists of 1.45 acres, located on the west side of Warrenton Road, approximately 780 feet south of Village Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: August 11, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Kathy Baker for the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mrs. Baker: Good evening Mr. Chair and members of the Commission; Kathy Baker, Department of Planning and Zoning. This item is a Conditional Use Permit for Stafford Lakes McDonald's. This request is for a drive-through facility within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. The property is zoned B-2, Urban Commercial. And this is a portion, a 1.45-acre portion of a 3.1-acre parcel, 44-56. And McDonald's USA is the applicant. I'll note that there was a prior rezoning back in 2006 for this property, and also a Conditional Use Permit for a portion of the property. The proffers are included in your package for reference. And while they remain on the property, the conditions would be replaced or superseded by this Conditional Use Permit. You'll see the location of the property on the south side of Route 17, and the yellow strip that you see highlighted there is an access road. It's a private road to serve the Walmart property located just east of Village Parkway in the Stafford Lakes vicinity. You see the property itself has previously been graded. The red boundary around the parcel is the portion that's subject to the Conditional Use Permit. You see the Walmart located to the west of the site, and then to the north and east are additional small scale retail properties. All the surrounding properties are zoned B-2. And you'll see the two areas where I highlighted are additional pad sites that would be developed in the future on the remainder of the parcel. This is a copy of the Generalized Development Plan which shows a 4,500 square foot McDonald's restaurant site with the drive-through to be located... you would have dual service lanes located to the east or to the right-hand side of the building. Again, Warrenton Road is to the top of your screen and the Walmart access road is to the left side of the screen. You would have your primary entrance into this site off of the Walmart access road. And this entrance would also serve the additional pad sites; there would be additional entrances off of a rear access road. The drive-through, as I said, would be a dual ordering station and then your drive-through drive-up windows where you would receive your food and make your transactions is located on the north side of the building. There is sidewalk located along the frontage of Warrenton Road, and the applicant would be constructing sidewalk along the access road to connect to that sidewalk that's existing. It would also connect to allow for a future pedestrian access to the Walmart and the other retail development in the

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

vicinity. As you can see, the hatched area are the areas for future development and not included in this application. We'll note a transportation analysis was submitted with the application and estimates almost 3,000 vehicles per day at the highest intensity. Based on the study, there's no anticipated impacts to Warrenton Road or to Village Parkway, which is a signalized intersection. There are delays anticipated for your internal traffic, which would be leaving the site onto Warrenton Road, but this would not cause any impact, as I said, to Warrenton Road. I have noted in the staff report that the applicant will be working with the Walmart owners to reconfigure stop signs that are located where that proposed entrance into the site is. Right now it's a two-way stop and, with an addition of the stop sign coming from the McDonald's site, that would become a three-way stop; and they would prefer to have a north/south through access and just make it a two-way stop. So, that would be addressed at the site plan stage. These are the architectural renderings that have been provided. These are included in the conditions that the restaurant would be constructed in accordance with these proposed renderings; generally, a brick frontage with stone accents. The proposed conditions are included in your report and include one dual-order drive-through facility as shown on the Generalized Development Plan. The applicant wanted to note that the restaurant would operate on a 24-hour basis 7 days a week. The conditions state that there would be no direct access to Warrenton Road, and that sidewalk would be constructed along that site access road with connection to the existing sidewalk on Warrenton. There would be directional signage placed on the site for drive-through to indicate how to traverse through the site. To continue, the building would be constructed in conformance with the architectural rendering as I said. The canopy lighting would be recessed within the canopy or would be downlit. There's a berm to be constructed along the frontage of Warrenton Road; this would be in addition to landscaping. This is actually included in the proffers that are already specified on the property. And lastly, no carnival style signs, banners, etcetera, except on a temporary basis. The site is within the commercial corridor within the Suburban Land Use designation. This area is again along the corridor highway, Warrenton Road. The Suburban Land Use does allow for retail uses that serve the immediate community. And staff has determined that this is consistent with the established and proposed development patterns in the area. The conditions are intended to mitigate any impacts to surrounding properties. Of course, I'll note that there are no adjacent residential uses in the immediate vicinity. And the application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. So staff is recommending approval of the application with the conditions shown in Resolution 15-187.

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

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, you said a dual-lane drive; is this the first one in Stafford?

Mrs. Baker: No.

Mr. English: Aquia Town Center has one.

Mrs. Baker: I was trying to think where.

Mr. Rhodes: We also have one in Stafford Marketplace.

Mr. Gibbons: What's that?

Mr. Rhodes: I think Stafford Marketplace... just up from Stafford Marketplace. I think that's dual-lane right there on the corner of 610 and Staffordboro Road.

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

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mrs. Baker: I think this is a fairly typical design for newer fast food restaurants.

Mr. Gibbons: They're indicating they have one where the arches meet the road.

Mr. English: Kathy, do you know... they said this is a 24-hour business. Is that just going to be... for 24 hours, do you know is the restaurant part of it going to be open? Like I know the one here, I think it's at Courthouse, they close the inside of the restaurant; it's just for the drive-through for certain hours. Do you know...?

Mrs. Baker: Actually I don't know. The applicant can answer that for you. They're here this evening.

Mr. English: Okay.

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

Mr. Bowers: Good evening members of the Commission, Chairman. My name is Roger Bowers; I'm here on behalf of McDonald's. I apologize that I have alternate neck gear today, but this is required by my doctor. I had some neck surgery about 3 weeks ago and I have about 3 weeks left to go.

Mr. Rhodes: Glad you're up and about.

Mr. Bowers: Yeah, it's been good. As you may know, McDonald's is a tenant in this location. The owner is Sumner Stafford and Mike Bagby is here with the owner group tonight. The conditions proposed are acceptable to both McDonald's and the owner, and I was to convey that to you; including the staff comments about addressing the open items at site plan on traffic issues. This was a long time coming. I first met on this location in 2010 where we were back in the corner where that other out-parcel is. There was a bank CUP that was approved for this site. Over time, McDonald's was able to negotiate with the owner and get the corner location, which they prefer, and is now very excited to be on that. We feel like it's an ideal location, especially for Route 17 southbound traffic. As you know, the other McDonald's are all on the northbound side and, you know, it's tough to cross the stream for people. It is a jewel drive-through location; traffic comes in, splits to two ordering locations, and then merges back in for a single pay and then pickup location. McDonald's has done a lot of work and found that to be the most economical and time consuming, because it's often the one person at the ordering station that backs things up. And, as you may know, drive-through has become 50% or more of McDonald's business. So, as they've done that, these newer designs have really made that process the most efficient it possibly can. This site, as Kathy has told us, in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and the existing zoning, the conditions have mitigated any impacts that this site might have such that the criteria are met. And I'm happy to go through those with you if you wish, and I'd entertain any questions or comments you have.

Mr. Rhodes: There was the question, just to confirm, on the 24-hour operations. Will they just be drive-through 24-hour or all...?

Mr. Bowers: I'm not even sure what that is. I think they may have 24-hour operations. No, the condition is not restricted to just drive-through. But I will tell you the practice has been that the lobby hours are not open late as it is at Courthouse. But I think that is, you know, it's one of those things that over time this condition is, as Kathy said, it's one that McDonald's asked for because it's not a fete accompli that they're going to do it that way. And, in fact, in this location, you know, I've seen

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Walmarts that in the Christmas season stay open, you know, all around the clock and then aren't open other times of the year. That really will be up to the operator of this store. We just want to be clear so there's not any question later.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. English: You're not having any issues with Walmart about the road right there.

Mr. Bowers: Not at all. I've got a real estate guy in... I'm drawing a blank on the name... in Arkansas who is... it's Bentonville... who's been responsive to me and I've had a call into him. Right now I'm waiting on VDOT. I've called them about the stop condition issue and we're going to... about what they will look at, and so that's something we know we have to work through. But what we know is that there are two stop signs out there right now. We would add a third. VDOT doesn't want a third. The only one we control is the one on our site. So, you know, I know VDOT would prefer the through road but there is a little kink in that road. It's an odd little intersection because of the way it kinks over, and I guess that's why they put the stop there. I don't even know why they put the stop there. I will inquire and get an answer on that once we understand with VDOT. But we control the third stop sign. And if need be, we'll leave that one off and we'll sign it such that people understand it. In fact, we feel that the primary use of that access road, because it's not at the light where people come into Walmart, and where Mary Washington is, it's there... I think the primary use is going to be actually the McDonald's and the out-parcel when it's done below. So it might actually work better with the stop conditions on the parking lot and the open condition for us. We can make that happen today, but we still need to make sure that's what VDOT and the County wants. But we'll do that at site plan.

Mr. English: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, other questions for the applicant? Yes, Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: If this were to get approved by the Board of Supervisors, you got a sense of when it would be completed?

Mr. Bowers: It's on fast track. The lease has already been signed and the clock's ticking. We have... we're not even going to be able to get it open before we have to start paying rent. So, McDonald's will move as quick as we can. In fact, tomorrow we'll be starting on, with your all's positive recommendation which we would appreciate, we'll start on the site plan documents and get ahead of the game and try to have those starting through the process so that if we're successful at the Board in June, then we will move quickly into site plan.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Bowers: Realistically, first quarter of '16, you know, they'll break ground maybe. Maybe in the '15. It takes about a hundred days to get one of these built. So we'll move as quickly as we can.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for the applicant? Okay, thank you sir; appreciate it.

Mr. Bowers: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: With that we'll move to public comment. If there's any member of the public that would like to speak on item number 1 and make comments, you may come forward and do so at this time. But

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

when you do, they are comments addressed to the Planning Commission as a whole. It's not an interactive dialogue with questions and answers. Certainly, if there were significant issues and there were a way through staff to be able to try and address those, we would attempt to do so. But it is an opportunity for you to make known your issues or concerns or comments you have towards the application. Any member? Hearing none, I'll close the public comment portion of the public hearing and move it back to the Planning Commission. Further discussion among Planning Commissioners? This is Hartwood District.

Mr. English: I'm going to make a motion that we go ahead and approve CUP14150456.

Mr. Apicella: Second that.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. There's a motion to recommend approval of CUP14150456, the Conditional Use Permit for Stafford Lakes McDonald's by Mr. English, seconded by Mr. Apicella. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No, I just think that it's excellent we've got another McDonald's in that area. I think it's a great place to be. I think it's going to do very well up that way.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good, okay. Somebody likes their English muffin, got it. Okay, Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I think it's a good project as well and, living in that area, I think I'll benefit from it.

Mr. Rhodes: Two English muffins, got it. Okay. Any other...?

Mr. Gibbons: I have one.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: For the record, there is a true dual lane McDonald's at Potomac Mills.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Gibbons: True.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, dual side; I gotcha. There's one in Central Park as well; dual sides.

Mr. Gibbons: Is that right?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah. Very good. Anyone else? Very good. With that, I will call for a vote on the motion to recommend approval of CUP14150456, the Conditional Use Permit for Stafford Lakes McDonald's. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Good luck to you going forward to the Board. Thank you very much. With that we'll move onto item number 2, CUP14150439, the Conditional Use Permit for Falls Run Industrial Park Car Web.

2. CUP14150439; Conditional Use Permit - Falls Run Industrial Park Car Web - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow motor vehicle sales, repair and reconditioning within the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District, on Assessor's Parcels 45-15H and 45-15G. The property consists of 4.55 acres, located on the west side of Falls Run Drive, between Nelms Circle and South Gateway Drive, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: August 11, 2015)**

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission; Mike Zuraf with the Department of Planning and Zoning. This item is item 2, a Conditional Use Permit for Falls Run Industrial Park Car Web. This is a request for a use permit for a motor vehicle sales facility in an M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District. This is on two parcels, 45-15G and 15H, that cover 4.55 acres. The applicant is Farshad Fakhriyazdi and representing him this evening is Trisha Irons, also with Car Web. Looking at the location of this site, the site is at the corner of Nelms Circle and Falls Run. The site is highlighted in red on the screen. The property zoning of M-1, you can see shaded in light blue, that zoning surrounds the property on four sides. There also is some nearby B-2 zoned property as well. That's shaded in the light red color. Looking at the existing conditions of the site, the site itself, both properties are undeveloped. They are entirely wooded right now. Slopes are gradual on the site. The site does not contain any sensitive natural resources and there are no known cultural resources. The site is within the existing Falls Run Industrial Park. Looking at the surrounding uses, on the aerial photograph to the north is the Manheim Auto Auction site, to the south... and the south that I'm referring to is here... this is a federal facility. To the east is the McLane Distribution Warehouse and to the west is Mapei Manufacturing facility. Looking at the site layout plan submitted with this request, it does include a single-story 38,800 square foot building with a showroom, warehouse, and vehicle detailing area proposed. The application, I did note that the sales facility would occupy almost about a quarter of the site, of the building, with the remainder used as flex office and warehouse. But staff does note that it could be used entirely as a vehicle sales facility should the business expand and be able to do that. The access to the site is... there's two access points proposed, one off of Falls Run Drive and one off of Nelms Circle. Travel isles and parking surround the property, surround the site. The building does include bay doors on the front and back of the building. A condition has been added by staff to require that all loading and unloading of vehicles shall occur in locations away from public right-of-way and on the site. The site layout plan does designate the location of parking for vehicles for sale, customer parking, and employee parking. Staff is also recommending a condition that vehicle display be limited to the designated parking spaces shown on the plan. Also, staff notes that the parking spaces are proposed on both sides of the building in areas where some bay doors are proposed, so another condition recommended would not permit parking spaces to block the repair services bays for the use.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

This image is of one of the sheets of the approved site plan that was already obtained on this property, so it does mirror the proposed building and access points that the applicant's included. It includes a landscape plan. This is the landscape plan sheet that does identify landscaping that's proposed across the frontage of the site which will help with the screening of outdoor storage of vehicles that are for sale. And also, as the plan was approved, the stormwater management plan is located in the front corner of the site. And also, staff does note that the north end of the site in this location, there is a separate strip of land that is not subject to this property; it is under separate ownership. That's wooded currently and that site is to remain wooded. That will help to screen the facility as well from South Gateway Drive. Also, I'll just note that a trip generation analysis was conducted. The number of trips generated from this use, the increased use of a vehicle sales facility, is not adequate to require a full scale traffic impact study. Also, with this proposal, the applicant has only depicted use on half of the property. So, on this image, the parcel 45-15G is shown as being undeveloped and the applicant did not have any specific plans at this time for the use of this site. And we've gone through and explained to the applicant that typically with this type of conditional use permit, we'd like to see how the site is going to be used. They did say they had no specific kind of ideas on how it would be used at this point, so staff has recommended a condition that the parcel 15G not be permitted to include motor vehicle sales or storage of vehicles that are for sale. And the applicant is aware of this. They did want to keep the property within the request and they didn't have a problem with that condition that we proposed. The applicant did include building design illustrations with the request. The façade consists of metal wall panels including enhanced storefront entry details with raised architectural elements, extra window openings, and varying façade details. The architectural guidelines that exist in the County's Comprehensive Plan include guidelines for freestanding commercial buildings. The design of this building meets several of the design guidelines that are provided to us. Staff does note that the architectural guidelines discourages the use of metal façade materials, but staff does not note this as a concern in this location as it does fit in with all the uses that are adjacent since this is an existing industrial park. Looking at the Future Land Use Plan, the Comprehensive Plan recommends this site as a location within the Southern Gateway Urban Development Area. The proposed form of development and use is not consistent with the goals of the Urban Development Area which anticipate future uses to be a mix of commercial and higher density residential. However, because the site is located within an established industrial park, guidelines for new development related to site design, including pedestrian inter-connectivity, pocket parks, and general forms are not necessarily feasible at this time. Development of this site and the surrounding industrial park in a manner consistent with the UDA Plan is really going to require a full scale redevelopment of the area. And also I'll note that there are amendments to the Comp Plan you're considering which proposes changing these UDAs to Targeted Growth Areas. But the land use recommendations are similar and would not change staff's comments on this proposal. The proposed conditions provided, it limits the access to the two entrances proposed, limits the location of the outdoor storage of vehicles to these parking spaces shown, require loading and unloading of vehicles to occur onsite, require vehicle repair within enclosed buildings, also parking not blocking service bays, requiring vehicle display parking in designated areas, prohibiting motor vehicle sales from parcel 15G as discussed, and requiring building design and conformance with the elevations provided. Staff notes the positive aspects that this does address the Redevelopment Area Plan recommendations that encourage use of underutilized industrial properties, it's consistent with the established development pattern in the area, public facility impacts are de minimus, and there are no public safety or welfare concerns with the use. And the one negative is it is not in conformance with the UDA Land Use recommendations. Staff does believe the positives outweigh the negatives and is supportive of the application, and recommends approval.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for staff? Okay, thank you very much. Applicant please.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Ms. Irons: Hi, my name is Trisha Irons and I'm the Business Manager at Car Web. And I want to start off by saying thank you very much for having us here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and to the Commission, for considering this conditional use plan. Mr. Farshad Fakhriyazdi was en route to this meeting tonight. He had actually driven from New Jersey from the auction there, as he goes there every week, to get call from his Neurosurgeon that he immediately report to the emergency at Georgetown University Hospital because of a medical condition that they have discovered. And so, that's where he is as we speak and will probably have surgery tonight. And so that's why he is not here. He would have been here. He's been looking forward to this opportunity for quite some time, and so I apologize that he cannot be here. I hope that I'm able to answer any questions that you may have. I'm excited about the project. He's been in this business for many years. This location is perfect. Right now he's leasing the property that he's currently in, and so being able to have his own property is going to be an advantage for him. He does both wholesale and retail, and so that's why this is a good location, directly across from the auction, from the Fredericksburg Manheim Auction. And I don't know if there's any other things I can provide or if there are any questions I'd be happy to try to address them.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Questions for the applicant? Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Hi. I guess one question is, is I noticed he had the cane and needed the cane.

Ms. Irons: Exactly.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Well, I'm sorry. Just for some background, I mean, you said he's leasing. Basically that's on Nelms Circle and it's the backend of somebody else's building.

Ms. Irons: Right.

Mr. Coen: So this is an existing business but that would have more space and more of a venue than sort of in the back.

Ms. Irons: Exactly, exactly.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Irons: And it's not, obviously not in a storefront location like on 17, but because he does both wholesale and retail and is primarily an internet based business, you know, it's okay. That location is actually perfect for us.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Other questions for the applicant? Very good, thank you ma'am; appreciate it.

Ms. Irons: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: I now will open it to public comment. If there's anyone member of the public that would like to speak on item number 2, the Conditional Use Permit for Falls Run Industrial Park Car Web, you may come forward and do so at this time. Seeing no one come forward, I'll close the public comment portion and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Is there discussion among the Commissioners? It's George Washington District.

Mr. Coen: Yes sir. I would like to move for approval for CUP14150439.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Motion recommending approval of CUP14150439; is there a second?

Mr. English: Second.

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

Mr. Coen: Yes. As I noted at the beginning, this week when I went out and looked at the site, I agree that they're doing a great job in where they are, but this would give them a better venue for the types of both retail and commercial that they do. One question, I guess; staff had several conditions.

Ms. Irons: I'm sorry. Yes, we are agreeable to all the conditions.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And so, it's the idea that my motion would be to approve it with the conditions added.

Mr. Rhodes: With the conditions as stated. Very good. Okay. Any further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? All those in favor of the motion which is recommending forward approval of the CUP14150456, the Conditional Use Permit... correction, sorry... CUP14150439 which is the Conditional Use Permit for Falls Run Industrial Park Car Wash signifying by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Is there any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0, goes forward. Good luck with the Board. Thank you very much. With that we'll move onto item number 3 Mr. Harvey.

3. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas and 5-Year Update - A proposal to amend the existing Stafford County Comprehensive Plan, by adopting a new textual document entitled "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2015-2035," dated April 22, 2015, serving as a 5-year update to the Comprehensive Plan and including amendments to Urban Development Areas. **(Time Limit: June 1, 2015)**

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. Good evening again. This item is to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan regarding Urban Development Areas and the 5-Year Update to the Comprehensive Plan. The issue

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

is consideration of the proposed Comprehensive Plan 2015-2035 document, which includes a new Future Land Use Map as an amendment to the existing Comprehensive Plan, and the amendments, which are the 5-year update to the existing Comp Plan. The format of the plan of this new document remains unchanged from the current 2010-2030 Plan document. And the amendments would not amend other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that are not part of this... of the 2010-2030 Plan. Just to provide some background, the purpose of a Comprehensive Plan is to serve as a guide upon which development proposals are evaluated to ensure conformance with the desires of the community, goals, objectives, and policies that shape the future direction of a community as it relates to the physical development of its land. Policies typically identify what the communities' vision is for future anticipated growth. So, history of the current 2010-2030 Plan: this was first adopted back in December of 2010; also, after a lengthy multi-year process. And following its adoption, it was amended several times to meet state code mandates regarding Urban Development Areas. And then, amended to address policy recommendations in the plan and modified land use recommendations, and to establish additional growth management tools within the document. This document would serve as a unifying document for the County's Comprehensive Plan. Our Comprehensive Plan is made up of several stand-alone documents, but we see this document as the main Comprehensive Plan document where are the other documents are referenced. They are referenced specifically in the first chapter of the Plan and that would not change. Also, staff would note that this is effort to amend the Comp Plan is consistent with the state code in what is recommended for comprehensive planning in localities in Virginia. So, the reason for having this Comprehensive Plan is that the County is growing, has grown a lot, and there's continued high growth rates anticipated. The latest projections project a population increase of over 89,000 people over the next 20 years. And that equates to approximately 31,700 additional dwelling units that the County needs to plan for and identify where they're going to go and what it's going to be like. And some may think that that's high but a trend that has been noted several times, that I'll note again, is that the population has more than doubled in past consecutive 20-year periods, dating back to 1950. So, every 20-year period you'll see... we've seen the population double. This latest projected population increase is about half of what we've seen in the past. The process to amend the Urban Development Areas as part of this effort initiated back in 2012. At that time, there was flexibility provided regarding the designation of Urban Development Areas that made them more of an optional proposal that localities could have as opposed to mandates. So, since that time, the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission has been considering the issue, sharing information back and forth through regular meetings. Early on, the Planning Commission conducted a survey of the business community to see what their thoughts were on the effort. There were subcommittees formed and held during special meetings to review this issue. Over that time, the Board provided general direction to the Commission and the Planning Commission responded with difference alternatives and concepts, so there was a lot of back and forth. The latest direction was provided from the Board of Supervisors in January of this year. In their discussion, they ended up with 11 points that serve as kind of a framework or guideline for the Planning Commission to follow in these latest amendments. And with those recommendations, the Planning Commission formed a subcommittee and worked on the amendments from February to April. What resulted is the draft 2015-2035 Plan and that plan reflects these guidelines. So, I'm going to go through the 11 points from the Board and state those and describe briefly how this plan meets those 11 points. The first one was to eliminate the name Urban Development Areas throughout the plan document and use TGA or Targeted Growth Areas in place of Urban Development Areas. And that was done; all references to UDAs were removed and replaced with TGAs throughout the document. Second point is retaining the Brooke UDA as a Targeted Growth Area. There were questions during the back and forth discussion on whether Brooke should remain as a UDA. And there was desire to keep it in and that was kept in and is now referred to as the Brooke Targeted Growth Area. The intensity amount of development recommended in this area is not as intense as it was under the UDA construct. Also, the third point then would be to eliminate the Eskimo Hill Urban Development Area and redistribute its

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

units to other Targeted Growth Areas. And this slide is a portion of the Future Land Use Plan. The image to the left is the current Land Use Plan. You can see the Eskimo Hill Urban Development Area is the light purple area identified with the number 4. And then to the left... or to the right, the proposed Future Land Use Map, the main Urban Development Area would transition over to Business and Industry Land Use. The associated park, which is the darker green shading, that was associated with that Urban Development Area, that land use changes over to Agricultural and Rural under this proposal. And this just shows you the full Future Land Use Map, current map and the proposed Future Land Use Plan Map on the right. The one change, in addition to the Eskimo Hill area, the shading of the now Targeted Growth Areas is the orange color now. So, we even changed the color. So now, the fourth point is for Targeted Growth Areas to maintain the current ratio that applied to the Urban Development Areas that require 50% of future growth to be designated in these areas. So that was part of the effort that the Planning Commission went through is this plan that you have does still identify 50% of the future growth occurring in the Targeted Growth Areas. The fifth point, maximum density for multi-family should be 14 units per acre, no more than 14 units per acre, as it's recommended in the Urban Development Areas. At one point along the process there were some ideas about supporting a higher density of development in some of the UDAs or Targeted Growth Areas, and there's a desire to kind of cap it at 14 and that's how this plan is represented. The sixth point, there should be no new Targeted Growth Areas and that point has been met here too. The seventh point, there should no more land use boundary changes except for any recommendations that come out of the Airport Compatibility Study. There are no boundary changes associated with the Airport Compatibility Study. The only other boundary changes that are represented are to the Courthouse Area and Southern Gateway Targeted Growth Areas. During the back and forth process, there were adjustments proposed to the Courthouse Area. It was related to the proposed relocation of the interchange and access road to Route 1, and then the boundary adjustments for Southern Gateway linked the Urban Development Area... Targeted Growth Area limits up to the redevelopment area limits in a few locations. The eighth point, staff was requested to crunch numbers and provide the few as possible townhouse and multi-family units in the Targeted Growth Areas in relation to land area. This effort was made, but we will note that we were required to fit more future residential dwelling units in a smaller area and in fewer Targeted Growth Areas. So there are some increases to townhouse and multi-family units that ended up happening; there was no other way to make it fit. The ninth point, no additional multi-family and townhouse units allowed in suburban areas and that request was adhered to. There are no changes to the intensity and amount of growth in suburban areas. Refresh the Comp Plan document as part of a 5-year update with no substantive changes to the document and that was adhered to and we'll go through some of those other adjustments that were made in a moment. And completion of the document by June and we're on track for that as well. So, some of the elements of the Targeted Growth Area amendments I want to point out as well, is in the initial preamble of the Targeted Growth Areas there are some additional recommendations that are highlighted. They were some recommendations that existed before, but they're more so highlighted now. There are recommendations for small area plans to be developed for each of the Targeted Growth Areas to better identify the location of different uses within each of these targeted areas. There were modifications to the mix and number of dwelling units in each of the Targeted Growth Areas to address the projected growth needs. The table on the top is the current mix of projected residential and commercial development in the... those were the 7 Urban Development Areas, and the table at the bottom is the proposed new mix of development in the 6 Targeted Growth Areas. So to kind of highlight some of the main points, the Courthouse, Southern Gateway, and George Washington Village Targeted Growth Areas do experience an increase in the amount of development within those targeted areas, again to deal with accommodating more growth in a smaller area. What that amount of growth related to was an overall increase from 14,661 dwelling units to 15,880 dwelling units over a 20-year period. Also, the Brooke, Leeland, and Centreport TGAs, those actually experienced a lower projected development over the next 20-year period. And the projected amount of commercial

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

development was cut in half. This was in large part due to the reduction in the George Washington Village Business Campus which had recommended in one area 8.7 million square feet of office, and there were adjustments made to that to be able to accommodate a little more residential area development. And then the individual TGA descriptions were modified to reflect all these changes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please.

Mr. Apicella: Before we move to another slide, can you keep this one back up? I'm just curious if the Board was or is aware that as a result of, number one, the increase in overall number of units, but more importantly the reduction of a TGA results in an overall net reduction of commercial square footage by almost 50%. So that's the trade-off that we experience by at least getting... those two factors taken into consideration. I mean, that's a pretty big change from where we were.

Mr. Harvey: May I?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella, Mr. Chairman, one thing to consider as Mike mentioned earlier in the presentation is the Eskimo UDA was converted to Business and Industry. That's not reflected in this chart so the acreage of Business and Industry and projected square footage of industrial uses would also increase. So there is something that softens the effect of it, but you are correct, Mr. Apicella, the net effect by adding more units into some of these existing boundaries of the targeted growth areas has an overall effect of having to reduce the commercial areas within them.

Mr. Apicella: I appreciate that context. Even if we did count Eskimo Hill, I'm just throwing out a number, let's say we added back another 1.5 million, 2 million square feet, we're still 40% below where we were. I just think it's an important point that needs to be highlighted as this effort moves forward.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, some additional recommendations included within the TGA amendments in Chapter 3 include recommendation for a phasing schedule for Targeted Growth Area development. Some of the phasing recommendations are associated with early phasing of available land in some of the Targeted Growth Areas or redevelopment of under-utilized properties might be considered as areas where follow-up phasing would be likely. And then, some of the Targeted Growth Areas that might be lacking public infrastructure would also be considered in more of those out-year phases of development of the Targeted Growth Areas. Also, requiring development of TGAs to incur in a fiscally responsible manner overall within the TGA, understanding that, you know, you may get individual projects that might be heavy in residential but then over the long term to make sure that the TGA develops and gets the commercial development to offset the residential impacts is a recommendation. Also, development should conform to draft Airport Land Use Compatibility guidelines. And I mentioned the other Courthouse and Southern Gateway boundary adjustments. Also, just some of the minor details of the update; there are updates to the format of all the maps for consistency with all the County map products. They are trying to create a consistent map format and appearance. The new format would be the map on the right with the title blocked at the top of the page. Amendments to the plan that are associated with the 5-year updates, within Chapter 4, we update some of the background transit and carpool background information within the Funded Road Improvement Map and schedule. We've added five projects that

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

were included on the FAMPO constrained long range plan within Chapter 4, that those projects have been added there. Adding the statement in Chapter 5 that the estimated public facility recommendations are informative and that capital improvement planning should be in accordance with debt limitation policies that the County has in place. And then, updates to public facility needs were estimated and identified based on the latest population projections and current population figures. That summary is available in Chapter 5 and the details spelled out in the appendix of the document. Also, there are updates in Chapter 6 to a lot of the background data of the existing land use and zoning data and maps, updates to population housing and employment demographics, and public facility and infrastructure inventories as well. Staff does bring up one point in this that there is new House Bill 2 which... and the effect of House Bill 2 on UDAs was brought to our attention more recently to staff's attention. There was a recent state code amendment under House Bill 2 that establishes a program to prioritize transportation funding. With this, their ranking criteria under House Bill 2, that includes priority for funding when a project is located within an Urban Development Area, or an area that is identified as being consistent with the requirements of an Urban Development Area. So, since the Targeted Growth Area recommendations are consistent in large part with the Urban Development Area criteria under the state code, and to not jeopardize transportation funding opportunities, staff has suggested some language to clarify that the TGAs meet the UDA criteria in the state code. So there would be the one statement, and this statement that's highlighted is an excerpt from Chapter 3 of the Comp Plan, the first paragraph of the Targeted Growth Area discussion and recommendations. And so staff is providing this for the Planning Commission's consideration for modifications.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: If you go back... or go forward... so the section 15.2-2223-1, does that specifically just deal with the transportation aspect, or do we have... by putting this language, does it sort of rope in anything else under the UDA language? Because that's sort of the mindset was we wanted to get away from their language and their rules and regulations. So I'm just curious if this ties us back to it or just to the transportation?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, that section, the 2223-1, .1, that's the section that has the recommended densities and amount of growth. But, again, that language is optional. So it's not mandatory language; it does talk about the overall Urban Development Area, I guess, framework. So, I guess to answer your question, it is more than just transportation.

Mr. Coen: And I guess my concern is that an applicant would come in and say, underneath your Comp Plan it mentions this code of Virginia dealing with UDAs, and ergo we now want to rope into the state language, which is sort of our goal is to get away from that. So that's just my concern. It almost negates part of what we're trying to do is get away from some of this horrible construct.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, Mr. Coen and Mr. Chairman, staff has had discussions with VDOT representatives at the Fredericksburg Area and Metropolitan Planning Organization meetings. And again, kind of they're tying our hands to some degree. If we want to be more certain of getting funding, we need to have some sort of reference back to the UDAs. It doesn't have to be exactly a UDA but it has to reference that it's meeting the intent of a UDA. So maybe this isn't the most perfect language but somehow we have to refer... they specifically said we have to refer back to the code section dealing with UDAs in order for us to qualify for that funding.

Mr. Rhodes: Now what I thought I heard though was it either had to be in a UDA or an area that is consistent with, and that's why you use those words consistent with?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Or something like a UDA.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, what are they quoting from? I mean, when you sit down... does the Commission of the Highways determine this? Does the legislature?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Chairman, again that was a discussion that was held at a meeting at FAMPO and FAMPO received a briefing from the Secretary of Transportation's office. And they explained a little bit about the ranking criteria and how HB 2 may affect localities within the Fredericksburg District of VDOT. And again, that's where this discussion came out of is that this is going to be part of the ranking criteria in which VDOT's going to use for allocation of transportation funding.

Mr. Gibbons: Is that an administrative action on VDOT's part? Or is it...?

Mr. Rhodes: The requirement. That requirement that it be in the UDA for funding, was that actual statutory language?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'm not certain if that's actually written language into HB 2 or that's something that's being put in the Administrative Code for the state.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: I'm really concerned, because this whole ranking process has been fouled up since January. And we lost a lot of money in the 630 order. So if it's being like a hammer over your head, you either go along with this and call it a UDA or you've got to go back and say you're going to comply with a UDA. So then it comes back as a UDA or...? I mean, I'm concerned about this.

Mr. Zuraf: One thing that was made clear is it doesn't need to be called... you know, we don't have to change the terminology to UDA and they've identified some of the consultants they have. They identify where, you know, through all the comprehensive planning of the other localities throughout the state, where other areas identify what they call UDA-like areas that have similar characteristics. So I think there is some flexibility in what they're... how they're looking at it.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Yes Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, has the language already been incorporated? And if so, where? And if not, where would it get incorporated?

Mr. Zuraf: Of what's being suggested here?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: No. This is...

Mr. Rhodes: We would vote to add this to the Targeted Growth Areas paragraph.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I'm looking for something that mirrors even the stuff that's not in blue. I can't quite find it. So, TGAs are discussed in 3...

Mr. Zuraf: Chapter 3... let me find the page... in the mark-up version, it's page 3-15. It's kind of replacing the statement that was deleted.

Mr. Apicella: The one that starts, urban areas are intended?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, an additional issue that staff was requested to note was there were issues through the early discussion raised that may be on the scope of the current effort if the Planning Commission would consider... might consider forwarding to the Board as a separate suggestion for their consideration. And the one point that was discussed was recommending an extended CIP that would look at the projected capital facilities in the Comp Plan over the full 20-year period of the Comp Plan, and to determine if the facilities meet the affordability policies of the (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: And we had talked about that last session as possibly doing it as a transmittal letter.

Mr. Gibbons: I don't see the 20.

Mr. Rhodes: So as we had discussed before would be that we would have a narrative transmittal memoranda of some form that would highlight to them to consider looking at beyond the 10 years. Maybe not looking with the specificity of a CUP and the actual by-year funding stream, but looking at the requirements that actually carry out consistent with the Comp Plan which would be through 20 years; that'd be 11 through 20.

Mr. Zuraf: Staff does support the amendments to the Comp Plan, including the new 2015-2035 Comp Plan document, with the additional reference to the TGAs being consistent with the UDA recommendations in the state code. Staff notes the Plan meets the criteria specified in the state code sections cited here on the screen and meets the 5-year update requirement in the state code. The Planning Commission has a deadline of May 27, that's your last regular meeting, to make a recommendation prior to the June 2<sup>nd</sup> Board meeting. And I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for staff before we go to public comment? Please, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Mike, just a quick question on this new language issue. And just it's sort of timing. If we were to ask staff to look at other communities of other language so that it doesn't have such a big window in it about other applicants who come in and try to grab anything under the UDAs in it, can we have you do that and come back in the two weeks' time period with it and can we put that in there then? Or is that beyond the scope of the public hearing aspect?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Coen, I would recommend that we have further discussions with VDOT to see if they're fine with the language. Because ultimately, they're the ones who are going to be gauging it and, as Mr. Gibbons said earlier, their process is still being worked on as far as how they're

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

going to evaluate localities' projects. So, if we're certain that VDOT's satisfied with it, then I think that would meet the overall need. Also, I'll point out that staff, when we advertise the amendment pursuant to state code, we forward it to VDOT for their review and comment. They have a review period that could extend beyond the Planning Commission's timeline, but again we're trying to work with them directly on this Comp Plan amendment to see if they're satisfied and meets all their requirements and viewpoints.

Mr. Coen: I guess my question is, when you say the language, do you mean the new language that we were given tonight or the existing language before we heard this latest? I mean, you said you were going to ask if you thought if they were happy...

Mr. Harvey: Yes. We're going to ask them if they would specifically look at the language that staff had recommended tonight. We know that the existing language would not be sufficient based on the comments we received previously, that we have to cite the code section in our plan. Because that was some of the language that was stricken out in the current version was the code section citation.

Mr. Rhodes: Other comments or questions for staff before we go to public comment? Great, thank you very much. I will now open this up to public comment. If there's any member of the public that would like to come forward and speak on this item, you may come forward and do so at this time. Again, we would ask that you state your name and address. A green light will come on indicating 3 minutes available to speak; a yellow light when there is 1 minutes remaining; and a red light will start flashing when the time is expired and we would ask that you conclude your comments.

Mr. Hornung: Good evening Chairman, good evening gentlemen. I look at the most important quality of life issue in this County is providing opportunity for the residents here to be able to work here and not have to commute. Sixty-something percent I think now are forced to go elsewhere to find employment. To me the Comp Plan ought to try to remedy this long range problem and look at the quality of life issue. It ought to be addressed in some form or other, and it's just going to be (inaudible). I think the plan was well thought out, you know, as it was put together with the direction you got, but I think things have changed. I mean, I really think what happened at the last meeting, your last meeting, if you take the example of George Washington Village project, that rezoning request was worked on for 6, 7 months by the Commission, four public hearings. It's sort of a test of what about implementing this plan here in some version in the George Washington Village area. How are people going to react? There's basically nobody here tonight to speak to that. But not one person in those public hearings supported this type of growth in this area, at all... at all. I know it's a growth area, the question I have is what type of growth. And I really think that we need to focus with this Comp Plan as we evolve it, is to look at it how do we restore the quality of life. Because if we allow, and I think it calls for in the Courthouse, GW Village, and Centreport area, at least 10,000 new dwellings -- all right, how does that improve the quality of life for people here and those people who come? What's going to happen to them if they follow the same pattern? Sixty percent of those are what... going to pick up and go north and be miserable. A lot of people are unhappy because we don't have a handle on doing this. I think the proposal that I gave you is a possibility that ought to be fully vetted in how it's done (inaudible). Really it's a once in a lifetime thing. Once this gets going, that is gone. And this is a prime area of the County that we can focus on economic development and those three, the Courthouse, George Washington Village, and Centreport, maybe ought to be relooked at as not TGAs/UDAs, but as a Central Stafford Business District. I really think that that's important. We talk about the growth coming, all right, and I don't know, there's 31,000 people coming?

Mr. Rhodes: About 87,000.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Hornung: Okay. My question is, why do we have to absorb all those people? I'm not against residential growth; it's going to happen. But, what's happening? We've got people who are coming -- let's take for example, coming out of Washington, Falls Church, Alexandria, Fairfax, Prince William, and here. Why do we have to accept all of that? They're always going to be coming here. Why not set this growth area up for economic development for those who do come and the people that are here, to make things work? It's our last chance and I don't know how the mechanism of this works. You were talking, before I go, sorry, about the 630 interchange. I understand the formula for funding for the 630 interchange, and I may be wrong with this but you can help me out with this. VDOT is looking at economic development as a weighted item for funding a project like this. They're willing to boost it up. Adding 10,000 people here, is that really going to do it? Why not a Central Stafford Business District that then has a, well, will have a national appeal and VDOT could say, hey, this is an economic initiative, the state see it, your funding could be taken care of or at least improved. That's about as much as I can say at this point but I think you and I'm a little over time, but I appreciate it very much. (Inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this item?

Mr. Tulloss: Good evening folks, Mr. Chairman, my name's John Tulloss. I'm here this evening representing somebody else who's out of town on a medical emergency Stansbury Burton, who lives up on Holly Corner Road. Excuse my voice. His farm is 48 acres of pretty good-looking land but on this side of the fence is Stafford Lakes and on this side of the fence is his farm. Some years ago a part of his farm was in the growth area. I think in was in 2010 it was taken out of the growth area, which is a devastating thing to the value of his place. I don't think it bothered him so much before you begin to look at future potential medical bills; those things can wipe you out in a hurry. His property, for future reference, I think it's on, I think, let's see, tax map 43-64. It's a good looking piece of ground and we're talking about new growth, and yeah, I've been here a long time. Man, it's been wild, but there's some folks that have been farming for a long time and there's unfortunately not as many, but there's a few of them still around and they get ready to sell a piece of ground and oh geez, you can't get nearly as much for it because you're on the wrong side of the fence. It really does hurt so I respectfully request you folks to look at putting Mr. Burton's property back in the growth area and move the fence or doing whatever you can do help him out a little bit. And I appreciate your time gentlemen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Anyone else like to speak? Okay, we'll...

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a recommendation...

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: ... that we keep this open and defer it back until the committee makes a report on the meeting on Monday night and then... because we're asking for some guidance in there too, before we make a decision on...

Mr. Rhodes: So, motion is made to defer this to the 27<sup>th</sup> which is the day we will be...

Mr. Gibbons: No, no, no, no. Defer...

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, just defer the item.

Mr. Gibbons: Until the committee makes its report.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: I got you. Okay. So, a motion to suspend discussion on this item and then take it back up after we have a discussion...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman? I wonder if Mr. Gibbons would accept a friendly amendment.

Mr. Gibbons: Everything coming from you is always friendly.

Mr. Apicella: I just found some things that I think need to be addressed in the current document. I was hoping we could kind of walk through it, maybe spend 10 minutes?

Mr. Gibbons: No, I mean, why can't we do it at that time, walk through the whole thing? And then we can get the public hearings out of the way.

Mr. Apicella: That's fine.

Mr. Gibbons: That's all I'm trying to do.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, I think you're just trying to get the other items for other folks done.

Mr. Gibbons: And then get the committee report, and then... Steven's right. I mean, and then we take it up at that point, that's all.

Mr. Rhodes: Just to confirm, we'd like to defer further discussion on this item till after we get through, essentially after we get through unfinished business and bring up the committee report? Is that what I'm hearing? Or actually the committee has finished their work, right? So we're not going to do... we can actually have this discussion... we can do one of a couple of things. We can have that discussion now, on, I think, Mr. Harvey? We could have the discussion on Monday night just to understand any feedback that might have been received from member in that meeting?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I guess first for staff's benefit, is the public hearing closed or is it still open?

Mr. Rhodes: I think the public comment portion is closed.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. This is an active item on your agenda, Mr. Chairman, so if you want to pull in the committee's recommendation for the discussion purposes, since it's a related subject, I think it's appropriate.

Mr. Rhodes: We could do that, or we could defer the further discussion on this till after we get through unfinished business, if we want to modify the agenda.

Mr. Apicella: I guess, since we've got some other applicants in the audience, just to be fair to them, just to move through the rest of the agenda and come back to this. I didn't see a groundswell of interest on this topic from the audience.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, and just to confirm, do we need a motion to modify the agenda, Ms. McClendon?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, you can have a motion, but if no one contests to the item being moved, then a motion and a vote is not necessary.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so we will just, with no objection, we'll move this item till after the... just going through, I guess, the New Business and we'll take it back up for continuing discussion? Okay. Very good. We're moving. Items number 4 and 5 dealing with Old Dominion Village -- the public hearing was continued to May 27<sup>th</sup> so we'll take those up then. As mentioned in the beginning, item number 6 has been deferred to May 27<sup>th</sup> and we'll just highlight there were two open items on that; one that they're working on, the other one was on modification of the restricted uses. I will be talking to the applicant on this so if anyone had any feedback on those, please share it with me in the interim. Item number 7 is Reclassification of Abberly Stafford Courthouse Proffer Amendment, RC15150551. Mr. Harvey.

4. COM14150427; Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment - Old Dominion 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 amendment would expand the areas where townhomes are allowed in the Suburban Area land use designation to include where townhomes are constructed and incorporated within a mixed use district, such as PD-1, Planned Development-1; PD-2, Planned Development-2; and P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning Districts, at a proposed maximum density of 12 dwelling units per acre. **(Time Limit: June 21, 2015) (History: April 22, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to May 27, 2015)**
5. RC14150428; Reclassification - Old Dominion Village - A request for a reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts, to the P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, to allow for a development consisting of up to 146 townhouses and 93,100 square feet of commercial uses on Assessor's Parcels 38-101, 38-102, 38-102A, 38-103A, 38-103B, and 38-103C. The property consists of 40.273 acres, located on the east side of Jefferson Davis Highway, approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Eskimo Hill Road, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: July 21, 2015) (History: April 22, 2015 Public Hearing Continued to May 27, 2015)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. RC14150333; Reclassification - Embrey Mill Commercial - A request for a reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, to allow for the development of up to 103,770 square feet of commercial uses on Assessor's Parcels 29-72 and 29-72B. The property consists of 16.63 acres, located on the north side of Courthouse Road at the intersection with Mine Road, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: July 21, 2015) (History: Deferred on April 22, 2015 to May 13, 2015)**
7. RC15150551; Reclassification - Abberly at Stafford Courthouse Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcel 39-16L and portions of 39-16, 39-16B, 39-16H, and 39-16J, zoned UD-4, Urban Development, Mixed Use Village Center, to adjust the mix of dwelling unit types. The property consists of 22.02 acres, located on the west side of Old Potomac Church Road, approximately 2,000 feet south of Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: July 21, 2015) (History: Deferred on April 22, 2015 to May 13, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, recognize Mike Zuraf to lead the discussion.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. This item is consideration of a proffer amendment on Assessor's Parcel 39-16L and portions of several other parcels within tax map 39. It's zoned UD-4, Urban Development, Mixed Use Village Center and a public hearing on this case was held on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. There were issues raised by the Planning Commission at the time. Attachment 1 that you received included the revised proffers. You subsequently received by email a new set of proffers and then tonight you received a second revision of the proffers, and that's... so the paper version at your desk is the latest version of the draft proffers. The latest changes are highlighted in yellow. But the changes that were made in response to the issues at the April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting included response to a concern, a request that the building materials not be modified to include vinyl siding. The applicant did remove that proffer change from proffer 3A. And then the next issue was, requesting cash contributions for schools be increased due to the increased number of school children that would result from the proffer amendment adding additional bedrooms. The first adjustment to this proffer, to proffer 8F provided a cash contribution of 480 dollars and 37 cents per unit for a total contribution of 138,451 dollars in total. The latest change that you've received upped that amount to 555 dollars and 55 cents per unit for a total contribution of 160,000 dollars to go towards schools. The applicant included kind of a basis for how they came up with the contribution and that's spelled out in the memo. And I'll just note that the other additional change to the proffers that you received tonight was an adjustment to the timing of receipt of the proffer contributions to match the state code which requires receipt of proffers prior to occupancy permit. So that's how staff has... we have it all set up to collect proffers at that time. So that's consistent with how we operate.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Questions for staff?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, do you have a sense of what the total the total contribution would be, both in kind and in cash per unit?

Mr. Rhodes: Cash comes up to, what, 1,010,000?

Mr. Zuraf: Not off the top of my head. I have to get the calculator out. Crunch some numbers.

Mr. Apicella: I guess I just have another context question. So, really, the big change here, one more time, is aside from some, I call it editorial changes to the proffer statement, or technical changes, is moving or changing the number of 2-beds by a plus of 38 and reducing the number of 1-bedrooms by the equivalent amount, right? That's the real fundamental change here?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Gibbons: You have another fundamental change when he's going from the building permit to the certificate of occupancy. That's a big, fundamental change.

Mr. Apicella: I understand, I think though that... I thought the state code sort of required moving to occupancy permit. I could be wrong. I thought I saw something that came out of the last session that...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the state code requires that proffers be collected after final inspection, prior to receipt of the certificate of occupancy, and that's how we handle proffers.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. English: Mike? I don't know if you can answer this or if this is going to be for the applicant. Why did they want to change these from that many... from the 1s to the 2-bedrooms. Because when they first started out I think they wanted it because the 1-bedrooms would be good because of the school and the Germanna area. Do you know why, or is that a question for the applicant?

Mr. Zuraf: The applicant is here, but my understanding is, and they can expand on it, but my understanding is they've now, I guess through market research, that they feel that a greater number of 2-bedrooms would work better on the site.

Mr. English: Nothing against you, but don't you think they should have done their homework before they did this? And that's to the applicant, so I'm not... I'll ask the applicant. Sorry.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Other questions for staff? Please.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Real quickly, and I know it was in our initial packet, the, I mean, I wasn't here when this was passed, when was this initially passed?

Mr. Zuraf: This was initially passed in October 2013.

Mr. Coen: Okay, so in October 2013 it was 1-bedrooms and then, you know, not even 2 years later, it's decided that the market's changed and we need 2-bedrooms?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I mean, it went from an even split of 1- and 2-bedroom units to a greater number of 2-bedroom units by 38.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for staff before the applicant comes forward?

Mr. English: Has the School Board looked at this at all as far as the impacts that you know of?

Mr. Zuraf: They've...

Mr. English: They probably received it but they didn't make a comment on it.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English, Mr. Chairman, I don't recall a specific comment. We had some correspondence with the School Board staff today advising them of the revised proffer for increased dollar amounts and they were asking about the nature of the request and we explained that there was an increased number of bedrooms, but I didn't... we didn't hear back, one way or another, as to their disposition on that, other than, more money is good.

Mr. English: More money is good? Of course it is. Okay. Thanks Mike.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other questions for staff? And by my high-tech math going through the portions for Fire Rescue, libraries, general government, the modified education, transportation, and the parks and rec, which were not per unit, but were the 800,500 and then the 50,000 it comes out to 3.439 million in cash. Comes out to about 3,439,000 if I caught them all.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I was just trying to get a sense of the overall contribution and how it might compare to, say, what we had proposed.

Mr. Rhodes: That doesn't include the in kinds. Okay; applicant please.

Mr. Cook: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Bo Cook and I'm here to represent HH Hunt on this issue. First of all I'd like to kind of give you a history of this whole issue. We actually started working on this project back in 2011. We actually did come up with an initial mix back then, which was basically an even split. So that's where the original mix came from. And typically what we do, we just, we talk with our management group and they kind of give us an initial mix that they want to pursue. We understood that 3-bedrooms were kind of taboo because of the family issues. So back then we actually just came up with a mix of half 1s, half 2s and then a very small amount of 3-bedrooms. We didn't have a particular zoning that this would actually fit into, so we worked with staff for a very long time to try to come up with something. We actually had our case ready to submit it under the old zoning and they actually told us that we couldn't do that so we had to kind of work with the UDA that they were actually trying to develop at that point in time. So we did that. We basically started that process probably in 2012. We have monthly management meetings, and actually, probably early 2013 the issue came up about the unit mix. And our management group at that point had issues with the mix we had originally come up with. So this issue really didn't come up just recently. It actually came up 2 years ago. So basically that's when we started working with outside consultants and they actually came back and recommended that we increase our 2-bedrooms at that point in time. What happened was, in this, and you can go back and look at the site plan that was actually approved back in 2013, it actually matches what our current mix request is. We're in a dilemma now because we have a site plan that based on 100 and whatever... 102 1s and 182 2s and then the 6 3-bedrooms. What happened was, is that we actually began to develop our architectural plans back in early 2013 and we actually went very far in that process to make sure that our site plan matched those units. What happened as we were going to the rezoning, is that we had the market study. We actually gave that market study to the person who did the physical impact study, Mr. Fuller, and he actually used on his first draft of the physical impact study he used the mix that we have proposed... that we are seeking today. The error that occurred, and it was my error, is that the zoning team that we had in place back then actually sent an email questioning the mix. The email was sent to me and I didn't respond back that that was the current mix that we wanted to move ahead with. So what happened was is the planner that we were working with actually reverted back to the original default mix of 140, basically at an even split that showed up in the proffers. So this just didn't happen. A mistake was made. I made it. So to say that we just changed our mind is not the case. We're just trying to get this project to where we can build it. Currently we can't build it. The architectural plans we have match the site plan, which basically matches the mix that we're seeking tonight.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for the applicant?

Mr. English: So what you're saying is, if you can't get the 102 1-bedrooms and 182 2-bedroom and 6 3-bedrooms, you can't build it.

Mr. Cook: Can't build it.

Mr. English: Why? I mean you're just saying because of the... What's the mix over here behind the Courthouse?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Cook: Our architectural plans match that mix. Each building was specifically placed on the site plan that match that mix. So, and Mr. Harvey can confirm, or Mr. Zuraf, is that if we get site plan approval which we still do not have, we can't build what we have submitted to the building department.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Please Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Okay, so... but in theory you can build, but you can't build what you've submitted, so you would have to change it?

Mr. Cook: Correct.

Mr. Coen: Okay, and then correct me if I'm wrong, but having lived in apartments, I mean, the floor plans and how they fit into a building will be different for 1-bedroom versus 2-bedroom.

Mr. Cook: Correct.

Mr. Coen: So by changing this you're going to have to change floor plans or building constructs anyways because what you've designed, say, for a building to be some 1-bedroom, and some 3-bedroom, and a couple of 2-bedroom, you'd have to redo it anyways because the floor plans won't fit as they're currently designed?

Mr. Cook: Correct.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions for the applicant? Okay. Very good. Thank you sir; appreciate it. Back to the Planning Commission. Further discussion or other positions? This is in Aquia.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I was not a part of the original process for this plan to be approved; however, it was approved and I think the end result was that it was going... it's planning to be a very positive addition to the Courthouse area. If you take a look at the build out around the Courthouse with the hospital and the proposed community college, it somewhat makes sense that a few more 2-bedrooms to where you might have some young adults who work at the hospital or go to college together, they might utilize that. I mean, I don't know that we can determine that just because there is an increase of a few bedrooms that there will be that much of a greater increase or impact on the schools. And that seems to be the main controversy surrounding this, as I interpret it. When I look at the staff report, when they look at their student calculator, 68 to 86, an increase of 18 students, and I want to thank the applicant for working with us in producing additional proffers to help cover or mitigate the impact of that. And I'm going to vote in favor or to approve the application.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Is there a motion to recommend approval of RC15150551, Reclassification for Abberly? Is there a second?

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Apicella. Further comment Mrs. Bailey? Thank you very much. Mr. Apicella?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague Mrs. Bailey. I think overall, again, this is a good project. A significant piece or anchor of this project is the Germanna community college. They've proffered a site. We may not get another site elsewhere in the county. So I think that's something we all have to consider. I think it fits in the context of the UDA. It was our first UDA proposal. I think what the applicant is saying is, it would not otherwise be economically viable for them to proceed with this project if we did not change the number of bedrooms in the way that they've requested. Perhaps it's not the right way to look at this but if I just look at what was already approved, again, as I mentioned during earlier questioning that the big change is changing the number of 1-bedrooms, reducing that by 38, and increasing the number of 2-bedrooms by 38. So if I just look at the proffer contribution associated with this revised reclassification proffer amendment, it turns out to be about 4,210 dollars per unit. That's not a small sum. It certainly gets closer to the school's recommended proffer amount that we suggested, I guess, over a year ago. It may not be as high as what the current Board is using, but at least it comports with what we had asked for, at least in our recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. I would also reiterate that they're offering an \$800,000 contribution for turf fields at Brooke Point High School, again, something that we might not otherwise get if this project doesn't come to fruition. So all in all, it is a change. I don't think it's a huge change in the context of the total number of apartments, or the total number of residents we have in Stafford County. So for those reasons I will support it.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Further comments? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Oh go ahead. I will defer to the gentleman from Hartwood.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: I would like to make a substitute motion to defer this until the schools look at this, because at 160,000 dollars in proffers that they've added, I don't even think you could buy... I mean...

Mr. Rhodes: Is there a second? Okay second for the substitute motion. Mr. Coen? Mr. English? Further comment?

Mr. English: I am very concerned because I think, if this a project and the schools haven't had an input in it with the changes and you got 160,000 dollars going to cash proffers for the school. What are you going to get for 160,000 for the school when you got probably... and I feel like you're going to have a bigger impact on, as far as kids in that area, now that you're going to move these two from 1-bedrooms in that complex... that's the reason for my request for a deferral, to have the School Board have a little bit more impact, I mean a little more say in this. That's the reason for my...

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Further comment, Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Yes, and if I understand you correctly, Mr. English, you're asking for the School Board so sort of in the same construct that we did with the George Washington project which worked exceedingly well. The idea is that staff will contact Mrs. Kidby as the Chair of the School Board to get the School Board's input? Am I understanding that?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Coen: That's what I thought, so that's why I seconded it.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Just to clarify on that. I do know Ms. Kidby had said that they have worked their processes with their staff and they expected staff would bring... that it'll be a staff to staff discussion and staff will bring it up to them, and if they have any concerns with the staff's position they'll then take it up, because they can't necessarily agenda and formally do each one of these. Just to clarify that.

Mr. Coen: I certainly think that Ms. Kidby once communicated with would then tell staff that's the better... I mean, as we've seen unfortunately frequently, there's a disconnect between what staff says and what the School Board members say. We have heard... we have received some communications from school board members having concerns about this. And so I think that they would like to have some input. Just a couple of things from students that I know, the turf fields at Brooke Point are already done. They've said that they've already played on them. But a big concern, and I applaud the efforts by the members of the Commission to try to get money, because I think when this first came around it was zero, so the fact that the two of them worked extremely hard to get something is commendable and I applaud them for that, but I do think, again, this sort of goes back to the George Washington Village thing, getting something on the night of the meeting is disconcerting. And to the idea... just the mix issue. Germanna is primarily a community college whereby people are either living at home and have graduated High School and are going there prior to going away to a four year school, or they are individuals who are from the military, or already living in our community, who are attending classes there, and they already live there. So I'm not quite certain that this is going to be like my students at VCU, who live at VCU or nearby it to attend a four year college, ergo they would want apartments. And so to me there is a disconnect in the type of colleges in the mindset. So I... that just doesn't seem to connect the same with me and maybe it's just because of my experience, but I think it would be useful for the School Board members to have some sort of input into this. They may well say that the 160 is fine, which might pay for a trailer and a half, or one school bus and a half, but I think it'll be helpful to get their input in this situation.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Further comments? Yes, Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I think if it does get to a deferral, if the deferral is approved, I think that in asking the question to School Board it should relate just be to the increase of the 38 units, because the other matter about this proposal has already been decided. So going back and asking what they think about, you know, the proffer of the community college site versus money for schools, again, that's already... that train... that ship has left the port. So let's just focus on the 38, if it goes to deferral, not anything beyond that.

Mr. Rhodes: It's the 38 on top of the 438 that were existing. So it's about an 8.5% increase. But just to confirm on the motion, the motion is to defer two weeks for an opportunity for the schools to provide a comments on the increase of 38 bedrooms to the proposal? Okay. Further comments? All those in favor of the substitute motion, which is recommending deferral for two weeks until May 27<sup>th</sup> to provide an opportunity for the schools to comment on the increase of 38 bedrooms signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed?

Mrs. Bailey: Nay.

Mr. Rhodes: Passes 6 to 1... substitute motion passes 6 to 1. So we've addressed item 7. We're going to go onto item number 8, Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, proposed Ordinance O15-16, Stafford County Code Section 28-25. I believe when we had talked about this before we had asked for some greater definition... modification and greater clarity in some of the definition which has subsequently been done, but, Mr. Harvey?

8. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O15-16 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Section 28-25, "Definitions of Specific Terms," to define microcell communications facilities. The proposed Ordinance would also amend Section 28-39, "Special regulations," to add performance standards for the microcell communications facility use, and to allow this use as an accessory use to any by-right use in the B-1, Convenience Commercial; B-2, Urban Commercial; M-1, Industrial light; M-2, Industrial Heavy; PD-1, Planned Development-1; PD-2, Planned Development-2; P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development; and UD, Urban Development Zoning Districts and on any public facility in any Zoning District. **(Time Limit: June 9, 2015) (History: Deferred on April 22, 2015 to May 13, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you alluded to, staff took into account the Commission's questions and concerns and proposed some modifications to the definition of microcell communication facility, as well as the special provisions related to microcell communication facilities. In particular, with the definition we added some terminology about low wattage because there was some concern about the power that's emanated from these antennas. Also we added in there that the antenna related equipment would be designed to supplement an existing service area by receiving and transmitting wireless communication signals. Again, that was a concern or question that came up at the public hearing at your last meeting, that these are not really intended to be, or serve the same function as a communication tower. These are sort of infill type of antennas that are supposed to serve and resolve capacity issues in more densely frequented places where people are often using their cell phones and using the cell phones to surf the internet, and those types of things. Also, I wanted to clarify that in the definition that the antenna and related equipment shall be affixed as an accessory use to a building or structure in accordance with provisions of the special regulations. So again, tying it back to that this is supposed to be an antenna attached to a building and it's not going to be a freestanding antenna. It's not supposed to be anywhere like a communication tower. And in the special provisions, again, clarifying that these antennas will not exceed 15 feet in height above the roof or eave line of the building. Also the antenna would not exceed 3 foot by 2 foot in size or exceed an output of 60 watts. Again, trying to get back to the Commission's concern, are these going to be small antennas, big antennas? And it's limiting in size and also scope. Also there was added language regarding stealth technology and camouflage techniques in order to try to make the antennas blend in to the building and be as visually unobtrusive as possible, also to... there's an additional provision in there specifying the applicant shall comply with all federal, state, and local codes and guidelines and that these accessory uses would be to all non-residential uses permitted within the applicable zoning categories. There was some concern, could someone put this on their house, and the answer would be no, based on these proposed changes. Some of the other questions that came up were dealing with safety. Staff did research and basically what we found is, these types of facilities are heavily regulated. The FCC, FDA they specifically regulate

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

different levels of safety. OSHA, they're involved in this. Also, we noted that some terminology from the world health organization indicates that they have not found anything adverse as far as cell phone usage to individuals' health. The results of the question about whether these antennas would be taxable and the county would receive some monetary benefit from their existence in the county, in consulting with the Commissioner of Revenue, yes they would be taxable, provided that the lease range arrangement has a value to it. And the value that would be taxable would be based the lease rate. So it's income related taxable value. And I'd be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for Mr. Harvey? If not, is there a motion to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, so moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, motion to recommend approval of proposed Ordinance O15-16, seconded by Mr. Gibbons. Further comment Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I think that based on the research that I did, it's an important technology and I think we certainly have to address it here in Stafford County. I applaud the staff for going the extra mile here and further looking into the issues and concerns that were raised by the Commission and making appropriate modifications to address those issues and concerns, so I support it.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Any further comments Mr. Gibbons? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion to recommend approval...

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Ms. McClendon: I'm sorry. Just for clarification purposes. This is the ordinance with the recommendations by staff shown in red?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Ms. McClendon: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Is there a different number to it though? Just to... Sorry I didn't...

Ms. McClendon: In the Planning Commission's packet it's not actually numbered as the ordinance.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. So, it's a motion to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance as presented by staff tonight, with the modifications. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I think I said it that way.

Mr. Rhodes: That's what I thought I had you say. Very good. Thank you, Ms. McClendon. All those in favor of the motion to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance as was presented by staff tonight signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Item number 9 has been deferred till... comes back up on May 27<sup>th</sup>. Therefore, we're now onto the two New Business items which are amendments that were forwarded to us to consider for authorizing for public hearing. So, item number 10 is the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, proposed Ordinance O15-20. Mr. Harvey.

9. COM15150549; 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 27, 2015) (History: Deferred on March 25, 2015 to April 22, 2015) (History: Deferred on April 22, 2015 to May 27, 2015)**

NEW BUSINESS

10. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O15-20 would amend the Subdivision Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sections 22-153, "Lots for required buffers;" 22-267, "Open space land regulations;" 22-270, "Review and approval of cluster subdivision plans;" and the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Section 28-82, "Required buffers" to clarify the design of the use for open space land in cluster designed subdivision. **(Time Limit: July 21, 2015)**  
**(Authorize for Public Hearing by: May 27, 2015)**  
**(Potential Public Hearing Date: June 24, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This item was referred to the Commission from the Board. We had worked with their Community and Economic Development Committee on this issue. On particular, the Board has been working somewhat in parallel tract to the Planning Commission. As you recall, the Commission has worked on Comprehensive Plan amendments that would give some guidance to the staff, as well as the development community, on preferred designs for cluster development. Specifically, giving the Board and the staff and the Planning Commission guidance with review to Conditional Use Permits where the cluster development may have bonus density. The Board was working on these proposed zoning and subdivision text amendments for similar but different purpose. When we looked at the Board's legislative agenda from last year, they felt that it was necessary to adjust some of the cluster regulations in the State Code. I made a presentation at the General Assembly building and to the Senate Cities, Counties, and Towns Committee and the feedback that they provided to us was that they felt that we had latitude within the current legislation to make some adjustments. So this ordinance amendment is an attempt to make those adjustments. In specific, it would basically say that buffer areas cannot be included within the required amount of open space. As you may recall, that was some of the questions that we had on a couple other cluster plans where there were small strips of

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

green space behind lots and/or buffers that were required by the code that were being counted towards the open space. So this code amendment would prohibit that, so it would not count towards the required open space. Buffers still would be required based on our other zoning constructs, but not be credited towards the open space requirement. Also, this would require the developer of a cluster development to specify the use of the open space and who is going to be the responsible party for that open space. In particular, the code defines what are permissible types of open space; in particular, agriculture, forestry. Also, for the purposes of better land development, it allows for Homeowner's Associations to own the open space. It also allows for individual property owners; for instance, if someone was going to farm it, they could have the open space. Or it could be owned by a conservation group. So, this proposed amendment would clarify those things and make the disposition of the common area more clear as to what's being proposed and also who it's going to. Further, it refers to if the open space has to comply with industry standards. The Board had some concern again about having potentially small pockets of open space that weren't necessarily meeting their feeling of the intent of the cluster regulations. In particular, dealing with the industry standards, in the County we have the land use tax program that says if you're in forestry use you have to have at least 20 acres. So, we would apply that standard to a cluster type development. Similarly, if you're in active tilling and agriculture, you have to have a minimum of 5 acres, so we would also use that as a standard. If there's any other industry standard for conservation areas, we would refer to that and apply that as we review these types of plans. Staff would recommend that the Commission consider authorizing this for a public hearing tonight. We note that...

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I move that.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to recommend... motion to authorize for public hearing by Mr. Gibbons, seconded by Mr. Coen. Further comment Mr. Gibbons? Mr. Coen?

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I just have a question for Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mrs. Bailey: Were you contacted by FABA? I understand the Builder's Association has some questions or concerns about the proposed ordinance and there might be some misinformation that's being put out out there. So, I had suggested through several different people that someone contact you.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mrs. Bailey, I had been contacted by members of the Builder's Association. In my correspondence with them, is that they had heard that the regulations were going to change with regard to densities of development. And these regulations do not affect density of development as per se. That's the only comment I heard specifically. I have not had a formal sit-down meeting with anyone on it.

Mrs. Bailey: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other further discussion?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this matter going to a public hearing and hopefully getting to the finish line after the many months that we have been chatting about this.

Mr. Rhodes: Isn't this the Apicella Ordinance?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I don't know if I'd go that far, but I think it will hopefully drive a much needed improvement in the way that bonus density is provided for cluster subdivisions.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any other comments? All those in favor of the motion to authorize this for public... authorize proposed Ordinance O15-20 as presented tonight for public hearing signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. We're onto item number 11, the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, proposed Ordinance O15-24. Mr. Harvey.

11. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O15-24 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sections 28-25, "Definitions of Specific Terms", 28-39, "Special Regulations", 28-56 "Application for planned developments" and 28-137, "Types of signs permitted in P-TND districts". The amendment would define principal building, secondary building and street screen applicable to P-TND zoning districts, clarify technical changes to regulating plans and neighborhood design standards for redevelopment projects, and allow business signs in the P-TND zoning district. **(Time Limit: July 4, 2015)**  
**(Authorize for Public Hearing by: May 27, 2015)**  
**(Potential Public Hearing Date: June 24, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This item was referred to the Commission from the Board of Supervisors. I'll note that it has an expedited due back date. They've given the Commission 60 days for its consideration. This amendment would make some adjustments to our P-TND zoning district. As you recall, we have one such existing project in the County that has this zoning classification on it; it's Aquia Town Center. As you've seen from your last meeting, we had a public hearing on another project that proposed a P-TND zone and at your next meeting we'll have a third project proposing a P-TND zone. In those discussions with those applicants and the owners of Aquia Town Center, it's been noted that the requirements in the P-TND zone are intended to be a higher density urban form of development which, since the zone was established in 2008, no one's been able to move forward with a successful project. They've stated that the projects need to be more suburbanized but still stay mixed use. So there are a number of changes that are being proposed that would help go towards that direction. The amendment would define what a principal building is; also what a secondary building is. And that relates to a number of the regulations as far as location of the buildings in relation to the street, in relation to one another, and other requirements within the various transect zones of the TND District. Also, it would define what a street screen is. Currently, in the P-TND zone, if you have a principal building, your parking lot, if it is along the principal street, has to have a street screen. Well, the code doesn't say what a street screen is currently, and the staff's interpretation is well if it's screening, that

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

means it's not visible. And there's some concerns about how that would look on a practical sense by having a large wall or a large hedgerow along a main street within a project. So the proposal would further clarify that it could be a smaller hedgerow or some other landscaped area to help break up the visual view, but still allow people to see that it's a parking lot. Also, it would delete the street screening requirement in the S-DC Transect Zone. The S-DC Transect Zone is the highest intensity transect zone of the urban core for this district which, in a lot of regards, makes sense because it's supposed to be an area that's highly walkable, highly dense, and this would be... the existing street screen would actually create a barrier between the parking area and the sidewalk. Also, the amendment would give the Director the ability to grant technical modifications for transect zones. There are some technical modifications allowed in the code today, but with regard to transect zones you can only do boundary line adjustments; you can't move transect zone to another part of the property unless you go back through a proffer amendment process. So this would allow for an administrative change rather than an actual zoning amendment change. Also, there would be changes for the bulk regulations for redevelopment projects; specifically, building the height to street ratios, setbacks, and those types of things. So a proponent in a redevelopment project could ask for administrative relief rather than have to go through a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals. And for redevelopment projects that would apply to Aquia Town Center. And one of the things that they've experienced is with Aquia Town Center, you currently have a number of existing buildings and you're going to try to impose somewhat of an urban form of development adjacent to those buildings. Well, the existing office building in that area would not meet some of the requirements as far as height of the building in relation to the street and setback and those types of things without having to relocate the existing street within the project. So this would allow some more technical modifications as the plans further develop for that project. Also was brought to staff's attention that the current regulations for the P-TND zone allow for wall signs on buildings. It also allows for essentially a project sign for the overall development, but it doesn't allow for any other freestanding signs. And if we go with this more suburban style of mixed use project, you would typically see in those types of settings where there may be freestanding signs for individual large users or multiple signs for different parts of the project. So this would allow a business sign in this zone similar in size and nature to what you see in our commercial zones. And I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have about the particulars.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for Mr. Harvey. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: You may not have this readily available, but I wanted to make sure that the public understood, if not the Planning Commission, that there have been several P-TND proposals since 2007 and just the 4 years I've been here, I've had to adjudicate several of them. So, even though only one has been approved, there's certainly been an interest in pursuing these kind of projects, irrespective of the requested changes. Is that correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, that's correct Mr. Apicella. If I remember right, we had the Oakenwold project which was not successful ultimately but it proposed a TND zone. And we had some of the same kind of issues with them as far as them trying to lay out their project and the parameters of it. We had George Washington Village which the Planning Commission recently made a recommendation on and that was also a proposed P-TND zone.

Mr. Apicella: So, aside from the applicants in the queue or considering being in the queue, I'm still trying to understand what the... I'm sorry... I'm still trying to get clear on what the catalyst is for these changes. And, more importantly, how these changes would deviate from the current P-TND construct.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Well, the primary catalyst has been Aquia Town Center in the effort to redevelop the town center and deal with the zoning construct. Based on the current zoning construct in the County, our R-3 zone only allows 7 units per acre for multi-family, whereas our TND zone or UD zone allow for higher density. So, there's no way for the Aquia Town Center to unbundle its current zoning scheme. And in talking to perspective project developers for that property, they've noted that again the more urban dense form of development doesn't have a market in this part of the County yet. So for that project to move forward and be successful, they felt that it was necessary to have changes that could allow more suburban style mixed use development rather than this dense urban mixed use development.

Mr. Apicella: So, it may not necessarily have a market today, but it could have a market 5 years from now, 10 years from now. My concern is, does this materially change the desired outcomes that the County had hoped for when it established the P-TND construct 8 years ago?

Mr. Harvey: It will have some change to it. The most significant change will be for the redevelopment projects, because it will give them a lot more flexibility in how they can vary the code. Whereas, the non-redevelopment projects would still have to adhere to the code as it's written, with the exception of being able to be more flexible with its transect zone location.

Mr. Apicella: I guess following along the same line of inquiry, is there another way to achieve this without throwing the baby out with the bath water? You know, we have several business categories, B-1, B-2, B-3; could we not also consider as an alternative a P-TND-1, a P-TND-2? Again, I think there's some good stuff in the P-TND ordinances that exist now. I'm just concerned that, number one, trying to make changes because a specific applicant wants or needs it when the County at-large might have a different interest, and, more importantly, I'm concerned about any unintended consequences or in long term, again, not achieving what we had hoped. One of those things that was pointed out in the staff report, again, it might not be viable today to have business on the bottom and apartments, you know, up above, but that's still something we might want. And I'm not quite sure how these changes might impact that desired outcome in the future.

Mr. Rhodes: Just to clarify, obviously, if we did make a change, it wouldn't preclude us making a change the other direction later. But what I do want to confirm is, were we given any flexibility in this referral from the Board for modification of the text or language as it stands?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, no, there was no flexible language in this. If the Commission wanted to develop changes to it, you could forward a recommendation for a separate amendment.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I think Steven asked a good point though. The analysis of what it takes to make that a viable project, I'd like to have that so we can look at it. I mean, if it's only done on behalf of Aquia, I support because I think the County did right. But, I mean, if we can't make something that's generic for the County as a whole, and I know the lawyer is going to say you can't spot zone, you know, so you can't just take an action for one. But if we could have the background, Jeff, like you're talking about, what was the thought process that went into it and why did they come up with it, that would help.

Mr. Rhodes: Were those specifics provided to staff or to the County of their analysis of market conditions with and without modifications?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gibbons, I'm not aware of specific marketing information. I do know that we've had multiple discussions with the Economic Development department about what's being proposed at the center which some of it...

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, but Jeff, somebody gave advice to the Board that in order to make this viable, we had to make these changes. There was some methodology behind it, that's all I'm looking for.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Director of Economic Development has offered that if necessary, he would be willing to come and speak to the Commission in closed session.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Now, to meet the timelines, this would have to be advertised by... we'd have to vote to advertise this for public hearing by the 27<sup>th</sup>, right? By our next session?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: And then that would... that wouldn't get us in time to do the first session in June; that would mean we could do the public hearing the second session of June upon which we would have to act on the things; there would be no more meetings before our timeline ended.

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so we do have one session of flexibility but that puts us at a point where we would have to advertise then if we were going to have a public hearing before our recommendation was back.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Coen: And I'd be curious to see how this would have applied to other items. Because... and I understand I emailed you earlier in the week about doing it for the whole entire County for one specific project, and we sort of have to. But I'm curious, for example, in the transect zone, being able to be changed or moved. How would that have applied if the applicant had that much power that they could go and do it to you rather than going through us or some other mechanisms? What could the theory happen? Because I too am sort of concerned with the idea of doing it countywide when it's really geared towards one place, and then being used with unintended consequences. And so I just would like to see as we go forward how could it be applied.

Mr. Rhodes: So, if I understand this and haven't heard anybody say otherwise, there would be an interest in having Economic Development speak to us which they believe they'd need to do behind executive session... in a closed session at our next meeting, and then taking this item up for disposition at our next meeting? And then the other added point would be just if you could apply this to one of the other applications and tell us what the implications would be. Is that what I'm hearing? So, is that a motion then to defer this item to May 27<sup>th</sup> and have an opportunity to talk to Economic Development?

Mr. Apicella: So moved Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Apicella. Is there a second?

Mr. Coen: Second.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

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

Mr. Apicella: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? Everything good on that Jeff?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so all those in favor of the motion to defer this to May 27<sup>th</sup> for further discussion and have a discussion with Economic Development signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed? Passes 7-0; thank you all very much. And with that we're moving back as we had suggested before... oh, wait, wait, wait... okay, we're going to move back to item number 3 but we're going to start off our discussion of item number 3 with the Committee talking about the meeting on Monday.

3. *Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas and 5-Year Update - Continued*

Mr. Gibbons: Yes please.

Mr. Coen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes indeed, our sub-committee met again Monday. We basically, just to give some background, Mr. Hornung had given some information this evening, but after our last meeting of the full Commission, Mr. Hornung who's a former member of the Board of Supervisors and a former member of the Planning Commission, sort of sat back and took a bird's eye view at different things that had either been said by committee members, the public, information that had been provided by Mr. Gibbons, and etc. and sort of looked at this from a bird's eye view about what could be done. And he eluded to some of this previously, which he is passionate about, and it's really amazing. He did an excellent, thorough job of developing a concept and providing it to us. Staff was terrific. It's really great that we can sort of come up with an idea and the staff is so helpful and that's what the whole process is really supposed to be about. If you look at page 17 of his rendition that he gave us this evening, I think this sort of is the catalyst for a lot of his mindset was. That once the Airport Overlay District had been passed, he sort of, we looked at, we had touched on it as a Commission, but there were so many of our targeted growth areas that are underneath areas that are not

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

really where we intended to put residential, and the attitude being that... do something different. Also I think, and certainly I'm sure he'll give me a high sign or certain hand wave, that certain elements that came along with the idea that commercial was going to take care of everything, is sort of problematic and raises some questions, and so what he has developed is something, as he said this evening, to come up with a Central Stafford Business District, with the idea that this area around the airport would be developed as a business district for the County. And I think, Mr. Zuraf, you have the slide of what this would like, if you'd be kind enough. I didn't want to take your fun away from you, Mr. Chairman, saying...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: UDA.

Mr. Coen: There we go. Thank you. And I asked Mike if he'd be kind enough to put it so that the people can see it, but the sort of the attitude is that this general area would be a business zone, a district, as it were... with the idea of making it, you know, we've said and we have signs that say Stafford is a business friendly community, and so to follow that through with a construct of that, he looked into sort of an example of what was done in Huntsville, Alabama, which is also in your package as well. I think we sent this to everybody, and they did sort of the same thing. They picked this designated area, that's where we want to put business and that's what we want to do, sort of as a planning construct. Certainly there were various issues that would permeate from this. Obviously the water, sewer, and electronic infrastructure to some of that area already, but extending it would also... would need to be considered and done. Certainly a large concern is the number of units. Under our TGA... I just love saying TGAs... under our TGAs we have designated, as Mr. Zuraf showed us this evening, certain areas... bless you... for residential in this area, and if we were to take certain areas out of that, then the question would be, what do we do with those residences. There's certainly two views. One view expressed by many people, that's it's sort of like a balloon, that if you take it out of one area it has to go somewhere, so either we have to go up in the remaining or create new TGAs, or do something. Mr. Hornung expressed tonight the attitude of, well, quite honestly, if we don't build it, that will just go to Spotsylvania and, you know, they seem to want them. So the... but that's certainly a construct that would need to be looked at, of what do you do. Staff certainly has a view point that we should plan for the homes, or the residences and the people that we anticipate based on our, and we've done this for a while now, looked at different computations of what's going to come. There is another viewpoint that says, no, maybe not. Another issue that would need to be looked at is what businesses are we talking about. Are we talking about biotech, tourism, other medical... what? And I believe, Mr. Harvey, correct me if I'm wrong, but Economic Development is supposed to be coming before us at some point with some plans or viewpoints to sort of, not so much tied to this, but timing wise it seems to be rather good.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Coen. The Economic Development Department has been working with a consultant to update the Economic Development Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan was last adopted in 2006. That plan will be coming to the Commission shortly to be amended as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Economic Development Strategic Plan lays out some groundwork as to marketing strategies and targeted industries for the future.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. Awesome.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. English: Has the Economic Development gotten a copy of this. Did they get a copy of this?

Mr. Harvey: Not yet, Mr. English.

Mr. Rhodes: The comments are that it has not been given to anyone else. Just waiting for an opportunity for Planning Commission members to be able to see the information.

Mr. Coen: And then another... the last couple of issues would be, and Mr. Hornung really... the plan is very comprehensive and thought out, what type of incentives would be proposed to those who are in this area, that we would like to have for business, that they would not just rush to do 3 acre lots and etc. but be enticed to do this type of plan. So it's not just gee, this would be nice. There is a whole thought process of how do we make this happen. Again, it would take numerous years, decades, to really come to fruition. And then the last one is that this would logically have to be put into the Comp Plan. The sub-committee discussed there's basically two ways to go about this. Certain elements of this technically would fit under the 10 elements or some thereof that Mr. Zuraf brought forward to us tonight, and so we could have sort of said, well this A, F, G, Z can fit into so let's slide it into the Comp Plan now. The other avenue to take would be, since we're going to ask the Board of Supervisors for... give them a list, and one of which was the... doing the CIP for 20 years, add that to our list. To say, we would like to look at this construct. We would like to really view it and pursuit this and sort of build a team effort on this rather than just do it piecemeal. And the sub-committee unanimously felt that it should really come to this body, ask this body how they felt, but that our feeling was that... add it to the list of things to ask the Supervisors for us to look into. So that way they can say if they like the idea, and then we form another sub-committee or we draft the same people, and we look into this to see how we could make this happen, if this is a desired effect of it. And so that's sort of where we are. I think that's, unless Mr. Gibbons or Mrs. Bailey would like to add anything, or Mr. Harvey, if you think I missed anything, but I think I summarized it alright. I mean it's, quite honestly and I'll just do this from a personal point of view, I think it sort of wraps our head around something that we have been dancing around, of trying to diversify our economy here and do something and I just think it's... maybe it took somebody involved in the airport to have a higher view and to look down on us, but to sort of pull it together. So with that, I'll just throw that out for any discussion or what not.

Mr. Rhodes: I will just submit that I do think that the degree to which the Planning Commissioners believe there's merit here for further consideration that the best way to proceed would be to raise awareness of it to the Board via our transmittal and allow them to give a reaction to it as we go forward. I would just disqualify an aspect of it, I don't believe that because you plan, then you get growth. The growth came in earlier years when we hadn't planned. It's something you got to face, so you want to plan for the growth. We can do it all by-right and have it be massive impact on our infrastructure and complications, or we can try and plan as deliberately as possible to try and mitigate to the greatest degree possible the impact on the infrastructure, but I don't think that because we plan and have a concept, that that's what brings the growth down. So it's important to consider all these elements and factors in there and so I think there is a lot of merit to the consideration of the items here. I just think that would be one element of clarity. The only other element I just highlight since I've moved to Stafford twice now, and it wasn't that I came here and went, darn it, there are no jobs here, I'm now going to have to go north. I moved here with my job north because this is where I wanted to live and I would submit, most every neighbor I know that has moved in has moved in all with that dynamic. They were already working up north but this is where they chose to live so I think we're going to face a lot of that because of the range of what's in this geographic area.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, please.

Mr. Apicella: I believe that Mr. Hornung has presented what I think is a much needed vision as a potential alternative to residential development around the airport. I think we, as my boss used to say, reserve the right to get smarter as we move along. The Comp Plan was developed, you know, 5 years ago plus. Since that time we've come up with an airport land use compatibility plan. I think that's going to help guide decisions in the future. That being said, the airport is clearly an asset in my view, and I'll say the word, sub-optimized asset. And I think, whether it's this plan or some other plan, about an alternative approach to the best utilization of this unutilized asset would be helpful to everybody. The Board, the public, the development community, businesses. So I would almost take it a step further that this product that Mr. Hornung has graciously put together could help further inform what I think is really needed here and maybe coincides with what the EDA is doing, and hopefully championed by the Board of Supervisors which will be a strategic plan for the airport and its invariance. I think it's sorely lacking, again, how this unique asset, it may not be where the airport wants it in terms of operations today, but our goal is to look long term. Once it gets plowed over and there are houses there, that's going to be what it's going to be for whatever period of time. We'll lose the other opportunities that might occur. For better or worse, it's in the center of the county. To me that makes sense. It's near the interstate and Route 1. At least the plan today was for there to be industrial business uses around that area. I think there had been competing proposals to put residential development there and we're further recommending even more residential in that area, which, I don't often ascribe to the notion of best and highest use, because that's something that is a collaborative view, but in this case I think I really do have to look at what's the best use for that area. We can put houses anywhere in Stafford County, but there's not a lot of places that kind of mirror what we have at the airport. We talked about offline, individually amongst ourselves, you know, another, I call it STAR, Stafford Technology and Research Center in the center part of the county, or a contractor focused community in that area. We don't have opportunities like that to have a conglomerated business center around Stafford County, because that landmass just doesn't exist elsewhere. So I think it's a potential opportunity loss and it deserves further research. And I apologize for going on and on, but I feel so strongly about this in larger context of how much commercial development that we're going to be losing as a result of the revised comp plan if it's proceeds forward, but in particular this area, which I think is a great spot for business and industry use, and I think it needs a vision. It needs some guiding principles, a small area plan, whatever. We just don't have that yet, and I think if folks saw what opportunities might exist, they might change their view of how that area should be developed in the future, not for residential use, but potential for I call it business use. I'm not talking about retail use. I'm talking about business use. So, I'll get of that soap box. I do have some other thoughts about the Comp Plan that I hope to share with the committee. Some tweaks that I think we might want to talk about before we push forward. But just in terms of Mr. Hornung's proposal, I just wanted to address it.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a couple of brief comments. I certainly want to thank Mr. Hornung for the time and the energy and the effort that you put into coming up with the proposition for the proposal of a Stafford County Business Center. I do strongly feel that there is a little bit of a disconnect. I don't know how we go about trying to bridge that gap, but I think this is a good conversation piece to bridge that gap between the need for commercial, industrial, business to go alongside the housing that is needed here in the County. I do have some concerns though that, you know, because if we take a look at bringing more businesses here, or bringing more industry here so that we can create jobs for those people who live here, I do strongly feel that those job opportunities will be for those people who will move into the County as well. Because I don't think that everyone that lives here will fit the profile for some of those jobs that will need to be filled. So I don't know that this will take care of our transportation issues. As a matter of fact I think that if we had a business center in the

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

center of the County, then we have employees that live in Stafford, they're all going to segue over to one area. So that will cause us to have to take a stronger look at our transportation issues and still on resolving those. I'm not so sure that it will take care of school issues either. Because as you have more businesses and you bring more people into the County, certainly they're going to bring children with them. But I do appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion and to analyze it. Take a good look at it because we definitely do need to figure out what is the best recipe for our county and how we can better utilize the airport that we have, that's currently under-utilized, and take a look at the tax basis and bring more balance to that. So thank you very much.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Any other comments on this aspect?

Mr. English: I'm just going to make mine real short. Mr. Hornung, thank you so much for this. I think this is long overdue and I'm sorry I couldn't make your presentation on Monday night, but I think this is a good concept and I think this is what the county needs, but I really, really appreciate what you've done.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: One last thing, and I too want to applaud you again and I agree we need to plan for growth. One of my big things is that you don't plan for just the 20 years, that we should be thinking further out and thinking of when the roads are going to be expanded, Route 1, 17, Courthouse, etc. You that now that in 50 years, 60 years they're going to have to go to an additional lane, so we should be thinking that way. However, what I think is long term planning and what may be planning may not be where the County is. The County needs to plan for growth. I think Mr. Gibbons has been really strong about we need to know what we can afford and how we're going to do it. I think that, as Mr. Gibbons also... sorry I keep taking words out of your mouth... but he continues pointing out, and anybody who knows this area knows that our continued reliance on defense jobs is difficult with the sequester and the way that things are going and other situations with the military, and there may well be hordes of jobs up in D.C. now, and those tied to it, but we don't have a guarantee that that's going to be the case and we run the risk, as I said, when we were dealing with George Washington Village of being almost a factory town. And when that factory closes down we have nothing, and so I think this is forward thinking that we can say, we need to have other things in our basket, other than just the defense jobs. And then we can, I think Mrs. Bailey is correct, we need to plan for the infrastructure, we need to plan for the growth, we need to make sure that the developers and whatnots are paying full proffers to pay for that and to deal with that as part of this whole construct. But I think the elements of trying to do this is something well worth to get off the launching pad and to see where we can go from it. And I just... I hope that we take it and send it to the Board to try to get their input.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other comments on this aspect of the discussion? Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Is it the feeling of the Board that we could add this on as a recommendation going forward?

Mr. Rhodes: I get a sense that the interest is as we would comment and highlight to the Board in a transmittal about the 11<sup>th</sup> through the 20<sup>th</sup> year and looking at the costs of growth that we would also comment and reinforce the proposal was presented to us on a Central Stafford Business District for their consideration and opinion back to the Planning Commission on how we proceed to include highlighting the fact that we have addressed the Airport Compatibility Plan as well, and those are all dynamics I think we'd want to highlight to them going forward.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Again, Mr. Chairman, I applaud the work that Mr. Hornung has done. I still think that the broader recommendation, again, is to consider a strategic plan focused on...

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, but this could be a catalyst...

Mr. Apicella: I agree. Along the lines of, but, again, with all due respect to Mr. Hornung, there may be other scenarios, approaches, information that the Board and the EDA and Airport Authority, and other stakeholders might want to, you know, coalesce around. So it's not... it's a great product but it's not the be all and end all, because we don't know yet.

Mr. Gibbons: I didn't say that, but I just wanted to get the feeling of the Commission that we forward it at least to the Board and let the Board decide.

Mr. Coen: And I would sort of say, but we sort of have three things on our list to ask the Board to allow us to look into. One is the CIP for 20 years, one would be the CSBD, and then the third one would be a strategic plan for the airport. I think those two may be tied, but I think Mr. Apicella's point is accurate that there really hasn't been a mindset of what is our strategic plan for that. It may well tie in to this other construct, but it shouldn't be just be ignored.

Mr. Rhodes: Just a nuance on that just to confirm and clarify, I don't know that it's specifically requesting that they refer all those items back to us independently to do, but it's to reinforce the critically of the need from a planning perspective to address those items and areas. The 11 through 20 year could just be an element that they work with the Commissioner of Revenue and others, and the Planning Department to get those projections so they have that visibility looking forward and the implications of that. The airport plan they could refer to others. Yeah, okay, got you.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright, we got more to do on this, but there were other items... if you could please, just so it's on the mic for all four people and Tom's mom who is watching...

Mr. Hornung: I want to thank you all for this. I cut my teeth where you are. I began as a member of the Planning Commission and when I got on the Board the County was in such financial disaster. I mean, it really was. I don't know if you realize it, but back then in 1982 we were on the verge of being the first political jurisdiction in the Commonwealth of Virginia since the Civil War to have to declared bankruptcy. We had to go to the Governor to get the bank to make an extension, because they hadn't been paid, and they were calling. I mean, it just goes on and on. This was sort of a whole growth out of this and I just wanted to tell you all, I appreciate that, and it's really not so much, you know, as mentioned about the airport, but the whole issue of what the County needs to do and go forward is basically what's pushing this. I love the County here. I been here for a long time, plan to die here, and I appreciate the work that you've done and I'm impressed with this body. I really am. I can't tell you. Bob and I go way back with the Planning Commission and everything else. I anticipation of you might doing something about this tonight, I brought seven copies for the Board members and an extra copy for the Economic Development Office of the proposal, so if you pass something on to them, they have the same copies you have. I'm going to say good night and thank you very much; appreciate it. Take care.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, Mr. Coen... excuse... Mr. Apicella, you had mentioned you had some other items you wanted to raise?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Yes sir, so looking at our orange binder, I found some I call them anomalies. So on page 19, this is kind of my personal view, but in terms of the preparation for the plan, I thought there was a great deal of information in our staff report that truly reflected the level of effort that went to, at least the TGA that kind of fed this. It's really not captured here. So I don't think the public truly understands the amount of time and effort that went into this revision of the Comp Plan, and I would just ask that some consideration be given to really giving some greater specificity to the amount of work that went into this. Not just in terms of the sub-committee but we've been talking about this for years, and I just, I don't see it, kind of, reflected in the description here. I saw it in the staff report, but I didn't see it in 1.7. And somebody picking this up for the first time might think that there was sort of some De Minimis effort to just kind of make minor tweaks, and that, I don't think that's the case. I mean, we talked about a lot of concepts and constructs, went back and forth with the Board, got one set of guidance, got revised guidance, got a third set of revised guidance. I'm not saying we get to that level of specificity, but there was a lot of interaction back and forth solicited input from the public, from the business community. I just don't feel like it fully captures the amount of effort that went into this. so that's kind of a broad comment, and I don't have specific words here, but may the staff, if it winds up getting deferred, can think about... I mean it doesn't change the policy, it just kind gives some greater meat on how we got to where we are in revising this document.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Sort of along those lines on page 1-11, where it talks about in 2012 the BOS started this process, and after soliciting input from... I think we solicited input from the public. I don't see that word there. I think the public needs to be added before we talk about soliciting from members of the land development community, real estate, yada, yada, yada. So just those two words "the public". I'm not sure if Mike sort of covered this, but in several places...

Mr. Rhodes: I would submit that that latter point is not a substantive change and we can certainly and we can certainly vote to add that in to what we had before, before we would recommend it forward.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Are we going to do it one by one?

Mr. Rhodes: I don't... usually that's preferred, unless we can figure out how to capture them all and verbalize them in a motion. So I think we're universal, at least in this one on the page 1-11, that word states in the second paragraph that's listed on the page near the end of that first sentence where it talks about, actually the end of the second sentence, after soliciting input from "the public", members of the land development community, real estate, and after that... but it's putting in "the public" in between "from" and "members". Correct? Okay. So for the record, that's part of any motion we make on this thing here, right? Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Looking at pages 3-2 and 3-3, and Mike may have covered this, but it's not in the document that was put on the website, so I'm not sure folks understand we're picking on of these maps, not both of these maps. Figure 3-1 and figure 3-1. It's on or the other.

Mr. Rhodes: It would be the second, because that's the new standard.

Mr. Apicella: I understand, but I'm just saying, right now, without having it x'd out, it looks like there is two figure 1s and I found that in several places. I just want to clarify that some of these figures that are duplicated twice are going to be removed in the final product.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: They'll all be with the ones with the banner at the top of the page. That's our understanding.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, and from a technical side we had a problem trying to x-out the map electronically.

Mr. Rhodes: So for clarity for the record on the motion, it would be, in cases where there are duplicate maps, it'll be the map that has the banner across the top of the page. That is the new standard for Stafford County.

Mr. Gibbons: Why couldn't you use the word "replaced"? You know how you have a draft on the documents so everybody knows it's a draft? Some term that says...

Mr. Apicella: I just want to be clear we're giving staff the leeway to make those changes if we were to move forward tonight. On page 3-4 in the second paragraph...

Mr. Rhodes: And I think everyone agrees with that, so...

Mr. Apicella: What is going to go there? No, no, no, no. On page 3-4.

Mr. Coen: Okay, now I'm on 3-4.

Mr. Apicella: My fault. Under 3.2, basis for the plan, well I guess it's now the first paragraph, it goes dot, dot, dot. So I'm not clear what goes there.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Harvey, Mike? Can you clarify what will follow? Page 3-4, first inserted paragraph under section 3.2. The paragraph ends with infrastructure and services and... Okay. So any motion we would make on this is with the understanding that the staff will finish that section on talking about the basis of the plan.

Mr. Apicella: I would hope so.

Mr. Rhodes: And we will give them latitude and have confidence to appropriately...

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that we just end the paragraph... end the sentence at "services."

Mr. Rhodes: At "services"? Okay, and you're comfortable with that then?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so it'll be with understanding we're having a period after "services". Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I somehow ended up with two page 3-15s. So on my first page 3-15, where it says "targeted growth areas" about the... after the first third of the document.

Mr. Rhodes: That's my second 3-15.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I think that the Board says targeted growth areas are areas of the County where a... I think it should say potential... concentrated urban or suburban development pattern is most

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

appropriate. Because otherwise it implies it will happen, in my view. After the “a” and before the word “concentrated”, I would put the word “potential”.

Mr. Rhodes: I would just submit “is most appropriate” does tend to qualify it from not being an absolute... not disagreeing with you, but...

Mr. Apicella: Well, my concern is, someone could say, as these get disapproved, that you said that a TGA was appropriate, but you denied it. So just kind of a further clarifier that there’s no guarantee that at the end of the day the TGA is going to come to fruition.

Mr. Rhodes: Does anybody have a problem with “potential”? There you go. That is part of the record copy.

Mr. Apicella: Sorry to be petty. Where it says the suburban form of development should provide the same benefits as an urban development, but will have an appearance and form similar to the established suburban communities only... I think it should say at somewhat higher density. I don’t think suburban is intended to be at the same level of density as urban development. In fact the policy says otherwise.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so what was the word again?

Mr. Apicella: Only at “somewhat” higher density, or a word similar to “somewhat” for context.

Mr. Rhodes: Any concern with that, Mr. Harvey and Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Harvey: No, Sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, we’re going to call it “somewhat” instead of “a”, alright? On 3-15, on the narrative 3-15, not the map 3-15.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, on page 3-16 where it says, it’s close to the bottom part of the page.

Mr. Rhodes: Blue ink?

Mr. Apicella: This equates to half of the projected growth over the 20-year planning horizon, I think it would be helpful to the reader to know what that number is. I know you can find it elsewhere in the document, but I think it would be helpful to the reader to know what overall population we’re talking about.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so instead of... in addition to it saying 15,873 units to... okay.

Mr. Apicella: Half of the projected x number of growth in 20 years.

Mr. Rhodes: After the projected 87,000 person population projected over 20 years.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Rhodes: So it would be “this equates to half of the projected 87,000, or whatever that number is, I think it’s about 87,000, projected 87,000 population growth over the 20-year planning horizon, or whatever that actual number is.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I think what it really needs to say is, this provides half of the housing units for the 87-whatever.

Mr. Rhodes: Well it says 15,873 new residential units, and then it goes on to, that number equates to half of the projected 87,000 person growth.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, it doesn't sound right to me, but I can live with that.

Mr. Coen: Change it from this to that number?

Mr. Rhodes: This requires the creation of one or more TGAs within the Comprehensive Plan that provide for construction of approximately 15,873 new residential units. This equates to half of the projected 87,000, or whatever that number is, population growth.

Mr. Apicella: It's the "equates" part that doesn't sound quite right.

Mr. Rhodes: This should support half of the projected 87,000 person population growth over the 20-year planning horizon. This should support half of the projected 87,000, or whatever the appropriate number is, population growth over the 20-year planning horizon. Everybody okay with that? Okay. I'm going to say they are. Okay, Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Page 3-19, second paragraph. It says "if a TDR program is adopted". I believe we have finally adopted a TDR program.

Mr. Rhodes: Where is that? What page?

Mr. Apicella: Page 3-19, second paragraph.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Oh "if they", okay, got you. So TGAs...development right from properties outside the TGAs for the adopted TDR program? Or for the TDR program? Furthermore, up to an estimated 1,490 dwelling units could be made possible by transfer of development rights from properties outside the TGAs as part of the TDR program. Is everybody okay with that? As part of the TDR program, period. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: On page 3-21, again, it may just have been an issue of not being able to cross it out, but you got two tables, the old table and the new table. So the old table needs to be removed.

Mr. Rhodes: Right. There is no old table. I do not see it there. Okay. Right now there is only one thing that we are not changing that we're understanding staff will if they get the opportunity, and that is the one on 1-7, which is a little greater clarity and fidelity on the preparation of the plan. All the rest we have verbalized and generally agreed to edits on those.

Mr. Apicella: So this last point was, I want to say a little controversial last time and it will probably be the same this time. I'm on page, well, 3-34. We've given an inventory of infrastructure requirements. We... it hasn't been modified despite the fact that we've added another 1,000 units for the George Washington Village TGA. So saying that we only need, still, one elementary school and one middle school is a little disconcerting to me. I know your point was overall. You know, we've kind of moved the chess pieces around and that's true, but the bottom line number has still changed by about 1,200 units across the county. I could argue that they're here.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Harvey, if we accept and ask staff to, even after we move this forward, would you all be able to correct some of these numbers here as to what they currently are with... just ensure that there is a linkage between what we put into the TGA from a number of units compared to what is on there, and where necessary, make those modifications.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we can do that if the Commission wants the TGAs be self-contained. In the past they weren't self-contained necessarily. They were incorporating a lot of overall commercial within the county, but not necessarily all the commercial. Mr. Zuraf can add to that.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I know in some the consideration for George Washington Village there's the estimate of how much for high school, and it was a percentage, so, you know, you don't have a full high school and what do we do with that.

Mr. Apicella: But here is the point. We were looking at a 3,000 unit subdivision, okay? That number is 2,000 below the number right now, and at that number of 3,000 we needed 1 and a half elementary schools... this is per the schools. I consider them to be expert.

Mr. Rhodes: If we want them to... where we are identifying TGAs and we are identifying a number of units and we want them to try and show the implications of that, as Mr. Harvey said, and as a self-contained unit we'd like to make sure that they ensure the correlation of the... via regular planning criteria, the correct numbers that are associated here, would be the request. And now, just to clarify, is it that we just want them to leave it the whole number so until it gets to the next whole number, they put that number up there? I mean, by that math you would come out to 2.25 elementary schools. I think we leave it... these are not perfected numbers. Just so they have clarity, I think you just leave it whole numbers, wouldn't we?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that would be preferable. Also I want to point out too, staff did not take liberal license with this. From the standpoint of now the airport compatibility plan, which is not yet adopted, but is under consideration, recommends there be no schools in this area.

Mr. Rhodes: Right, so that would... so if that were adopted, that has other implications.

Mr. Apicella: This doesn't necessarily mean that just because you build 5,000 units in the George Washington... because part of the construct we had with the George Washington Village proposal is that schools might be moved outside of George Washington Village. It still... if we build to this number, we know that we need x number of schools.

Mr. Rhodes: Right now I've heard no objection though, that part of our recommendation on this would include asking staff that the correlation between the projected numbers of units to be by their planning numbers, updating the numbers that are listed below it on the sections for the TGAs. Right? Okay.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, if I can get clarification.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Harvey: We're going to change the way we have it reported here, because right now the UDA construct and the TGA construct says, you're going to have so many houses, so much business potential and you're going to provide, in this area x schools, x fire stations, so we're going to go away from the x

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

schools, x fire stations and say that it would create a demand for rather than it will be provided in that physical area.

Mr. Apicella: That's not what I'm saying.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, we... okay.

Mr. Apicella: The issue of where it gets sided would have to be addressed. So if it falls under the airport zone...

Mr. Rhodes: He just said it creates a demand for. He didn't say where it was sided.

Mr. Apicella: Well I think he was... the way I heard it though was that we're somehow absolving the developer of some responsibility to help offset the cost. That's not what I'm suggesting. The bottom line of what I'm suggesting is, these numbers have changed. The numbers of residential numbers have changed, I'm sorry to belabor the point, but the amount of infrastructure has not changed and in this case it's a significant change. So it's not reflective of the change that occurred in residential units. And I'm sorry to also belabor this point, but I feel like I have to, I didn't get a chance to finish it. We had a very concrete proposal via an applicant, we ran that by the schools, they told us what those numbers of units would result in in terms of infrastructure requirements, and that's... what I'm saying is, what we have here, what we have in the original still doesn't comport with the requirement. So for 3,000, one more time, I'm sorry, I feel like I have to say this because it's very important, at least from my vantage point, at 3,000 units we needed one and a half elementary schools, .75 of middle school, and half a high school. I realize we can't put that in here. That won't make sense, but I'm saying, we're still in the original version. We're smarter today than we were 5 years ago. We undercut the amount of infrastructure we need and so maybe you're saying under the new construct they would completely revisit how many schools we would need. I'm suggesting that's exactly what we need to do. Because we know that 5,000 is going to be way more...

Mr. Rhodes: I'm not sure what you're fighting for, because we all agree that we need to update the numbers to reflect...

Mr. Apicella: I think they need to be accurate, as accurate as we can get it.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't think is asking for them to be inaccurate. I mean, I'm not sure...

Mr. Apicella: What I'm trying to say is, before, they weren't accurate.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know that they weren't. A 3,000 unit... if it wasn't a whole number, I don't know that by our planning criteria at the time we did it before, that it was a 1.8. Now if we wanted to put .8 elementary schools, that's certainly inaccurate than by saying 1, but I don't know that the 1 was necessarily wrong. But now that we've added another almost 1,000 units to it, and now that we have a little bit of update on some of the school student numbers, if it gets above 2, it should certainly say 2, I agree.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I just want to make sure we're on the same page.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I think that's what we're trying to do. That said, Mr. Harvey was trying to make sure he gets the context right as we are giving them the direction to please make sure to correlate those

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

numbers based on the current planning criteria to the facility needs and now there was a little different question. It wasn't going back to challenging doing that, but a little different question making sure he gets the context right for how he represents it.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, and Mr. Chairman, just for me to understand, it's that the current plan doesn't necessarily have self-contained UDAs, or self-contained TGAs, so it doesn't necessarily in the current plan identify that you're going to need all the public facilities build in that TGA to serve that area. It says, in this area we think we want a 500 acre park, or we want 2 schools, or we want a fire station. It doesn't necessarily...

Mr. Rhodes: It's not a specific calculation of the population.

Mr. Harvey: ... the demand that's generated by that area.

Mr. Rhodes: In the existing Comp Plan?

Mr. Harvey: So do we still want to have those locational items identified? At minimum we'd like to see these types of public facilities here in this quantity, but we know it's going to generate the need for that plus. Is that how we want to report it?

Mr. Rhodes: I think what I'm hearing is the desire to have our representation of what we'd like to see there be what is the demand that's generated by the population increase of the TGA.

Mr. Harvey: For them to be self-contained then?

Mr. Rhodes: What we say we'd like to see there be based on that perspective of what the increased population would require.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. That helps.

Mr. Coen: I think the concern was that the one that came in, they kept saying, well your plan says one elementary, that's all we have to do. And so I think what Mr. Apicella to a certain degree is trying to get us out of is the mindset that because it says a number in the comp plan then the applicant doesn't have to do what is really necessary. And then lastly, I don't know, is it possible to put something in there that talks about current computations of numbers rather than putting it as a fixed number so that if, I mean I know we update it every 5 years, but if in 3 years, or 4 years the school system updates how they compute what those 3,000 units will kick out... would we have to adopt the plan to change the numbers?

Mr. Rhodes: Do you have in the background what your calculations are based on or what the estimated demand is based on.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, in the appendix of the plan it gives the background calculations. And again, as we described previously, we did not change the methodology because our proffer guidelines have not been updated, so we've used the county wide numbers rather than the new student numbers and things of that nature. So, again, we kept the rationale for public facilities the same in the overall appendix which projects out over the 20 years based on the growth what we'd like, we need.

Mr. Apicella: I guess I wonder if it would be helpful to the Board of Supervisors, and give them a chance to make the final call about the portions thereof. Because if it's 1.9 versus, you know, 1.1, that's

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

important to know the difference. And I think that might, again, help everybody. To just go down to the lowest common denominator might create false information going forward. Just as a starting point. They can decide they want to take 1.9 and move it to 2, or take 1.1 and move it to 1. I just think it's important information.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Do we want to, as staff updates those numbers to correlate to the modified residential units in each TGA to reflect that our desires for those areas are equal to the amount of demand or requirement that they generate. So we want that to include a single tenth decimal point, at least as far as schools are concerned? That's what I heard Mr. Apicella suggesting. Is everybody good with that? Okay. Any other items? Mr. Apicella or any other member? Okay. So we had discussion there and nobody objected to some specific modifications to what was in front of us on the Comprehensive Plan. We also had a suggestion there and nobody opined differently that we would ask staff to at least keep as a note to self, if they have the opportunity to make a section and rework the narrative that's on page 1-7 dealing with the preparation of the plan to please make it more robust and then we have had discussion here of a commitment that whatever we recommend forward, should it be this, as we just discussed, to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration. We'd also develop a transmittal memo that would highlight to them what we believe is an important need for them to consider from a planning perspective, the facilities and county demands that are represented in the CIP but looking at what is the demand at least in the years 11 to 20 to match with the comp plan. We will also acknowledge to them and highlight for their awareness the proposal that was presented to us on the Central Stafford Business District for their consideration of possibly endorsing that forward for further work and consideration. And then also strongly recommend that they consider an approach to the development of a clearer strategic plan for the airport as part of their considerations of these... response to their referral on the Comprehensive Plan update. Alright. Captured? If it does and... I'd entertain a motion for recommendation to send forward to the Board of Supervisors the Comprehensive Plan with the modifications and adjustments as discussed tonight and the development of the transmittal memo to represent the points that we addressed. There is a motion by Mr. Gibbons. Is there a second? Second by Mr. English. Further comment, Mr. Gibbons? Mr. English? Other members?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, first of all, again, I want to applaud the sub-committee. I think they did a fantastic job, especially given the limited amount of time and the perimeters that they were given. I just have a couple of points I feel like I need to make. I wish the BOS, the Board of Supervisors, had given us a much broader mandate and more time. I think this is a fairly important effort, and while we talked about TGAs for a long time, the overall Comp Plan, we didn't really have a lot of time to deal with it. Again, the sub-committee did the yeoman's work in trying to meet the guidelines that the Board of Supervisors provided, but I think there was another way to do this, a more robust way to do it. We weren't given that opportunity. I do have a couple of concerns. Based on the airport land use compatibility guidelines and actual conditions on the ground, including environmental conditions, and two proposals that had been in front of us, what gets put on paper may not necessarily bear out in reality, and I'm concerned that it sets some false expectations going forward, because these numbers, in my view, can't always be realized, no matter how hard somebody works to achieve those numbers. Again, the circumstances on the ground might not allow it. We had something in front of us today, a small CUP that dealt with the southern gateway. The southern gateway, as far as I can see, is not going to accommodate the numbers that we put there and... at least not for the 20 year horizon probably that we're talking about, and I'm just concerned, again, that, you can put something on paper. You can try to plan for it, but if you're planning based on unrealistic information, you're not really achieving a whole lot. And I'm concerned about it. Along the lines of the Central Business District that was recommended by Mr. Hornung, again, I'm very, very concerned about the reduction of commercial square footage by 50%, going from 20 million square feet to 10 million square feet, not just because of the lost

*Planning Commission Minutes  
May 13, 2015*

opportunity, but because of the lost revenue associated with that. If we're going to try to balance the tax burden on the residents of Stafford County, we need to increase the commercial tax pays and I think we've...

Mr. Rhodes: But just to clarify, that doesn't mean business can't come into Stafford County if you had over 11 million square feet, means we don't have identified in general areas in those TGAs that amount of square footage. We have a lot of other...

Mr. Apicella: But the demand signal is going to be centered around these urban areas, if... I don't disagree with what the applicants have said. Rooftops drive commercial and you want to closely associate your commercial with those rooftops. So this was... and quite frankly this was commercial on top of what we would otherwise get, I think. So, talk about moving... putting some pressure on the balloon. I agree with the notion that you've said, Mr. Chairman, that we're going to get this growth, whether we want to or not. These 30,000+ new units are going to happen in the next 20 years. Maybe it's 28,000, maybe it's 32,000, but we're going to get pretty close to that based on historical information. And we do need to find a place for those folks. All I'm saying is, the trade off by reducing one of the TGAs had a much more significant impact than I realized until we actually saw the end result, which, again, moving those chess pieces around the board had a pretty dramatic impact on where we were and where we're going to be based on that reduction. So I just want to end with, again, my sincere appreciation to everybody on this panel for dealing with this for 3 years now and the sub-committee for doing a great job with what they were given. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Other members?

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly.

Mr. Gibbons: That was the longest thank you I've ever heard.

Mr. Coen: We could get music like the academy awards. I'll just thank staff, quite honestly I think staff did an awesome job, an amazing job with doing all this and putting everything together, and so you keep thanking the sub-committee, but to me the staff is what made it work so well. One of the elements that I think that is phenomenal is the phasing which is something that was talked about way back when this started and the staff has really looked into doing phasing and small area planning and things of that nature, which I think, when we started this, way many years ago, it was sort of in people's minds and staff has helped making it work, and so I think that's excellent, and I really thank the staff and the Commission for moving forward.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Other comments? Okay. All those in favor of the motion which is recommending to the Board the Comp Plan, the modified Comp Plan with the changes that were discussed tonight, to include a transmittal memo to express the thoughts and feelings of the Planning Commission for further consideration of the Board, please signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Passes 7-0. We did something with the Comp Plan by golly! It hasn't been 10 years so it can't be... okay. Yeah, that's right. Okay, Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As mentioned earlier, the Commission will be receiving the Economic Development Strategic Plan to hold a public hearing and adopt it as an updated amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. So that's something to look forward to for your next meeting. Also, I would also like to report the Board of Supervisors approved the proffer amendment for the Centreport properties by eliminating the proffers and that has moved the ball forward. We've gotten very positive feedback from representatives from M&T Bank and we're anxious work with those Economic Development prospects that are locating there.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good; super.

Mr. Harvey: That concludes my report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. County Attorney's Report.

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you ma'am. Do we have any other standing committees? ARB? What are you all doing? Goofing off.

Mrs. Bailey: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good; got it. Alright. Nothing for the Chairman's Report. Everybody got their TRC information? I think two for Aquia? You're good on yours? Okay. Did we miss anything anybody? Yoo-hoo!

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

12. TRC Information - May 27, 2015
  - Marlborough Point - Aquia Election District
  - Courthouse Manor - Aquia Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*May 13, 2015*

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.