

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
July 22, 2015

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, July 22, 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: Baker, McClendon, Stinnette, Blackburn, Ennis, and Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

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

Mr. English: Mr. Rhodes, I met with the clients in items 5 and 6, with Clark Leming and them last week, and I just went over their issues.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you. While not a declaration of disqualification, for full transparency of discussions. Thank you very much for that. Anyone else? Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Yes sir. I had contact with number 1 and number 2 and number 7, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. So, again, not necessarily a declaration of disqualification, but just for full transparency. With that, before we go to Public Presentations, if you'd allow just so it might inform the public presentations, I would like to identify for those that are here and those that are watching that items 1 and 2 are cancelled for this evening. They were in the process of trying to make some modifications to meet some of the comments, some smaller modifications. They've made some larger modifications which will need to be re-advertised. The applicant is paying for the costs of re-advertising that'll be associated so it's not a cost and impact, but they will be cancelled this evening. Now, if anyone is here and wished to speak on that, the public hearing will be re-advertised for August 26th, but certainly you could always use the Public Presentation opportunity to speak on it if you should choose to. While we're on a roll here, I would also highlight... it's a unique evening... but items 5 and 6, this is Unfinished Business, but the applicant was working trying to accommodate comments of VDOT, of the County, of other individuals, and it's caused a number of changes which they now need to get re-reviewed by VDOT and staff in the process. So, they've asked for a deferral, so, a little out of order, but I'd... Mr. English, this is in your district.

Mr. English: Yes sir, Mr. Rhodes, I would like to make a motion, if we could defer this to the next meeting in August.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so that'd be to the August 26th. So a motion to defer 5 and 6 to August 26.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

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

Mr. English: No sir.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

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

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed. Certainly I wanted to make that clear before we got to Public Presentations so that if for some reason somebody really wanted to speak on those, you'd always have the opportunity. We're now at Public Presentations. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to speak on any item of the agenda except for items 3 and 4; 3 and 4 will have a specific opportunity for you to make public comment. But if you'd like to speak on any item on the agenda, of any other item you wish, you may come forward and do so at this time. When you do come forward, we'd ask that you state your name and your full address, and then a green light will come indicating 3 minutes of time available. A yellow light will come on when there is 1 minute remaining. And then a red light will start blinking and, at that time, we would just ask that you work to conclude your comments. So, anyone would like to come forward now?

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I figure Donald Trump doesn't need a teleprompter so I don't need one either. I thought I'd fill in the community about some things that are going on. I was at the last Board of Supervisors meeting and, um, there'll be some things coming back to the Planning Commission about TGAs... now I call them Troubled Growth Areas, kinda like I used to call UDAs Undeveloped Downtown Areas. You know, you can't develop a downtown area when you don't have no infrastructure. Some other things that are happening in the community are, um, I've seen some wildlife moving across, uh, Shelton Shop Road now that, uh, I think that new fire engine's going to be there. Oh, oh that's the Sheetz gas station. I miss... I'm a little misguided. The geese have already moved and, uh, the turtles are migrating slowly across. Uh, within 102 days, let's see, um, I think that's Election Day; that's coming up. Uh, that means that'll be the lame duck session of the Planning Commission, uh, the day after November 4th. And I did some research today about, um, what's called the echo boomers. Kind of an interesting thing that planners oughta look into, it's the Millennials. And it's a very interesting concept of, um, what type of real estate are they looking for, what do they really want to buy, and, uh, since I have two of those Millennials it's kind of interesting to hear their own aspects that they're not interested in single-family houses on 3-acre lots. Kind of interesting. So, something to ponder, especially for the update to the Comprehensive Plan that's coming back on the road. For those of you who don't know, the first time the Comprehensive Plan took 22 years, I guess, under several iterations of, uh, leadership, and then finally came out in 2010 and it was outdated. Fortunately, we have followed the law and 2015 is the 5-year update, and I'm sure we're going to do that. I've going to leave you with a comment. I ran into someone in Lowe's and they saw me in my Where's Waldo outfit, and they asked me, what's this association going to the School Board? And I said, well, Waldo, the W stands for wildlife and the A stands for analytics and the L stands for leadership and the D stands for diplomat and O is an optimist. Now, those of you who really listen to

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

my last name, I have a W and a S, K, I on the end of it. And those are for woodlands, skill, knowledge, and imagination.

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

Mr. Blaisdell: My name's Vernon Blaisdell. I'm sure you all were watching the Supervisor meeting, the last one, and you saw my uncle, Preston, right there get up and talk about our piece of property that we have down near 95. I mean, some of the Supervisors I don't think really knew where it was, but I'm going to assume that you do, but if you don't, I'd like for you to know where it is. We border right within sight of 95; we've got the river to the south of us, 17 is on the north, and Belmont is on the east. We've got water, we've got sewer, we don't have an airport, we have access to 95; we have everything and more than some of these districts that you all have cut out. But yet we spoke in 2011 about getting us included into it. That got passed over. Here we are again back again now, in 2015. We're still trying. For some reason our property, 180 acres, 186, gets left out. And I mean, it's all around us and we cannot get that designation for high density. So, hopefully, you can put a face with a property. And we don't have an ax to grind; we are just trying to get a designation for our property. And hopefully Mr. Coen will follow-up on that and the Supervisor did include that the other night when they sent this back to you, that our property was to be looked at. And this is the second time in 5 years. So, hopefully, you'll know that we are not just somebody out there with a tax map number. We're people, we've been here for over a hundred years. My great-granddad bought the property back in 1920 or 1919 and we've been paying taxes on that place all these years, and it keeps going up and going up. And our family gets more diverse, you know how that is. You have too many people to deal with and it keeps going, you get more and more. We're trying to get things settled. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Seeing no one come forward, I'll close the Public Presentations and we'll move onto Public Hearings. Again, items number 1 and 2 were cancelled; they're going to be re-advertised for the 26th of August, with some modifications. Therefore, we'll move onto item number 3 which is the Economic Development Strategic Plan. I know we've got folks from Economic Development here and I know they've got the consultant, Mr. Basile that's here, but so if we could move on with item number 3, Mrs. Baker.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC15150710; Reclassification - North Stafford Office Complex Proffer Amendment - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcels 19-31A, 19-31B, 19-31C, 19-32, and 19-32A, consisting of 21.42 acres, zoned B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, to modify the site layout. The property is located on the south side of Garrisonville Road and east side of Furnace Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: October 24, 2015)**
2. CUP14150319; Conditional Use Permit - North Stafford Office Complex Retail Food Store - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a drive-through facility within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District. The drive-through facility is proposed for a retail food store on Assessor's Parcel 19-31B, and a portion of 19-31A and 19-31C, which is zoned B-2, Urban Commercial and under concurrent consideration for a proffer amendment. The site consists of 4.44 acres, located on the south side of Garrisonville Road approximately 700 feet east of Furnace Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: October 24, 2015)**
3. Economic Development Strategic Plan - Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, to update and replace the Economic Development Strategic Plan (2006) and the Economic

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Development 10 Point Plan (2011) with the document entitled, “Stafford County, Department of Economic Development Strategic Plan,” dated April 14, 2015 (ED Plan). The ED Plan includes a technical analysis of economic development and growth in the County; goals and objectives for the County to meet its economic development potential; an implementation plan; an assessment of assets and opportunities the County can build upon; the identification of priority development areas and catalytic projects; an executive summary; and a technical appendix with details and documentation supporting the technical analysis. **(Time Limit: July 26, 2015)**

Mr. Basile: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name’s Ralph Basile. I’m the consultant that worked with a team to put together the Economic Development Strategic Action Plan. We put together the one that you have been working under since ’06 and we’re invited back to participate in updating it. So, we’re glad to be back and met many of you, met many of the stakeholders in the community. And I’ll go through about a dozen slides with you. I’m only going to focus on... I’ll focus on some more than others and try to keep this brief because I know you’ve had an opportunity to look at it. Okay, the agenda is just basically going to outline what I’d like to go through. I’m going to focus more on the third and the fourth items on this agenda; the process and the key visions and goals. The process is pretty simple. We wanted to figure out where we are now, where we’re going, and how do we get there. It’s a pretty pragmatic approach to figuring out such a policy document as an Economic Development Plan, but the policy document’s grounded in a lot of economic research, a lot of talking to folks in the community, some pretty common sense type stuff. But we wanted to lay out the process in that fashion so we all can understand it and move forward with it. The purpose of it is really, as I mentioned, to update the ’06 plan. But I’ll throw some numbers at you just to give you an idea how involved the document is. We created about three dozen objectives based on 10 project goals. And from that we identified 22 strategies. For each of those Economic Development strategies, we identified about 15 different aspects for each of the strategies, including assigning a priority level to how important that particular strategy would be -- and they go from top to high to medium to other. We also put timelines on each strategy; how long should it take to implement those strategies. And we developed three timelines; short term 1 to 2 years, medium term 2 to 5 years, and long term 5 years or more. So, we wanted to create a skeleton, if you would, and put meat on the bones that identified each of those strategies in a lot of different ways that people could measure in the next few years are you meeting those objectives and the strategies that were based on those objectives. As I mentioned, we started out where are we now. And when we did that, we not only looked at existing conditions and recent trends, but we talked to 30 different folks. We had 30 different stakeholder interviews, we held a retail forum and open house, we looked at nine peer communities, if you would, to identify how are they conducting economic development, we completed what’s called a SWOT analysis which stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, and we identified several items under each of those categories, and conducted a best practices review. So, based on all of that discussion locally, we started developing those Economic Development goals, those Economic Development objectives, and the strategies. And then put a lot of flesh on each one of those strategies. Some of the folks we interviewed are listed here; different important entities in the County, not just the government itself, but some of the area businesses and support industries. The peer reviews were done with other counties so you all could see how others are doing what you all want to do. And we identified and prioritized all of that to start developing those particular strategies. We identified about 10 key goals, and each one of those goals are listed here. They came out of the interviews, came out of the forums, came out of the discussions we had and they include giving more attention to finding and attracting more retail and restaurants to the County. I’ll speak to that in a second regarding the Aquia Towne Center project which I particularly worked on to try to bring that to fruition. And then working on attracting targeted industries and diversifying your economy; and those are buzz words in my business, diversifying and economy. They also included creating achievable metrics. What’s that? Well, that means performance; measuring; are you really doing well in attracting your share of the economic development pie. We also thought ended up looking

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

at some of the, I call them the social or the land use issues which the Planning Commission deals with, and that's... you know, we want to retain the rural flavor in many parts of the County but consider appropriate development in other parts of the County. The... we ended up targeting eight different areas; four of them are redevelopment areas: Boswell's Corner, the Courthouse Area, Falmouth Village, and Southern Gateway. And then we also targeted four other areas: the Warrenton Road Corridor, the Centreport Parkway, you have waterfront areas that could be developed, and finally Aquia Towne Center which folks probably know just from staying in touch with things. The developer and the County are very close to signing a memorandum of understanding that'll allow that project to proceed. We worked closely with counsel in Richmond to identify a funding strategy needed to close a development funding gap in that project. And that's all been blessed, sanctioned, packaged, put into an MOU and soon will be signed. So, hopefully that project will start implement one of the key goals of our plan which was to attract more retail and restaurants in the County. I mentioned that we prioritized each of these strategies into four levels; those with the greatest immediate impact down to those that would require more of a long term set of actions. We... I list here the different 22 strategies and which groups we put them into. We had seven of them in the top priority strategies. We had four...

Mr. Gibbons: Can I ask you one question?

Mr. Basile: Sir, yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: The main goal was retail and...?

Mr. Basile: That's one of them. One of the 10 goals was to attract more retail and restaurant.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you.

Mr. Basile: Sure. And then, so that ended up being of course in some of the early priority efforts. The higher priority efforts included three others. We also identified five other strategies that are important but may take a little more time to develop and then seven long term strategies that can be pursued as you start to have success in the other higher priority strategies. So, we're here tonight to refer this plan to the Planning Commission for consideration and inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. And I'm here to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Rhodes: Questions? Mr. Gibbons, please.

Mr. Gibbons: Can we have a soft copy of this?

Mr. Rhodes: We can get copies of the slides, right? Yep, we'll make sure and get them out to everybody. Other questions? Yeah, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: My question would be is a soft copy of that available on our website so people in the County can see it? In case they couldn't read the slides as fast as they were going through.

Mr. Baroody: Mr. Chairman, Tim Baroody, Deputy County Administrator. Also, Director of Economic Development. To Mr. Coen's question, yes, it is currently posted on the Economic Development website.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good, thank you. Other questions? You're good. Thank you very much.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Basile: Thank you; have a good evening.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Now, if there's any... I'll open up the public comment. If there's any member of the public that would like to comment on item number 3, you may come forward and do so at this time.

Ms. Knight: Jo Knight. And I'm a member of the EDA. I am here to tell you that I believe this needs to be... it needs to be approved and then I think we need to abide by it and try to feed it properly. And I'm not sure that you realize what happens out here daily as we show properties. You know, I've worked in this forever, in the County, and I do know what happens, what really happens. Where this number 2 says accelerate infrastructure upgrades serving critical commercial and industrial sites, that is a major issue for us. You know, I'm currently in the process of working with someone who is selling their property, and I have a buyer. And they could either choose to use the property and grandfather it exactly like it is by using a few strokes of the paintbrush and just keeping it that way. Or they could do much nicer for it. But if they do much nicer, they lose the benefit of the grandfathered clause. Any major changes, you're down the tube with that. And the problem is, years ago this property was on a septic. Today, because you're just off Route 17 and visible to it, you're in this corridor where you've got to connect with any new or changed commercial -- you have got to connect to public utilities. Well, when public utilities are maybe a half mile away, or a quarter to a half mile away, and you seek to do this, you've got to pay to run that public utility. And there is no shortcut that's easy. There are pro rata situations that can be set up, but that costs money. And the small guy out here to buy this business, or an average small guy who wants to set up a business, isn't looking to besides buying the land and then putting a building on it or fixing up a building, it is... the headaches you go through to accomplish what you need to accomplish and the expense just discourages it. And we end up with shabby situations that we really don't want. And that is so common throughout areas we have set aside and we want growth. And about the only way that you keep a plan in place where you have a vision, like the Courthouse Area or other areas, is that you do have a developer come in and buy up the properties and make these things happen. He lays out that plan that's your vision for the next 20 years and then he's part of it too. And he puts money into making that plan work. He owns the property so he can direct how they go and he's going to have utilities out there to everything. So, that makes it work and it only works in conjunction. I can't save things, for example, the church across the street or the buildings by it and have them go with the vision here if the person who's listed it for sale wants to sell, and somebody comes along and they want to buy. There isn't any control with this. And there's no extra money in it for the County. So, to remember that we need to work with this plan and make this plan work is I think very important.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Ms. Knight: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this item? Okay, with that I'll close the public comment portion of the public hearing and bring it back in to the Planning Commission. I know that we had an opportunity to look through this when we referred it to public hearing and then again now. So how say ye folks?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, before we take a vote on a motion, I do have a question about how this would sit in the Comp Plan. Would it sit in its entirety in the Comp Plan?

Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Baker?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mrs. Baker: Yes, this would be a separate element of the Comprehensive Plan, just as many of our other documents are. It's a component of that; it would be in its entirety.

Mr. Rhodes: It would become its own chapter if you will?

Mrs. Baker: It's not its own chapter. It's going to be a separate element such as, we have a wildlife habitat plan, we have Chesapeake Bay plans, they are separate documents. They're listed in the Comprehensive Plan in reference but it would be its own document as incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Apicella: So, if you went on the Planning website and you clicked on the Comp Plan, as its amended in the future, you would actually be able to see the document in its entirety?

Mrs. Baker: On the web page they are listed separately and you would have to click on that separate document to pull up the entire document.

Mr. Apicella: And how many pages, just the Comp Plan itself, roughly how many pages is it?

Mrs. Baker: I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: Five hundred? Eight hundred? A thousand?

Mrs. Baker: Three hundred?

Mr. Rhodes: Three hundred.

Mr. Apicella: Three hundred? Okay. So this is another 86-page document that would...

Mrs. Baker: That's correct.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Anyone else? Please.

Mr. Apicella: So, again, not as a form of a motion but just as a thought, there's a lot of great work and information in this document. And kind of going back to my question and being helpful to people who might want to dig into this, I personally have worked on strategic plans over many years. There are parts of strategic plans that are more important and some parts that are less important. The more important is the meat of what we plan on doing; the objectives, the policies, the practices. The less important is the process of how you got there. And in reading the document, I personally found that half of it really talks about background and process. So it takes a long time to get to hey, what do we want to do. So that's one, I don't want to say concern, but one thought I have. The second thing is, I heard one of the public speak... the public speaker talk about vision. I actually did not see a cohesive vision articulated in the document. I see a lot of thoughts, I see a lot of objectives, but I'm not quite sure I saw a vision about hey, in 20 years this is what Stafford County wants to look like, this is what we want to be. I just offer that up as some consideration, if there's an opportunity for someone to go back and articulate hey, in 20 whatever, this is what Stafford County hopes to be.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: At minimum, I mean, well, we have to act on the item tonight with the time limits we have, we could, at minimum, certainly staff can express those couple points as the Board is considering it because there's always an opportunity between them however they can make a final decision on it.

Mr. Apicella: And the last thing I would point out, not to be petty, obviously the consultant did a lot of hard work on this and a lot of heavy lifting but, at some point, it's actually Stafford County's document, not the consultant's document. And my suggestion is, on every page other than saying that they supported this effort I would take out any of the consultant's, I call labels, that are on the cover page and all the other pages. Because again, it ultimately winds up being Stafford County's document. I don't think it would or be appropriate to have the consultant repeated in an 86-page document 86 times.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Other comments or questions?

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just a quick question, and Kathy can... more geared to you. I know in other elements of the Comp Plan we then take plans and morph them into the other elements of it. Is there anything in this that we would then need to try to readdress or change in any of the other sections? I mean to give it more oomph. I mean, for example, if it's in there, just to do the one that somebody spoke about, about the infrastructure. We have an infrastructure section of our Comp Plan, so do in that section of the Comp Plan do we now want to envision putting something in there that reinforces the economic development aspect of it in that aspect, or is it just sort of... my concern is that it's just sort of a standalone sort of document on the side and it's not integrated like we do with some of the other issues.

Mr. English: Wouldn't that go back to where Steve said about it would be a vision, because you'd implement it as far as in your vision statement?

Mr. Coen: Right. But also what I'm sort of saying is that if in our section on topic A, it's also reflected in this, wouldn't it make sense to sort of reference that in topic A. And then it sort of leads people to see it's a cohesive effort throughout the document. I'm not trying to make more work, but if we're going to go back to this horse anyways, we might as well make sure we have all the horses lined up in the carriage.

Mrs. Baker: Well, I'm hoping this document is already following what's in our Comprehensive Plan, but, Mike, do you have any further comment on...?

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening, Mike Zuraf, the Planning and Zoning Department. Yeah, the only comment I might add is in the main Comprehensive Plan document, you know, that as you know, it is... we're still working on the 5-year update and there may be opportunities to look at some elements in the main Comprehensive Plan document and try to tie in possibly within the Goals, Objectives, and Policies section and maybe some of the other chapters that are within the existing document. But also there may just really be the need for some follow-up amendments to the Comprehensive Plan in response to follow-up efforts that are recommended in the Economic Development Plan. And those might be more of a case by case basis as different priorities are identified by the Board in future years.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mike.

Mr. Gibbons: Can I get some guidance?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Please Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: Now, where do we stand with this now? I thought this was going to be integrated into the Comp Plan? The Comp Plan has been returned to us, correct?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes. This...

Mr. Gibbons: So it stays with us now and then it goes back up with the Comp Plan?

Mr. Rhodes: No, I think we have a motion to act on this one... I think we have a requirement from the reso... referral, excuse me, that we have to act on this one tonight which is asking the Board to adopt this in conjunction with the Comp Plan... as part of the Comp Plan to be modified to have this. And then we will still work on the Comp Plan itself. As Mrs. Baker had said, this is an add and in conjunction and in reference, but we'll work on the Comp Plan while the Board considers adopting this as part of the larger association with the Comp Plan.

Mr. Gibbons: So, how do you integrate it with your vision?

Mr. Rhodes: As we're working... I would anticipate and certainly staff can correct, but what we'll do, as we work on the Comp Plan update, concurrently the Board will be addressing this Economic Development Plan. If they approve its adoption as part of the Comp Plan, then we will take that into consideration as we're working on updating the Comp Plan. Until they act on it, it's not really... it's not passed.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'm with you. The first statement in the Resolution here it says, you know, as part of the Comp Plan and yet the Comp Plan was not approved; it's back here.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, the existing Comp Plan is approved and it exists, and so this will be asking the Board adopt it with that. Concurrently, we've got the referral from the Board to take everything we sent to them and relook at it.

Mr. Gibbons: I stand to be corrected.

Mrs. Baker: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yep.

Mrs. Baker: The Comprehensive Plan already references the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Mr. Rhodes: This is updating it.

Mrs. Baker: This is updating it. We actually have two plans that have been utilized in the past...

Mr. Rhodes: That's a good point.

Mrs. Baker: ... for Economic Development, and so that is updating. And yes, there may be things that back in the Comprehensive Plan, as Mr. Zuraf said, the actual goals and policies may be adjusted to follow this. But I'm sure you're going to find the majority of those goals and objectives already lie in the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions or comments of item 3? I've got here that if we recommend it forward that we would ask staff to highlight consideration in the Board in their final configuration of how it could be most effectively structured and ordered for the retention of the main... the vision of the main points, and then also the labeling or the branding of the plan. But other than that, I would entertain a motion...

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'll make the motion to forward it to the Board.

Mr. English: I'll second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to recommend that the Board adopt this as an update, seconded by Mr. English. Further comment Mr. Gibbons? Mr. English? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Thank you all very much and good luck. With that we'll move onto item number 4 which is the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance as we had referred previously to public hearing about modifications to P-TND elements. Mrs. Baker.

4. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O15-24 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms;" Sec. 28-39, "Special regulations;" Sec. 28-56, "Application for planned developments;" Sec. 28-66, "P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development;" and Sec. 28-137, "Types of signs permitted in P-TND districts," to modify development and performance standards for the P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District. The proposed Ordinance would define principal building, secondary building, and street screen, and remove the requirement to screen parking areas. Additionally, the proposed Ordinance would eliminate certain development standards, such as lot occupancy and building height to street ratio, for redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to the adoption of proposed Ordinance O15-24. Further, the minimum number of buildings in the T-5 Transect Zone would be reduced from two stories to one story. Proposed Ordinance O15-24 would allow monument, non-residential building, tenant, address, direction, and Critical Resources Protection Area (CRPA) signs in the P-TND Zoning District, and establish or modify standards for the signs. **(Time Limit: August 15, 2015)**

Mrs. Baker: Yes, please recognize Susan Blackburn to discuss this issue.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mrs. Blackburn: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners. This evening the Planning Commission is to consider proposed Ordinance O15-24 which would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Section 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms;" 28-39, "Special regulations;" 28-56, "Application for planned developments;" 28-66, "P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development;" and Section 28-137, "Types of signs permitted in P-TND districts." And this is to modify development and performance standards for the P-TND, which is a Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District. On May 13, 2015, the Commission discussed this item and voted to hold a public hearing on June 24th. In the meantime, further review of the zoning regulations were done for this district and the Board of Supervisors were made aware of potential additional provisions and regulations that might need to be modified. And they adopted Resolution R15-249 on June 16th. And this was requesting the Commission to conduct a public hearing on the additional changes and make recommendations and modifications they deemed appropriate for the proposed Ordinance. And on June 24th, the Commission cancelled the public hearing for the Ordinance version referred by Resolution R15-164 and authorized a public hearing on the proposed changes to the Ordinance version referred by Resolution R15-249, and that was to be held on July 22nd which is tonight. And the provisions for this Ordinance include sign regulations and the applicability of certain regulations for development projects within the P-TND Zoning District. The sign regulations for this district are unique and determined to be somewhat restrictive. Therefore, staff has amended the regulations to mimic the regulations for business signs within the B-2, Urban Commercial, Zoning District. Staff did provide a provision for principal building within the P-TND zone project to allow a 30-foot tall sign and blade signs on the buildings would also be permitted. The proposed ordinance would also remove the exemption from Article VIII (the sign regulations) which staff has determined was a typographical error. The amendment to allow the Director of Planning to waive the requirements within the tables of Section 28-39(q)(21) have been replaced with the statement stating the applicability of the requirements in the Tables shall not be applicable to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to adoption of this ordinance. And these requirements affected by this statement include the length of the building façades along a principal street supplemented by a street screen, the building height to street ratio, and the lot width and maximum lot coverage. In removing these requirements for redevelopment, the area along the principal street can be addressed in the neighborhood design standards and can be unique to the project while still keeping with the intent of the urban streetscape design. Renaming the exemption from Article VII (the Parking standards) has also been included in this amendment. The development in the P-TND district shall comply with the standards of Article VII, which is the parking standards, with the exception of the requirements as stated in Tables 3.3(a), 3.3(b), and 3.3(c) which are found in the P-TND development standards. Staff believes that this change will provide for a more comprehensive parking and transportation layout for the development in this district. Staff also included an exemption concerning the development in the P-TND district complying with the GDP submitted with the reclassification of the property. This requirement was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in November of 2014. Prior to this amendment, compliance with the GDP, which is a General Development Plan, submitted with the reclassification was voluntary. And this exemption will keep property from becoming non-conforming if the GDP was not proffered. These were all in addition to what was already presented to you in the earlier version of providing definitions for principal and secondary buildings, and also for street screens. And staff recommends the Planning Commission vote to recommend approval of Ordinance O15-24 that was referred to the Commission by Resolution R15-249. And the time limit to act on this is August 15th. And do we have any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Questions for staff before public comment? Okay, very good; thank you very much. If there's any member of the public who would like to speak on item number 4 you may come forward and do so at this time. Again, if you'd just state your name and your address, a green light will come on indicating 3 minutes, yellow light with 1 minute, and red light we would just ask that you work to conclude your comments.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Underwood: Indeed. Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, Tyler Underwood. As a civil engineer, I can greatly appreciate the need to modify the Zoning Ordinance. My life is primarily consumed with the application of zoning ordinances from counties all over the state. The issue that I see with this particular change to the Zoning Ordinance is it seems to be driven by a single project. A single project that, I think, by all standards has been a failure. And you can see the fingers of that change in the terms, or in the wording such as, this shall not apply to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to the adoption of this Ordinance. If my memory serves me correct, I believe there's only one such project in the entire County. That project, as everyone well knows, has been troublesome. So to see this type of language added to the Ordinance is troubling, particularly when it's added to sections of the P-TND Ordinance that existed at the time of the rezoning. It's not as if these are new sections that are being added that would cause an undue hardship on the development; these were existing known restrictions at the time of the rezoning that now are being waived. At least it appears so from this document. That's troublesome. To make changes for one particular project I think must be done with extreme care and caution, because this very quickly could become every project wanting the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission to start changing ordinances specifically for them. So that's a significant concern I have on this. As I said, I can greatly appreciate the need to change the Ordinance. The sign requirements are somewhat strange, in ways. If I remember correctly, back when the only redevelopment P-TND project was rezoned, their one main sign along Route 1 was actually excluded, put into a parcel and excluded from the rezoning because they didn't want to have to deal with the signage requirement at that time. So, it was known at the time that there was some issues, or at least it would seem to be, with the sign ordinance. So now we're going back and making more changes. Possibly the greatest concern I have is with Table 3.5(f), heights/number of stories. In particular, the T-5 transect zone is going from a 2-story minimum building height to a 1-story. Really, the whole goal behind, at least it would seem, the P-TND is to get something different than 1-story storefronts that we have throughout the entire County. At the time of the rezoning for the only redevelopment P-TND, if my memory serves, we the citizens ended up losing a tremendous amount of proffers in order to get this development. There was a lot of sacrifices that were made at that time by the citizens ultimately in order to push this project through, to get this first kind of starter project approved. And now we're back making more changes after there was more money handed out recently. So this is just something that I think we should take very serious thought about. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much! Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this item? Seeing no one come forward, I'll close the public comment portion of the public hearing and bring it back into the Planning Commission. Other comments or questions of staff or interests? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: I'm just curious if staff has any response to the concern. It was also raised by other people prior to tonight about changing the Ordinance for the entirety rather than just, you know, for one area and what they foresee in the future.

Mrs. Blackburn: Mr. Coen, in reviewing this, it was looking at various aspects of the Ordinance to see what had become a little more restrictive to not allow for some more creativity within the development. And we do still have the Neighborhood Design Standards, so there is still ways to make it still be an urban type of planned development. And as far as the future goes, as you're dealing with the Comprehensive Plan, many times ordinances do need to be amended. And many times it's because of the way the communities have changed. And this may be, you know, the last time we do this or we may be reviewing it again. I don't know.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, other questions or comments? Yep, this is one with our time limits we will have to act on (inaudible).

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. English: I'll make a motion to accept the amendment of the Zoning Ordinance, to accept it... to approve it.

Mr. Rhodes: Make a motion to recommend approval back to the Board.

Mr. English: Yes sir.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. English, second by Mrs. Bailey to recommend to the Board for approval of this amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No comment.

Mr. Rhodes: Other members? Yes Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: I would just say that I raised some of the concerns that were identified tonight about why we're doing this and about being driven by one project potentially. But I think I was satisfied as a result of the conversations that these changes were necessary and helpful to promote P-TNDs going forward, and they were significant changes in, you know, as you kind of look deeper into what's intended here. So, notwithstanding any concerns that were raised tonight, I think they probably are good changes and, as we just heard by Mrs. Blackburn, we may make more changes as we go forward. It's still, even though it's been on the books for a while, somewhat novel in terms of actually having projects in place that have been approved. And so we need to show some flexibility going forward to adapt to changing circumstances and to promote the kind of commercial developments that we want. And again, I think this will help us get there going forward.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Other comments? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: I too share what Mr. Apicella had raised before about trying to do things for one element. One of the things that deals with that is that as times have changed, some of what the people have envisioned at the beginning has changed. And we saw that with the P-TND and other areas that we started and then over the 4 or 5 or 6 years that things go through, things may change. So, I understand the concern. I'm going to vote in favor of this, for this one in part because we're getting the Comp Plan back so we can address this if need be. If there are future P-TNDs that we can address this and try to make it more relevant as we keep moving forward. Quite honestly, I think some of our Ordinances that were made we end up having to update, and I think this is just probably one of them.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. Other comments? Hearing no more comments, all those in favor of the motion which is to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve Ordinance O15-24 signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? It passes 7-0. We'll move onto... past items 5 and 6 because those were deferred to the 26th of August. So we're now onto New Business, item number 7, WAI15150714, the Garrisonville Landing. Mrs. Baker.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. RC15150498; Reclassification - Stafford Commons Retail Center - 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 a commercial complex including a bank, restaurant, and retail building on Assessor's Parcel 39-13. The property consists of 0.50 acres, located on the west side of Jefferson Davis Highway, approximately 1,100 feet south of Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 8, 2015) (History: Deferred on June 10, 2015 to July 22, 2015)**
6. CUP15150499; Conditional Use Permit - Stafford Commons Retail Center - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to permit up to three drive-through facilities within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District. The drive-through facilities are proposed for a bank, restaurant, and retail building. The site is on Assessor's Parcels 39-12 and 39-14, which are zoned B-2, Urban Commercial, and Assessor's Parcel 39-13, which is the subject of a concurrent rezoning request from the A-1, Agricultural to the B-2 Zoning District. The site consists of 10.45 acres, located on the west side of Jefferson Davis Highway, approximately 1,100 feet south of Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 8, 2015) (History: Deferred on June 10, 2015 to July 22, 2015)**

NEW BUSINESS

7. WAI15150714; Garrisonville Landing - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, Section 22-176(f), Private Access Easements, to allow a private access easement within a major subdivision on Assessor's Parcel 8-17, zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 17.71 acres, located off of Cottage Oak Drive, on the south side of Garrisonville Road, within the Rock Hill Election District.

Mrs. Baker: LeAnn Ennis will be giving the presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Mrs. Ennis: Computer please. I'm presenting this case for Natalie Doolittle, the project manager, who is out today. Garrisonville Landing is a PAE waiver that I'll be presenting. Good evening... sorry, I lost where I was... Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Item number 7 is a waiver request for Section 22-176(f) of the Subdivision Ordinance for Garrisonville Landing. The applicant is Bragg Clark with Cascade Land and Lakes, LLC. The date of the application was June 3, 2015. The site is located on Assessor's Parcel 8-17. It's located off of Cottage Oak Drive, on the south side of

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Garrisonville Road. It's approximately 17 acres, and it's currently zoned A-1, Agricultural. The request involves one lot that was proposed to be Section 2 of the Garrisonville Landing Subdivision. And the site is within the Rock Hill Election District. This is the aerial of the site; it is completely wooded now because, again, this was supposed to be Section 2 of the subdivision. You can see to the northwest of the property, that is the Isaak Walton League, and Hidden Lake is on the south of the subdivision. And the recorded lots in Garrisonville Landing Section 1 are to the southwest... southeast, I apologize. The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow a private access easement within a major subdivision, which is 22-176 of the Subdivision Ordinance where it states the use of a private access easement is prohibited within a major site plan. This is the approved preliminary plan that was approved by the Planning Commission in 2013. The plan was approved for 24... for a total of 24 single-family dwellings with a minimum of 3-acre lot sizes. They were to utilize public water and sewer... I'm sorry, private well and septic. A construction plan was approved in 2014 and the final subdivision plat for Section 1, which consisted of 19 lots, was recorded in 2014 as well. There was a pipestem parcel that was planned to be Section 2. That's this... I forgot how to do this... alright, this here is Section 2. And this was... Section 1 was all recorded and they recorded this as an outparcel and it created like a pipestem-looking lot. So, that's the future Section 2. So that's where we are with the pipestem-looking lot. The applicant no longer wishes to pursue the subdivision of the remainder of parcel 8-17 as previously approved. The proposed 50-foot wide private access easement would serve 17.7 acres for which the approved preliminary plan proposed 5 lots on Russell Keel Court and ending in a cul-de-sac near the shared property line with the Isaak Walton League. Allowing the PAE would reduce the impacts to the Isaak Walton League parcel and reduce the amount of environmental impacts with less fill dirt necessary for the wetlands crossing of the right-of-way. The applicant is also proposing a 50-foot wide buffer area adjacent to the property line with the Isaak Walton League to further reduce impact. If a waiver is granted, the applicant would need to withdraw the approved preliminary plan and revise the approved construction plan and submit a final plat readjusting the shared boundary lines with lot 2. He would also have to create the PAE to serve the proposed new lot 3. The plat would also vacate existing slopes, grading, and utility easements along the right-of-way of the proposed right-of-way for Section 2 that's no longer going to be necessary. Granting of this easement would reduce the number of houses against the Isaak Walton from 5 parcels and the right-of-way to 1. So this will be eliminating 4 parcels. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the property as being located in a Noise Zone 2 of the Quantico Noise and Range Capability Zones. The Noise Zone 2 identifies residential development to be incompatible with small arms, heavy weapons, and aircraft operations on the Base. The Comp Plan for this area recommends the reduced residential density of 1 dwelling per 10 acres. Section 22-241 of the Subdivision Ordinance identifies two conditions that have to be met by the Planning Commission in order to grant the waiver. And one is the minimum requirement would impose unreasonable burden on the subdivider, and granting the waiver will have no substantial adverse effect on future residents nor any property adjoining. Staff believes that these conditions are being met. Not granting the relief of this requirement would free the developer to construct a public street and would serve a minimum of 3 more lots. This would cause additional impacts to wetlands and reduce the ability for the property owner to mitigate impacts to the adjacent Isaak Walton League. The second condition we feel that has no negative impacts because nobody would be affected by the houses not being constructed. It wouldn't affect the adjoining property owners. Therefore, staff recommends approval of application 15150714 for Section 22-176(f) of the Subdivision Ordinance for the Private Access Easement to be granted in a major subdivision. Any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Questions for staff before the applicant comes forward? Nope? Okay, good. Would the applicant like to present...?

Mrs. Ennis: If you have any questions for them, they are here. Do you have any direct questions for them?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Or if they would like to present anything?

Mrs. Ennis: Would you guys like...?

Mr. Rhodes: Are you good?

(From audience): No sir, I don't have anything else to present.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Does anybody have a question for the applicant just to close that out? Okay, we'll bring that back to us.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'll move for WAI15150714.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to approve the waiver.

Mr. Coen: Second.

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

Mr. Gibbons: Yes. I met with this developer twice on this. Staff has met with them twice. And I want to commend the staff for taking this action because it really puts the buffer in for Isaak Walton and it really helps.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any further comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: I would just like to comment indirectly related; this is one of the few things we actually have the authority over. We can do Comp Plan Compliance Review and we can do Preliminary Subdivision Plans because part of the State Code gives us that authority, and then the Board in local ordinances has given us the authority for Subdivision Ordinance waivers. I had to get my tutorial on that by Ms. McClendon just to confirm. This is one of the three things we can actually do, by golly. So if there's no further comment, all those in favor of the motion to approve, not recommend approval, but to approve this Subdivision Ordinance waiver, WAI15150714, for Garrisonville Landing signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Good luck to you; thank you very much. With that we'll move onto item number 8, which is WAI15150750, the Anderson Consolidation. Mrs. Baker.

8. WAI15150750; Anderson Consolidation - A request for a waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, Section 22-143(a), Shape and Elongations, to allow the depth of the lot exceed five (5) times its width for a consolidation plat SUB14150437, zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 1.2618 acres, located on Stony Hill Road, one mile east of Hartwood Road, within the Hartwood Election District.

Mrs. Baker: Mrs. Ennis will also give this presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Mrs. Ennis: I wanted to make sure my applicant was here, because I was going to ask to move it if he wasn't. Again, I'm going to present this for William Sugg; he's the project manager for this.

Mr. Rhodes: You're covering for everybody.

Mrs. Ennis: Yeah. So, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission, item number 8 is a waiver for lot shape and elongation for the Anderson Subdivision. It's located on Assessor's Parcel 26A, Section 1, lots 6 and 6A. It's approximately 1 acre and it's currently zoned A-1. It's within the Hartwood Election District and it's located on the north side of Stony Hill Road east of Hartwood Road. This is the location map that you all received in your package. You can see here that it is 2 parcels. This is the parcel here and this is the parcel here. The applicant owns this piece, this piece, and this piece. The applicant is proposing to consolidate two of the parcels, which is 6 and 6A.

Mr. English: LeAnn, can you go back a minute?

Mrs. Ennis: Yes sir.

Mr. English: You dotted it; what about the part that's on the top?

Mrs. Ennis: This piece?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, to the left of 26A.

Mrs. Ennis: This piece?

Mr. English: Yeah, who owns that?

Mrs. Ennis: I think that's owned by this piece.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you. Sorry.

Mrs. Ennis: That's okay. Parcel 6 was created from Hartwood Village Subdivision in 1974 where an open space parcel of 1 acre was created behind the lots. The open space was not a requirement of the development at the time; therefore, Parcel A was divided up by the developer and given to the adjoining property owners. They did not consolidate them at the time; there was no requirement of the Subdivision Ordinance at that time. A lot of the property owners did consolidate but these did not. This

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

is the approved subdivision plat in 1974. These are the lots that were created. This is the open space parcel that was created that the developer gave to the individual owners. He created the lots like this to adjoin them to the properties. But this was how it was created. Currently, Parcel 6 is unbuildable because it does not have approvable soils to support a drainfield. It's also not a conforming lot as it is. It doesn't meet our minimum requirements for lots. The approximate location of the conventional drainfield would straddle the property line between 6 and 6A. Pursuant to Section 22-118(f) of the Subdivision Ordinance, water and sewer lots have to be served on the property to which it is. So you can't have easements for drainfields any longer. So they have to be on the properties. This is the proposed drainfield location of what they have their approved soils for. This is the lot here and it ends right here. The owner here you can see a circular driveway here and so this is a lot here and then this is a lot here. This is lot 5 and this is 6 and this is 6A. So the soils reports that they have have put the drainfield in here straddling the property line. That's where they found the most suitable soils. Section 22-143(a) of the Subdivision Ordinance for shape and elongation states that the depth of the lot shall not exceed five times its width. The consolidation of these two parcels would alleviate the drainfield requirement but will cause a resulting lot's depth to exceed the five times its width. An alternative drainfield was discussed but it was considered by the applicant and determined to be too costly. Consolidating these lots would not have any adverse effect on surrounding residents. Staff recommends approval of the proposed waiver for Section 22-143(a) for shape and elongation of the Stafford County Subdivision Ordinance. Any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Questions of staff? Or of the applicant? Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Just a quick question... or two quick questions. So, the back part is 6A; it was first designated as open space. Are other parcels along there still considered open space or have...?

Mrs. Ennis: No, they've all been consolidated. There's no longer any open space within here. That was removed in '76.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And then, what are they intending to do with this additional parcel and the drainfield?

Mrs. Ennis: They're going to consolidate it and put a house on it.

Mr. Coen: Okay. That's what I was curious about.

Mrs. Ennis: Yes sir. It's a buildable lot and, you know, the conformity just has to meet all the setbacks. So it would make the lot more conforming by doing a boundary line adjustment and consolidating it.

Mr. Rhodes: Other questions? Okay, very good. This one's in Hartwood.

Mr. English: Is the applicant here?

Mr. Rhodes: Applicant...

Mrs. Ennis: Yes, the representative for the applicant... do you have any questions for them?

Mr. Rhodes: ... would you like to present or discuss anything?

Mr. Kaila: I would just like to make a couple comments.

Mr. Rhodes: Please, I'm so sorry, please.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Kaila: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission...

Mr. Rhodes: You sat here for an hour, you should be allowed to.

Mr. Kaila: Thank you. John Kaila. I don't get a chance over the years to speak before the Commission so this is more practice than anything. I don't think this is a tough call. These people bought the property back then. The declarant, for some reason when he made the space area, or the area in the back, but just drew it all the way back to the back and sold them both together without consolidating them that time. She can't build on it but as Mrs. Ennis says, but for the changes in the Ordinances, they can't build on it. So I don't really think it's a tough call. I would like to thank Mrs. Ennis and Mrs. Hornung and Mr. Sugg for their help during this process. Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Any questions for the applicant? Okay, wonderful. Thank you sir. Mr. English.

Mr. English: I make a motion to approve the consolidation of the Anderson property, WAI15150750.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to approve by Mr. English; second by Mrs. Bailey. Any further comment Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, very good. Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No further comment.

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

Mr. Gibbons: What does WA stand for?

Mrs. Baker: Waiver.

Mr. Rhodes: Waiver. And then SUB will be subdivision plan, right? Got it. Okay good. Okay, no other questions? All those in favor of the motion which is to approve the waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance, WAI15150750 for the Anderson Consolidation signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? It passes 7-0. Good luck; thank you very much. With that, we'll move onto item number 9 which is SUB15150572, the Liberty Knolls West. Mrs. Baker.

9. SUB15150572 - Liberty Knolls West - A preliminary subdivision plan for 51 single-family residential lots on Assessor's Parcel 29-17, zoned R-2 with proffers and 2 waivers on 30.24 acres, located along the north side of Courthouse Road, north of Colonial Forge High School, southwest of Winding Creek Elementary, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: October 14, 2015)**

Mrs. Baker: Mrs. Ennis will give this last presentation.

Mr. Rhodes: And who are you presenting this for?

Mrs. Ennis: This is for Natalie Doolittle.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, very good; okay.

Mrs. Ennis: She's the project manager; she's been working with the developer. Good evening Mr. Chairman. Natalie gave me specific notes to write so I'm reading off of her notes. Item number 9 is a preliminary subdivision plan for Liberty Knolls. The site is located on parcel 29-17 located on the north side of Courthouse Road, north of Colonial Forge High School, southeast of Winding Creek Elementary School. The parcel is 30.24 acres, zoned R-2, Urban Residential, Medium-Density and subject to proffers. The plan proposes 51 single-family lots within the Garrisonville Election District. Here's an aerial view where you can see Winding Creek Elementary to the northwest, Liberty Knolls subdivision to the north and the east, and there's a large existing pond on the site. The parcel was rezoned in 2015 from A-1 to R-2, Urban Residential Medium-Density, and is subject to proffers. The R-2 zoning allows for the maximum density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is proposing a density of 2.1 dwelling units per acre. The main access will be from Courthouse Road via Sherman's Ridge Road. They are providing one inner-parcel access connection extending Penn's Charter Lane from Liberty Knolls... from the existing Liberty Knolls subdivision to the east. The applicant was granted an administrative exception by the Planning Commission for the required second access connection. The parcel is surrounded by Winding Creek Elementary School to the west and platted lots of Liberty Knolls subdivision to the north and east. Therefore, a second access connection to the adjacent parcels was not feasible. The Planning Commission also approved a waiver for block length in 2015 with the preliminary plan approval. There will be a 100-foot buffer for transportation per the proffers, from the edge of the property... from the edge of the existing right-of-way of Courthouse Road as proffered. There will also be a proffered 8-foot wide lighted sidewalk connection from the subdivision to Winding Creek Elementary. There is also a proffered tree save area approximately 2.2 acres that's located in the open space around the pond. The RPA is located outside of the proposed single-family residential lots on the proposed open space parcel A. All the lots will be served by public water and sewer and stormwater management will be achieved by using one stormwater management pond to be maintained by the HOA. Staff recommends approval of this plan, Liberty Knolls West preliminary. Any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Questions of staff before we go to the applicant? Yes Mr. English.

Mr. English: LeAnn, what's the status on a light there? Do you know anything about that?

Mrs. Ennis: A traffic light? I'm not sure if there was a traffic light... it wasn't proffered. I'm not sure; maybe the applicant knows. I'm not really sure. Oh, they're shaking their head. We'll defer that to them.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Yep, well we'll have the applicant come up in just a moment. Other questions for staff? Okay, applicant please.

Mr. Furnival: Good evening Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. Rick Furnival with Sullivan, Donahoe and Ingalls, representing Tricord Incorporated for the development. We do have some information about the access to the site; it probably would be helpful. Part of our plan was to show a restricted right in/right out access at the connection point on Courthouse Road until Courthouse Road improvements are constructed. At that time, there will be a median in front of the site and it will be restricted de facto by the median. The light is at the end of the Liberty Knolls project at the intersection with Woodcutter's I believe is the name of the road. That's where the light is.

Mr. English: Right there at Woodcutter's? It's not going to be up by the school?

Mr. Furnival: That is the school entrance.

Mr. English: No. To this parcel but I'm talking about the beginning of the entrance to Knolls. I thought it was right directly in front of Colonial Forge and then you go down to the bottom of the hill and that's Woodcutter's, correct?

Mrs. Ennis: (Inaudible – not at microphone).

Mr. Furnival: Oh, I'm sorry. Woodcutter's is the entrance to the school. The traffic signal is at the Liberty Knoll's entrance.

Mr. English: Where the school is.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Furnival: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay, alright.

Mr. Furnival: Yes, sorry about that.

Mr. Rhodes: And when is that, do you have any...?

Mr. Furnival: I do not know.

Mr. Rhodes: I think it was when they had a certain number of homes then it would be warranted and VDOT would allow it or something like that.

Mr. Coen: When they widen it.

Mr. Rhodes: Widen... oh that's right. It's when they widen it.

Mr. English: Sorry for the confusion.

Mr. Furnival: That's okay. I'd just like to thank staff for working with us on the project, especially with the retrofit of the existing farm pond. We've been concerned about the condition of that pond and being

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

able to refit that to stormwater management use is going to be a great benefit to the aesthetics of the area, and we do appreciate that. Any other questions (inaudible)?

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

Mr. Furnival: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: I'll bring it back in. Is there any other further questions of staff before we make... take action on this one? Okay, with that I'm going to throw my gavel down towards Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, as you noted previously, this is something we get to approve. So I'm going to ask you as the member in that district, what say you on this one?

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Mr. Apicella, I'd like to make a motion to approve this subdivision plan, SUB15150572.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion for approval and a second. Any further comments Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Gibbons? Anyone else? Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Yes, and just to be consistent, I have felt that this... I've had many reservations about this project since it first came before us. So, for consistency, I just don't really feel comfortable voting in favor of this. I appreciate all the work that has been done to try to make it and mitigate the impact, but I just don't see that it's the right thing.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all those in favor of the motion to approve the Liberty Knolls West preliminary subdivision plan signify by saying aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All opposed?

Mr. Coen: Nay.

Mr. English: Nay.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. It passes 5-2 Mr. Chairman.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. With that, good luck on that one. We're going to now move forward to the Planning Director's Report. Mrs. Baker.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

❖ iPads

Mrs. Baker: First of all, I will note that Stacie has handed out your iPads this evening, and I'm going to let her briefly tell you...

Mr. Rhodes: Technology!

Mr. English: Getting evil looks over here.

Mrs. Baker: ... what you will need to do.

Mr. Rhodes: We're supposed to remember our iTunes account we set up 5 years ago. Good Lord.

Mrs. Stinnette: You have to remember your iTunes account.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Is that AM or FM?

Mrs. Stinnette: If you need help, you can call me.

Mr. English: Oh, I'll see you tomorrow!

Mr. Rhodes: But we do this with it connected to the home computer, as part of the process.

Mrs. Stinnette: Yes. Or any computer as long as you have your iTunes information. You can do it at any computer.

Mr. Rhodes: At their iTunes.

Mr. English: If we don't remember iTunes, how does that... well, I'll talk to you tomorrow.

Mrs. Bailey: When do we do this by?

Mr. Rhodes: You want us to turn in the other ones next meeting, right? August 26?

Mrs. Stinnette: If you could, yes.

Mr. Rhodes: And we have to bring the other one back with the plug.

Mrs. Stinnette: With the plug.

Mr. Rhodes: I've got to find that too. Okay.

Mr. English: I don't think I had a plug in mine.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you Stacie. Okay, Mrs. Baker?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

❖ Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Urban Development Areas and 5-Year Update

Mrs. Baker: Next we're going to talk about the Comprehensive Plan Amendment which has now come back... will be coming back before you all. And Mr. Zuraf is going to lead this discussion.

Mr. Rhodes: This is the greatest degree of job security for Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Okay, good evening. As you may be aware, on July 7th the Board of Supervisors did deny the proposed amendments to the Comp Plan regarding the 5-year update and the amendments to the Urban Development Areas. As part of its action, the Board did refer the Plan back to the Planning Commission. They did have some specific requests for the Planning Commission to consider; did consider adding the Blaisdell tract into the Southern Gateway Targeted Growth Area; and then considering any other amendments that the Commission deem necessary. In the memo we provided to you, we did provide a little bit of background information on the Blaisdell property. And if I could have the computer.

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Zuraf: This is not the right one. Sorry, yeah, this is not it.

Mr. Rhodes: Wing it.

Mr. Zuraf: So, in your memo, you did get... and we can go away from the computer. So, you have a memo.

Mrs. Baker: Sorry Mike, it's up now.

Mr. Zuraf: There we go. Alright, now we're back on track. So, just for orientation, the Blaisdell property, looking at the map on the right, the draft Future Land Use Plan, the Blaisdell property is in the... in this area of the County. And focusing in on the area, the Blaisdell tract is highlighted in red, currently within the Suburban Land Use designation under the current plan and proposed Land Use Plan immediately adjacent to the east of the Southern Gateway Urban Development Area. I've provided a few statistics; the overall site area is 184 acres. There are wetlands, floodplain, steep slopes that account for approximately 29 acres. The net area, 155 acres. There was a prior development proposal back approximately 2006 or 7 timeframe. And at the time, a development potential identified on this property was for 452 dwelling units with a mix of half of those as single-family units, 140 townhomes, and 72 multi-family homes. That equated to a density of 2.9 dwelling units per acre. Staff does not also there are other limiting factors on the site as well; a power line easement and archaeological site known as Hunters Ironworks that does take away some of the buildable area on the property. So, that development potential number that can be adjusted, you know, as the issue is considered. And if there's a desire for a greater mix of more townhomes than multi-family units, maybe the density could be higher or taken the other way. So, that's just to show you an idea. Actually I have... okay, here's the aerial. You can see the power line easement that cuts through the area here. And a lot of the other remaining area on the property is wooded. You have the RPA areas in the light purple color as well. This is the development proposal that was submitted several years ago. You have some of these environmental areas, steep slopes, that are removed from development potential. So, that's the background on that site for consideration. And then staff did, in the memo, include some other considerations that were not part of the specific Board direction, but were definitely part of some of the discussion by the Planning Commission and the Board as well. Those include maybe considering re-evaluation of the George Washington Village and Centreport Targeted Growth Areas due to their proximity to the airport. And in

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

this consideration, considering the number of planned units to maybe ensure their ability to fit in these areas, considering maybe modifications of the limits of the area, the land use and/or number of units recommended. And then also maybe considering relocation of some of the density to areas such as the Southern Gateway TGA. And also, considering deleting references to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan which was not adopted and considering re-evaluation of some of the goals and objectives of the plan which was not done earlier in this effort. And also considering other proposed development scenarios such as the Central Stafford Business District that was suggested at the Commission previously. And then also considering what type of extent of public involvement the Commission may want to consider. And timing was mentioned; the Board did ask for revisions to be sent back for a possible October public hearing. But also they did note that the Commission could ask for more time if they feel that's necessary.

Mr. Rhodes: Thanks. I would just like...

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

Mr. Zuraf: That should have been one of the last attachments.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, staff package. If not, we'll get it.

Mr. Zuraf: We can get that to you. It's under Planning Director's Report.

Mr. Rhodes: Planning Director's Report on the electronic. We'll double-check you. I was thinking about this a little bit and I immediately came up with a Grateful Dead song, you know, what a long strange trip it's been. But I think there's an interestingly positive opportunity here. We have, I think, either four or five times had some directed referrals from the Board since the Comp Plan went in, mostly targeting UDAs. And once UDAs were no longer mandated by the state, how would we deal with them. But I note that on all the past referrals the Board, nothing bad about this, but the Board really had it pretty much targeted towards those UDAs, what were currently the UDAs, and how would we deal with them. And they had some limitations associated with the UDAs, that this referral actually doesn't do that. This referral kind of sends it back with much more open ended. And I think that's a great opportunity. You know, it's always hindsight's always an amazing thing, and now we now have at least three, three and a half years of hindsight since the first referral came and a lot of different things have transpired and gone about. We worked the Airport Plan, we worked some other... just a lot of different dynamics have happened. And if we had gotten that first referral without limitations, without targeting it really to just those UDAs, what would we have done then? I think it'd be interesting to see if we step back and look at it again. The thing we know we need to do, our charge and our mission, is to plan appropriately for the projected growth. And there's a couple different sources you can go to growth; we've always gone to the one source which right now has us growing by about 70% in 20 years, about 32,000 dwelling units. We have to plan for that growth in a manner that will have the best able to absorb, least impact considering the infrastructure constraint and other things. That's kind of our given. But how we do that, I think right now we're being handed something that says open-ended. My reaction is that we immediately go back to the Board and ask for more time, suggest that we'd like to step back and relook how we deal with growth in general, and then take our subcommittee, re-energize it. If anybody wants to bail, you can bail. If anybody wants to join, you can join. But hand this back over to kind of step back and search fresh. What other approach do we take if we don't solely look at the existing UDAs that we were trying to call TGAs somewhat, with a little mod, and we just step back, how would we approach it now to absorb that growth. I just think it's a great opportunity to kind of change the approach somewhat to this and we can address some of these other things that have been specifically identified to us. We can look at the Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan. We can look at

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

some of the other elements that have been here. We've talked about schools and other things. We can just kind of step back and look at it. I think it's great potential but that would be, I think, immediately going back to the Board and saying, yep, we want to take more time. Have a communication there and tell them we'd like to look a little more broadly at different approaches, and we would come back with a recommendation as soon as we could get something together. Please.

Mr. Coen: I wholeheartedly concur with that. I might phrase they gave us by their language sort of the authority to be more broad. So I would narrow it and just say that we recognize that to really do this and do it well, we cannot do it, a comprehensive thorough job by an October 1st deadline. And just say, I mean, I did not watch the Board when they did the Airport issue by itself, but in watching the night where they talked about the Comp Plan, just items that were mentioned, in addition to the Blaisdell, were either by them during the meeting or by other people, was do we move some of the lines for the TGAs and particularly about the Centreport one, some questions about that. There was a question about the number for planning. The Airport Overlay, there were comments about it being too complex. There were other comments that said they didn't like it period. But others said they liked it but it was too complex. Something about the northern flight plan was mentioned. I know Mr. Apicella has mentioned, and it was sort of hinted at, you know, what is the future? And we haven't really received directive from either the Board or the Airport Authority of where they're envisioning it for 20 years or 30 years. Other Board members have mentioned other possible shifts in the USA. It was talked about, and we've talked about it, about more public meetings. And quite honestly there'd be no way by the timeframe to get it through us, through a public hearing with us, to have public hearings, unless you did it in August when nobody can come. Also, there's a question about the CIP that Mr. Gibbons and several others have raised; didn't understand how that works. And then there's, as you said, there's certain corridors that are sort of geared for growth and we've had them in the last month come to us about doing something different. And so do we look at different constructs. And so, I think given all of that, I have no doubt that if we can ask Mrs. Baker and Mr. Harvey and Mr. Zuraf, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, and all the people that you're standing in for, to do it all for us in August, they would do it but I don't think it's really equitable to make them try to do it. So certainly the subcommittee can go back, look at these things, and I would just say, just tell the Board we cannot do this by an October 1st deadline and we will need time to do it in a thorough and comprehensive way.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Mr. English?

Mr. English: Do you think we should send back a timeline that we ask for, I would say, after the first of the year?

Mr. Rhodes: I might suggest that we don't go with a hard date that we set on ourselves, but we say we'll probably be at least till the beginning of the year. And just leave ourselves a little flexibility. We certainly don't want to drag it out, but leave ourselves flexibility. We're not arbitrarily locked on something because we've still got to do our own... we would have to do a public hearing on anything we sent back for, right Ms. McClendon? Yeah, so we've got some deliberate steps that we'd have to do. Other thoughts?

Mr. English: Do you need a motion from us to do that or...?

Mr. Rhodes: Just consensus?

Ms. McClendon: A consensus is fine. We would have to take the request to the Board.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, since this is an agenda item, I think we can just do a consensus. If everybody's okay with that, we'll go forward. I think we should go ahead and start with a subcommittee, go ahead and start assuming we'll get approval? We've got to start looking at it anyways. Who is the subcommittee? I don't even remember.

Mr. Coen: Myself, Mrs. Bailey, and Mr. Gibbons. And I was wondering if, I mean, we did it during the day, our meetings during the day to facilitate staff, but perhaps if we looked for either evenings or Saturday -- I know that's a forbidden thing -- but that would allow other members of the Commission to have input where they couldn't do it during the daytime. And so, that would sort of be the avenue.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in serving, having worked on a much earlier version of the Comp Plan many, many years ago, and also on the Airport Land Use Plan, I think might be helpful in some ways... maybe not... serve on the subcommittee.

Mr. Rhodes: And there's no problem with more than 3 right? Okay. The more, the merrier. Okay, so we'll have the subcommittee start working it. At the same time we'll ask staff to draft something to go back to the Board to just tell them we got it, we're going to charge forward, but we will request more time we think we'll need to at least the beginning of the year. And we'll get it back as promptly as we can.

Mr. English: Will you be able to make announcements when you're having these meetings somehow?

Mr. Coen: Oh yeah.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, they'll have to be.

Mr. Coen: One, they have to be public. I believe in giving people as much notice. I don't want to get bombarded if I say we're doing something tomorrow and Mr. Zuraf I know would not appreciate that.

Mr. Rhodes: I just know that we've always went forward with... because of the way they were referred before, with the geography of those existing UDAs as always kind of a foregone conclusion and then you just start working on the margins of it. I just think stepping back and refresh the look is going to be good. A good opportunity. Great. Okay. Anything else from the Planning Director's Report?

Mrs. Baker: No. Just that Mr. Harvey and other members of the staff are broadening their planning horizons this week by attending the Virginia American Planning Association Conference.

Mr. Rhodes: Very good; thank you very much. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. Committee Reports. Do we... oh good, we'll have them again soon. Chairman's Report. The only thing I would address is I want to apologize to the members. I just dropped the ball on the last communication we had done on that act that we just got referred back to us, and so I did it last minute. And I hope you know I would always have intended to have shared it with you, gotten your feedback, made sure to incorporate that. I kind of shared it with you as a fait accompli.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

I think I generally represented what our views were but it wouldn't have been my choice of process. I just dropped the ball on it and so it was a last second thing. And so I apologize for that. With that, TRC. Does everybody have their stuff? Very good. It's Aquia Election District and Falmouth. Okay, good; August 12th. I'd entertain a motion for approval of the minutes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

9. TRC Information - August 12, 2015
 - South Campus Office Buildings - Aquia Election District
 - Bluffs at Cranes Corner - Falmouth Election District

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, before we do that, under Other Business.

Mr. Rhodes: Please.

Mr. Apicella: I have a thought about an item that we might want to pursue in the future, which is the order of the documents that are provided to us as part of our package. I think personally when we have a rezoning package that's 500 pages, I really... kind of going back to an earlier conversation of things that are most important versus things that are least important. Both from my vantage point and also from the public's vantage point it might be helpful to consider what might be a better order of the documentation. And, I mean, I don't have any absolute thoughts about what that might be, but I personally, for example, the staff report obviously up front, the proffer and impact statement are important to me. Parts of the application to me seem to be sort of extraneous although they can be lengthy. I don't find them to be all that important. TIAs can be 200 plus pages. To me that might go all the way in the back, especially as it can be updated. So I just think it would be helpful to us to consider what might be an order that might be preferable. I understand that there's no requirement in talking to staff about this that it be laid out the way that it is. But maybe taking a rezoning package as an example or a starting point how might we consider reordering it.

Mr. Rhodes: Maybe we take our next agenda in August and, as we're reviewing them to do our homework before the meeting, just think about it from that perspective. And then when we get back next time, if you have any suggestions as to a potential modification or order, I know staff, how they put them in one way or another, I'm sure it doesn't matter. I'll just throw back some suggestions the next time when we get back together. Okay, great, wonderful. Okay, move onto approval of minutes. I'd entertain a motion to approve the April 22nd minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 22, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Second by Mr. Boswell. Any further comment Mr. Gibbons?

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Boswell? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion to approve the April 22, 2015 minutes signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0.

May 13, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: So moved for May 13th.

Mr. Rhodes: May 13, 2015 motion to approve by Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Rhodes: Ah, he beat you. Second by Mr. Boswell. Further comment Mr. Gibbons? Mr. Boswell? Any other member? All those in favor of the motion to approve May 13 minutes signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0.

May 27, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: So moved for May 27th.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Motion to approve the May 27 minutes by Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Coen: Second.

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

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Passes 7-0.

June 10, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: I move for June 10th.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Gibbons to approve the June 10, 2015 minutes. A second by...?

Mr. Coen: I was not here so I'll abstain from that.

Mr. English: Second.

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

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? Passes 7-0. Oh, 6-0 and one abstention. Thank you very much Mr. Coen. Abstaining because you were not here, very courteous. But watched from afar. Any other comments? Any other items we've missed?

Mr. Apicella: Motion to adjourn Mr. Chairman.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2015

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Let's do it; we are adjourned. Thank you all very much. See you back on August 26th.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.