

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

September 1, 2015

Call to Order A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Gary F. Snellings, Chairman, at 3:00 p.m., on Tuesday, September 1, 2015, in the Board Chambers, at the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

Roll Call The following members were present: Gary F. Snellings, Chairman; Laura A. Sellers, Vice Chairman; Meg Bohmke; Jack R. Cavalier; Paul V. Milde, III; and Robert “Bob” Thomas, Jr. Cord A. Sterling was absent from the afternoon session due to a work conflict.

Also in attendance were: Anthony J. Romanello, County Administrator; Charles L. Shumate, County Attorney; Marcia C. Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Pamela Timmons, Deputy Clerk; associated staff, and other interested parties.

Presentation of a Proclamation Recognizing Childhood Cancer Awareness Month Mr. Snellings presented a proclamation and welcomed Ms. Andi McConnell, Executive Director of the Fairy Godmother Project, Ms. Margaret Beltran, founder of “Strong for Dom” in honor of her son that passed away from cancer; and Skip and Courtney Harris, members of the Fairy Godmother Parent Advisory Board.

Presentation by Mr. Woody Van Valkenburgh, President and CEO of Rappahannock Goodwill Industries, Inc. Mr. Snellings welcomed Mr. Van Valkenburgh who gave a presentation and showed a video citing one of Goodwill Industries success stories. Mr. Van Valkenburgh introduced Mr. Donnie Tolson, his successor as CEO and President of Goodwill. Following his presentation, Mr. Snellings presented Mr. Van Valkenburgh with a proclamation honoring him for his years of service and wishing him well on his retirement.

Presentation of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA) “Peak Performance Awards” to Aquia and Little Falls Run Wastewater Treatment Plants Director of Utilities, Mr. Michael Smith, and Mr. Snellings recognized Mr. Ed Hayner, Plant Manager at the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant; Mr. Brian Green, Plant Manager at the Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Plant; and Mr. Joe Graninger, Assistant Manager at Little Falls.

Presentation by Dr. Bruce Benson, Superintendent Dr. Benson said that there were 200 teachers new to Stafford County, and that they appreciated the Board's work on compensation so they could be paid for attending the New Teacher Academy.

Regarding Stafford High School, Dr. Benson said that classes were delayed to a September 14th start date due to the lack of a temporary occupancy permit. The academic classrooms were ready but no people were allowed in the building until the temporary OP was issued. Lagging behind were health, physical education, and fine arts facilities. Dr. Benson thanked the County's Code staff for its support and untiring efforts.

In discussing an \$8.3 Million salary savings, Dr. Benson said it was a much larger amount than anticipated, and that it could be traced back to the FY14 budget where \$5 Million was taken from the salary line item and moved to other areas, broad categories including text books, technology, operations, and maintenance. He said it was not done transparently, or in a way the School Board or the Board of Supervisors could have directed its usage. Dr. Benson said that challenges with the system (Lotus 123, dating back to 1983), and not being linked to the HTE system, were partially accountable for the discrepancy. The new system, once fully operational, would prevent that type of mistake from happening again. Dr. Benson said once the audit was complete in November, he would work with the School Board to use that money to buy down debt and pay down expenses.

Mr. Milde said that in 2007-2008, the Board had a contentious relationship with the School Board regarding transfers for upcoming school years. He asked why the School Division did not look at audited "actuals" and did not use two-year projections. Dr. Benson said his aim was to align the budget with actual expenditures and project expenses based those, which did not happen in the past. Mr. Milde and Dr. Benson discussed carry-overs and budgeting funds. Dr. Benson said that there were some accounts that were not accessed in two years, which resulted in a \$3 Million budget savings.

Mr. Cavalier thanked Dr. Benson for bringing the overage to the Board's attention the way he did, saying that Dr. Benson could have spent the money but did not and was awaiting audit results before doing so. Mr. Cavalier said that he thought that an amount as large as \$8.3 Million should have stood out to the Schools' Finance staff. Schools were in the fourth year of a five-year buy-down, and that money could be spent on that.

Mr. Thomas said there would be an approximate \$1 Million increase in Virginia Retirement Systems (VRS); \$1.5 Million in additional debt service; and a 2% salary enhancement, all ways in which the money could be put to good use. He added that he was glad that the money would not be used until the audit confirmed the actual amount.

Mr. Thomas talked about removing categorical funding and hoped the School Board would use the same budget matrix as the County, which with the new UniSys template, should be easy to do.

Ms. Sellers noted that Dr. Benson purchased a house in the Griffis-Widewater District, saying that he was first superintendent in several years to put down roots in the County, and she was very happy to have Dr. Benson on board; teachers appreciated the direction Dr. Benson was taking County schools.

Ms. Bohmke said she was present at the August 31, 2015 “Welcome Back” event and was amazed at the number of attendees and appreciative of Dr. Benson’s transparency in sharing budgeting information and the compensation model. She added that the event was voluntary but three-quarters of the auditorium was filled with teachers, administrators, and staff. Ms. Bohmke said that Dr. Benson brought all 30 schools together. She said, talking about budgeting, that she hated the “use or lose” mentality and thanked Dr. Benson for his efforts, saying that his vision for the School Division was incredible. She mentioned the Bridge program and asked that the School Board reconsidered it for reinstatement.

Mr. Romanello told Dr. Benson that the temporary occupancy permit had just been issued, effective September 2nd, for teachers and staff only. Mr. Snellings thanked Dr. Benson and Mr. Romanello for sharing the good news. He said that in a recent Free Lance-Star article, the Stafford County Schools were #1 in every category except one, where it placed #2 overall and attributed that to Dr. Benson’s success since coming to Stafford County.

Presentations by the Public The following persons desired to speak:

- Ruth Carlone - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Becky Reed - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Waylon Marks - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Irma Clifton - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- William Jurnigan - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Milton Breton - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Holly Hazard - Power Kix stidmets attending AAU Games; open house on September 26th at Power Kix gym (no time given)

Presentations by Members of the Board Board members spoke on the topics as identified:

Ms. Bohmke - OPEB update including financial investments on behalf of retirees; Legislative Committee update; Watch for Children signs in Leeland Station and Heather Hills; On-line petition regarding the name of the Aquatic Center, her reasoning and citizen support for adding Mark Lenzi’s name to the title of the Aquatic Center (citizen e-mails incorporated into the minutes at Ms. Bohmke’s request):

From: Weluvourtwins@aol.com

Date: August 31, 2015 at 5:07:59 PM EDT

To: jcavalier@staffordcountyva.gov, pmilde@staffordcountyva.gov, lsellers@staffordcountyva.gov, gsnellings@staffordcountyva.gov, csterling@staffordcountyva.gov, bthomas@staffordcountyva.gov, mbohmke@staffordcountyva.gov, bpotter@leesburgtoday.com, pjenkins@freelancestar.com

Subject: Mark Lenzi and Jeff Rouse Aquatic Center

Dear Stafford County Board of Supervisors (and fellow reporters),

We were deeply saddened to learn that the new Aquatic Center had been voted by the board and is solely to be named after Olympian Jeff Rouse. We understand the board decided to name a non-diving board facility Woodlands after Olympian Mark Lenzi, and can only wonder as to why such a vast discrepancy in our how county honors Olympians. This is a travesty and we urge all the board members to respectfully reconsider your position and make the new facility at Embrey Mills Development a jointly named Aquatic Center. To name a state-of-the-art facility solely after a swimmer is discriminating to those young athletics that may choose to become a diver. To our youth, it shows them that one sport is more desirable or more rewarded, and this is a disservice to all our potential athletes and Olympians. These two young men lived and competed in Stafford, trained here and went on to win MEDALS for our great Country. They both have given back to the community in which they resided and both deserve to have their names on the facility. If the board cannot honor both, then respectfully you should rescind to have neither name on the facility.

We are perplexed that it has come to a public outcry demanding justice for not only Mark Lenzi's legacy but for his family, friends and community that is supportive of our Olympic Athletes. We would appreciate you taking our request from a family that was born and raised in Stafford County. We have watched Stafford grow, progress, and develop into an inclusive community; however, with this action by the board it appears that this decision was exclusive. With regards to making your decision what factors did you consider when choosing the name of the Facility? Back in the day, many buildings in Stafford and surrounding were named after those that had passed as way to honor them. Both Jeff Rouse and Mark Lenzi are deserving of such an honor and naming the facility is is award that is given by the community. This new facility will be around for a long time and our community deserves to see our board carry on traditions and remembrance of those that excelled as Olympians and impacted our county.

We are not able to attend the meeting tomorrow but request that our letter be read and recorded in the meetings minutes. Let the voices of the community be heard, allow them to cast their vote on this issue. It is not only the honorable thing to do, it is your fiduciary duty to represent the community and hear the voices of the constituents who in which in trust you to make a fair and equitable decision regarding this.

Respectfully,

Jonathan and Bobbi Cooper Kleckner
668 Ramoth Church Road
Fredericksburg, VA 22406
252-531-5196

From: John & Lara Zick [<mailto:zicklj@verizon.net>]

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 7:44 PM

To: 'lsellers@staffordcountyva.gov'; 'mbohmke@staffordcountyva.gov'; 'jcavalier@staffordcountyva.gov'; 'pmilde@staffordcountyva.gov'; 'csterling@staffordcountyva.gov'; 'gsnellings@staffordcountyva.gov'

Subject: Honor Mark Lenzi

To the Board of Supervisors:

I grew up in Stafford County, and my parents have lived there for almost 40 years. It's exciting to see how much the county has grown since my childhood, and it sounds like the new aquatics center will be an impressive addition. But I'm writing to express my strong disappointment and disagreement with the inexplicable decision to name the center after only one of Stafford's Olympic champion athletes.

Mark Lenzi and I were classmates at Stafford High School, and I knew him well. I watched as he transitioned from a champion wrestler to a diver, at an age when he knew that changing sports would stack the deck against him. I was a spectator at one of his early diving meets. Despite his relative newness to the sport, he blew away his competition. He had a rare combination of natural talent, dedication, intensity, focus, and heart. Mark spoke often of his love for diving. He said in high school that he would make it to the Olympics, and he did – twice.

His name and his story should be known and remembered as an inspiration to young athletes everywhere, especially in his own hometown. This is all the more crucial because, having passed away far too young, Mark is not here to tell that story himself. For these reasons, I stand with the hundreds (perhaps by now thousands) of others who feel strongly that Mark’s name needs to be on the new facility. This will not diminish Mr. Rouse’s accomplishments in any way; he is every bit a champion himself, and deserves to be honored equally. But the Board’s refusal to include Mark is perplexing at best, and, in my view, shameful. Please reconsider your decision and honor Mark’s legacy.

Sincerely,
Lara Shelesky Zick
Stafford High School, Class of 1986

Mr. Cavalier - Infrastructure Committee update including new diverging diamond interchange design; VDOT open house at Colonial Forge HS, September 29th, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.; House Bill 2 transportation funding priorities.

Mr. Milde - Eagle Scout ceremony; release of a bald eagle at Widewater; R-Board meeting; Community and Economic Development Committee (CEDC) update including a reduction in conditional use permit (CUP) fees; Economic Development quarterly update – Stafford County was #1 in job growth out of 95 counties in the Commonwealth on a rolling five-year average.

Ms. Sellers - Attended George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) meeting, asked to serve on a panel with Mark Kelly (Fredericksburg) and Chris Yakabouski (Spotsylvania) about homelessness in the region, which the Community Services Board continues to discuss. Donna Krauss, Assistant to the County Administrator for Human Services, giving a presentation to the Office on Youth, at the State Capitol, on Tuesday, September 9, 2015.

Mr. Snellings - Provided timeline, Board votes, and adopted Resolution regarding the process followed when the Board named the Indoor Recreation Center at Embrey Mill, the “Jeff Rouse Swim and Sport Center” (November 13, 2014, R14-290)

Mr. Sterling - Absent from the afternoon session

Mr. Thomas - Deferred comments

Report of the County Attorney Mr. Shumate deferred his report.

Report of the County Administrator Mr. Anthony Romanello reported that Item 7 was removed from the Consent Agenda to provide time for a staff presentation; and Items 14 and 15 were moved from the afternoon session to the evening to permit Mr. Sterling’s vote on Winding Creek. Part of the proposed development was located in the Rock Hill District (a portion was also located in the Garrisonville District).

Legislative; Consent Agenda Mr. Cavalier motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to adopt the Consent Agenda, which consisted of Items 4 through 13, omitting Item 7.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Thomas
Nay: (0)
Absent (1) Sterling

Item 4. Legislative; Approve Minutes of the August 18, 2015 Board Meeting

Item 5. Finance and Budget; Approve Expenditure Listing

Resolution R15-295 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXPENDITURE LISTING (EL)
DATED AUGUST 18, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2015

WHEREAS, the Board appropriated funds to be expended for the purchase of goods and services in accordance with an approved budget; and

WHEREAS, the payments appearing on the above-referenced Listing of Expenditures represent payment of \$100,000 and greater for the purchase of goods and/or services which are within the appropriated amounts;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that the above-mentioned EL be and hereby is approved.

Item 6. Finance and Budget; Authorize Application to the Circuit Court to Extend the Deadline on Voter-Approved Bond Sales for Transportation and Parks Projects

Resolution R15-296 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CIRCUIT COURT TO ENTER AN ORDER WITH RESPECT TO THE NOVEMBER 4, 2008 REFERENDUM ON THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS, AND THE NOVEMBER 3, 2009 REFERENDUM ON THE ISSAUNCE OF BONDS FOR PARKS PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the County of Stafford, Virginia (the "County") held a special election on November 4, 2008 (the "2008 Election") on the question of issuing a maximum amount of \$70,000,000 general obligation bonds for transportation improvements (the "Transportation Bonds") and a majority of the qualified voters of the County voting in the 2008 Election voted in favor of the issuance of such Transportation Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Circuit Court of the County entered an Order on December 5, 2008, in accordance with Section 15.2-2611 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended authorizing the Board of Supervisors to proceed to carry out the wishes of the voters with respect to the Transportation Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the County held a special election on November 3, 2009 (the "2009 Election") on the question of issuing a maximum amount of \$29,000,000 general obligation bonds for parks and recreation projects (the "Parks Bonds") and a majority of the qualified voters of the County voting in the 2009 Election voted in favor of the issuance of such Parks Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Circuit Court of the County entered an Order on November 20, 2009, in accordance with Section 15.2-2611 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended (the "Code") authorizing the Board of Supervisors to proceed to carry out the wishes of the voters with respect to the Parks Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has determined that it is in the best interests of the County to issue the Transportation Bonds and the Parks Bonds and undertake the projects to be financed thereby in phases where \$57,829,267 of the Transportation Bonds and \$6,780,267 of the Parks Bonds remain unissued; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors proposes to extend the period during which the Transportation Bonds and the Parks Bonds may be issued in accordance with Section 15.2-2611 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF STAFFORD, VIRGINIA:

1. The Board of Supervisors hereby determines that it is in the best interests of the County to extend the period during which the Transportation Bonds and the Parks Bonds may be issued to ten years after the date of the 2008 Election and the 2009 Election, respectively. The Board of Supervisors hereby requests the Circuit Court of the County to enter an order extending the period during which the Transportation Bonds may be issued to a ten-year period ending November 4, 2018 and extending the period during which the Parks Bonds may be issued to a ten-year period ending November 3, 2019.

2. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Item 8. Planning and Zoning; Authorize the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing to Consider Partial Plat Vacation for Shea Estates to Subdivide 40 Acres

Resolution R15-259 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A PARTIAL VACATION OF THE SHEA ESTATES SUBDIVISION PLAT, WITHIN THE GEORGE WASHINGTON ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the subdivision plat known as Shea Estates was recorded as Plat Map No. PM030000127, among the Stafford County Land Records on July 16, 2003 (the Plat); and

WHEREAS, Note 14 on the Plat states, “The lots may not be further subdivided;” and

WHEREAS, Alan Howard (Property Owner) owner of Tax Map Parcel No. 56K-6 (Property) desires to subdivide the Property; and

WHEREAS, the Property Owner submitted an application to vacate the portion of the Plat that restricts the lots from being further subdivided; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2272(2) and Stafford County Code Sec. 22-108, the Board desires and is required to hold a public hearing to consider vacating a portion of the plat;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a public hearing to consider partially vacating the Shea Estates Subdivision Plat, to remove Note 14, which restricts the lots of the subdivision from being further subdivided.

Item 9. Public Works; Authorize the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing to Grant Permanent Access to a Public Right-of-Way on Bonnie Lee Court

Resolution R15-292 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINSTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO GRANT PERMANENT ACCESS TO A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY ON BONNIE LEE COURT

WHEREAS, the right-of-way for Bonnie Lee Court was dedicated to public use on May 15, 1998; and

WHEREAS, Bonnie Lee Court has not been constructed to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements, and has not been accepted in to the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the owners of Tax Map Parcel No. 20-58 desire to have permanent access to this public right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-1800(B), the Board is required to hold a public hearing prior to consider granting an interest in the use of the County-owned property;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a public hearing to consider granting a permanent access easement to the public right-of-way on Bonnie Lee Court.

Item 10. Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing for Consideration of Condemnation and Exercise of the County's Quick-Take Powers for the Route 1 North Sewer Improvement Project

Resolution R15-165 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS TO ACQUIRE A PERMANENT WATER-SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT TAX MAP PARCEL 21-69B TO SERVE ROUTE 1 NORTH, WITHIN THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the County is in the process of acquiring the necessary easements for the construction of the Route 1 North Sanitary Sewer Replacement Project (The Project); and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel 21-69B consists of approximately 2.061 acres of land (the Property) owned by Mark A. Stephens, LTD., (the Property Owner); and

WHEREAS, the Board must acquire permanent Water-Sanitary Sewer easement to construct the Project; and

WHEREAS, 0.2149 acre of permanent water and sewer easement was previously dedicated on the Property but due to design and alignment changes the previously acquired easement will be vacated and a new area of easement of 0.2446 acre is required. This is an additional 0.0297 acre of permanent water-sanitary sewer easement required on the Property to complete this Project; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the 0.0297 acres of permanent water and sewer easement on the Property, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the property is \$581, based upon the 2014 tax assessed value and the County is offering the same for the acquisition of the easement; and

WHEREAS, the Board, through the County staff, made bona fide but ineffectual efforts to purchase the easement on the Property, by offering said determined value on behalf of the County to the Property Owners; and

WHEREAS, the Property Owner has not consented to the acquisition of the easement; and

WHEREAS, the terms of purchase have not been agreed upon, and County staff was unsuccessful in acquiring a final settlement, but will continue to work with the Property Owners in attempt to acquire the easements; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to consider the condemnation and use of its quick take powers to acquire the 0.2446-acre of permanent Water-Sanitary Sewer easement on the Property; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to receive the public testimony, if any, at a public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator to advertise a public hearing to be scheduled pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C), to consider the necessity for condemnation and exercise of the County's quick-take powers, to immediately acquire 0.02446-acre of permanent Water-Sanitary Sewer easement on Tax Map Parcel 21-69B, for the sewer to serve Route 1 North.

Item 11. Public Information; Recognize September as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month in Stafford County

Proclamation P15-21 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE SEPTEMBER AS CHILDHOOD
CANCER AWARENESS MONTH IN STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, the month of September is designated as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month; and

WHEREAS, cancer is the second leading cause of death in children, after accidents; and

WHEREAS, childhood cancer rates are rising, and more than 10,380 children will be diagnosed with cancer in 2015 in the United States, and about 1,250 children under the age of 15 may die from the disease in 2015; and

WHEREAS, less than 5% of the Federal Government's total funding for cancer research is dedicated to childhood cancer each year; and

WHEREAS, National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month provides an opportunity to share experiences and information with the public and media to raise awareness of childhood cancer; and

WHEREAS, National Cancer Awareness Month is a time for families to honor and remember their loved ones lost to cancer and to recognize the health care professionals who provided care;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 1st day of September, 2015, that it be and hereby does recognize September as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month in Stafford County, and honors the children who have lost their fight with cancer or are fighting cancer, as well as their families and caregivers.

12. Public Information; Recognize Thomas Baker for His Special Olympics Accomplishments

Proclamation P15-22 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING THOMAS BAKER FOR HIS OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATION OF STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA AND THE UNITED STATES AT THE SPECIAL OLYMPICS WORLD GAMES

WHEREAS, Thomas Baker of Stafford County has been a Special Olympics athlete for several years; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Baker was selected to represent both Virginia and the United States at the 2015 Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Baker was one of 12 athletes from Virginia and a member of the 350 athlete team from the United States; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Baker competed in the powerlifting competition in the 140-148 pound weight class; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Baker earned gold medals in the bench press and combo all lifts categories, a silver medal in squat lifts, and a bronze medal in dead lift;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 1st day of September, 2015, that it be and hereby does recognize Thomas Baker for his outstanding achievements at the 2015 Special Olympics World Games.

Item 13. Public Information; Recognize Donna Cote on her Retirement from the Central Rappahannock Regional Library

Proclamation P15-23 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MS. DONNA COTE ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE CENTRAL RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL LIBRARY

WHEREAS, Ms. Donna Cote is retiring from the Central Rappahannock Regional Library after more than 40 years of employment, and 34 years as Director; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Cote was an integral part of the growth of CRRL’s card catalog system, which has evolved into the web-based catalog in use today; and

WHEREAS, during Ms. Cote’s tenure, an online portal was established for customers with the addition of audiobooks, E-books, and E-magazines; and

WHEREAS, the CRRL built or renovated nine locations in the region including the John Musante Porter Library and the England Run Library, which are “signature,” first class libraries that Ms. Cote helped design; and

WHEREAS, the John Musante Porter Library opened in 1992 and was named posthumously after (then) Chairman of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors; Porter Library is 23,000 square feet with a 100 seat theater and an atrium that features the work of local artists; and

WHEREAS, the England Run branch of the CRRL opened in 2010, is 30,000 square feet and features green initiatives including sun shades, a reflective roof coating, energy efficient glass, lighting, and HVAC, and is carpeted and tiled using recycled materials; and

WHEREAS, under Ms. Cote’s leadership, the CRRL has establish vital community partnerships that ensure its recognition in the community as a lifelong resource;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 1st day of September, 2015, that it be and hereby does recognize Ms. Donna Cote on her retirement and for her contributions to the Central Rappahannock Regional Library and to the region.

Item 7. Planning and Zoning; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract for Computer Software for Electronic Plan Review Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning; and Ms. Maria Perrotte, Chief Financial Officer; briefed Board members.

Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt proposed Resolution R15-288.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Thomas
Nay: (0)
Absent (1) Sterling

Resolution R15-288 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE
A CONTRACT FOR COMPUTER SOFTWARE SERVICES FOR ELECTRONIC
PLAN REVIEW

WHEREAS, the FY2016 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identified on-line permitting (electronic plan review) as a desired capital asset, with funding available in the County's General Fund; and

WHEREAS, SHI International Corporation (SHI) provides electronic "software as a service" for electronic plan and permit review that is complementary to and compatible with existing computer software programs used by the County to enable on-line permitting; and

WHEREAS, SHI is a named vendor under state contract to provide these services; and

WHEREAS, SHI submitted a proposal to provide on-line permitting services to the County and the proposal is reasonable for the scope of work to be performed; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to provide efficient and effective services to the County's customers; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that on-line permitting will benefit the County, in addition to its customers, in the review and approval process for plans and permits;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that the Board be and it hereby does authorize the County Administrator, or his designee, to execute a five-year contract for services with SHI International Corporation with the first year payment of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Two Hundred Eleven Dollars (\$150,211), unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Discuss the Process and Timing for Ordering Signs for the Aquatic Facility – Ms. Bohmke asked that this item be added to the agenda and for clarification about proposed signage. Mr. Romanello said that there would be a monument-type sign on Mine Road, and smaller directional signs in Embrey Mill leading to the Facility. A sign would also be placed on the building, all of which would be handled by the Public Works Department. He added that signs would be in place by the end of construction.

Mr. Cavalier said that (at the building) it was not really a sign but more of a mural or display area recognizing the accomplishments of all Stafford Olympic athletes past, present, and future. Ms. Jamie Porter, Director of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities, would brief the Board at a future meeting.

Mr. Thomas said that he foresaw a problem; that criteria should be established to determine who would be recognized in the display, or mural, or whatever recognition was determined to be appropriate at the Facility.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. Cavalier had information that she did not have, other than through the grapevine. Mr. Snellings said that nothing was finalized, and agreed with Mr. Thomas about the need for established criteria. He asked Mr. Romanello to draw up guidelines.

Ms. Bohmke referred to a document/narrative, received from Mr. Romanello that listed 11 athletes. Mr. Snellings said that he had not seen the document to which Ms. Bohmke referred. She said that in light of the “Lenzi issue” all Board members should have been involved from the beginning. Mr. Snellings said that there had been two meetings during which it had been discussed.

Mr. Thomas asked if recognition would be for athletes’ accomplishments while Stafford residents or those who were now Stafford residents but not at the time of their Olympic career. Mr. Milde spoke about Arlene Limas with Power Kix and her accomplishments over the past 25 years that she has been a County resident.

Legislative; Closed Meeting. At 4:37 p.m., Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Ms. Sellers, to adopt proposed Resolution CM15-16.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Thomas
Nay: (0)
Absent: (1) Sterling

Resolution CM15-16 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding *Board of Supervisors of Stafford County v. Safeco Insurance Company of America*, Case No. 307-77; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(7) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, does hereby authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

Call to Order At 5:22 p.m., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Legislative; Closed Meeting Certification Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Mr. Cavalier, to adopt proposed Resolution CM15-16(a).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Thomas

Nay: (0)

Absent: (1) Sterling

Resolution CM15-16(a) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2015

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 1st day of September, 2015, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that to the best of each member's knowledge: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

At 5:22 p.m., the Chairman adjourned the afternoon session of the meeting.

Call to Order At 7:00 p.m., the Chairman called the evening session to order. Mr. Sterling arrived for the evening session of the Board of Supervisors meeting.

Invocation Mr. Snellings asked for a moment of silence to remember Alison Parker and Adam Ward, journalists that were murdered in Roanoke, VA.

Pledge of Allegiance Mr. Cavalier led the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America.

Presentation Recognizing Special Olympic Athlete Thomas Baker Mr. Snellings introduced Thomas Baker, gold medalist at the 2015 World Special Olympics, held in Los Angeles, CA. He was one of 12 athletes from Virginia, and one of 350 who represented the United States. Thomas competed in the 140-148 lb. weight class in powerlifting and won gold medals in the bench press and combo lift categories, a silver

medal in squat lifts, and a bronze medal in the dead lift. Also attending was Jeff Rouse, Olympic gold medal swimmer, and Thomas’ parents, Gene and Barbara Baker, as well as Thomas’ brother, Michael Rollins. Mrs. and Mrs. Baker thanked the Board for recognizing Thomas and the accomplishments of all Special Olympic athletes.

Presentations by the Public – II

- Don McCormick - Winding Creek, VDOT waiver, traffic concerns
- Bonnie Thomen - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Thomas Brown - Winding Creek rezoning, traffic and safety concerns
- Sue Gill - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Margaret Lowry - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Jim Burkett - Winding Creek, against rezoning, traffic concerns
- Stacey Sikes - Winding Creek, VDOT waiver, traffic concerns
- Maureen Carden - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Tonya Gardner - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Mesbah Chowdhury - Winding Creek, congestion and traffic concerns
- Susan Hall - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Mark Repass - Proud of Jeff Rouse’s Olympic accomplishments
- Elizabeth Myers - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- William Jurnigan - Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center
- Paul Waldowski - Boys swam for the Quantico Sharks, Olympic athletes worked with the young swimmers, made a lasting impression on him and his boys; Diverging Diamond interchange; traffic in front of Colonial Forge HS is unsafe; prefers treetops over rooftops; Jeffersonian Principles (50% plus 1 to win election)
- Tylor Underwood - “Stafford being Stafford;” Include Mark Lenzi’s name on the Aquatic Center, confusion with a hyphenated name; Civil Engineer; Winding Creek does not meet SSAR requirements for a VDOT waiver

Planning and Zoning; Consider Authorizing a Reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District, Tax Map Parcels 29-4 and 29-5C (Winding Creek) Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a Power Point presentation and answered Board members questions.

Mr. Thomas asked about removal of a boulder, estimated to cost \$412,000, and if that was a sufficient amount to complete the project. Mr. Harvey said that Public Works staff indicated that it may be a bit higher than needed but it will not be known until the method of removal is determined. Mr. Thomas also asked about the timing of the proffers, whether all 97 units would be built before road improvements were underway. Ms. Erica Ehly, Planner, answered that all proffered transportation items must be underway during the first phase of the development. Mr. Thomas spoke about revenue sharing funds. Mr.

Harvey said that one-half of the money was from revenue sharing. Otherwise, County funds would be utilized. He added that due to the reduction in gas prices, there was a reduction in the fuels tax fund. He said the project was not in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and to include it, another project would have to be bumped from the CIP.

Mr. Thomas asked about right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Charlie Payne, for the applicant, said that they were working with the neighboring community, with Mr. Greg Henderson and the Berkshire HOA, and had an agreement to use their land. He added that if removing the boulder cost less than \$412,000, the remainder of the money went to the County in cash. Mr. Thomas said that based on a conversation (today) with VDOT, the waiver would not be granted. Deputy County Administrator, Mr. Keith Dayton, said that by all indications, the VDOT waiver would not be granted. Mr. Payne said his client had ever intention of appealing the decision if VDOT denied the applicant's waiver request. Ms. Bohmke said that she spoke with Marcie Parker, VDOT Residency Administrator, who told her that the waiver would not be approved, that any idea that it would was leading people astray; that the sign was posted at Fireberry for 20 years. Mr. Payne repeated that he spoke with VDOT and was encouraged to file the waiver. Ms. Sellers asked that Mr. Payne put in writing that the applicant would appeal if the waiver was denied.

Ms. Sellers motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Ordinance O15-25 with the amendment.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (3) Sellers, Snellings, Sterling

Nay: (4) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Thomas

Because proposed Ordinance O15-25 was denied, the Board did not hear the applicant's request for a conditional use permit at Winding Creek.

Planning and Zoning; Consider Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Development Standards in the P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mr. Cavalier said that the request was long overdue and plans for the Aquia Towne Center were underway to include 256 apartments currently under construction with commercial development to follow.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons desired to speak:

Tylor Underwood

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Ordinance O15-24.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Sterling, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Ordinance O15-24 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN 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”

WHEREAS, the P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District was created pursuant to Ordinance O07-39 on July 7, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the P-TND Zoning District was intended to promote a mixed-use, urban form of development; and

WHEREAS, only one property is currently zoned P-TND in the County; and

WHEREAS, to date, no properties have completely developed under the P-TND Zoning District regulations; and

WHEREAS, several pending zoning district reclassification projects have demonstrated a need to modify the P-TND Zoning District regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend the Zoning Ordinance, to modify the P-TND Zoning District regulations, to facilitate the orderly and timely development of mixed-use projects within the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission and staff, and the public testimony, if any, received at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices require adoption of this ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that 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,” be and they hereby are amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions remaining unchanged:

Sec. 28-25. - Definitions of specific terms.

Principal building. One or more of the larger buildings within a Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development (P-TND) Zoning District, situated at a prominent location, with vehicular access from at least one principal street. The neighborhood design standards plan shall establish upgraded architectural standards for principal buildings. At least 50% of the square footage of the buildings in the development shall be defined as principal buildings.

Secondary building. One or more smaller buildings within a Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development (P-TND) Zoning District which are oriented to automobile traffic, including use of drive-through windows, as long as pedestrian connectivity is preserved throughout the entire development. No more than 50% of the square footage of buildings on the property shall be defined as secondary buildings.

Streetscreen. A landscape strip, fence or wall located on the frontage line of a street or coplanar with the façade, at a minimum height of three feet, for the purpose of demarcating the edge of a parking lot at the street frontage or demarcating the principal street frontage line.

Sec. 28-39. - Special regulations.

(q) *Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development (P-TND)*

(12) *Additional regulations for T-5 transect zones.*

- a. All ~~primary~~-principal buildings shall have their principal pedestrian entrances along the street. For a corner lot, the pedestrian entrance shall be along the principal street.
- b. Façades shall be built parallel to the principal street frontage line along a minimum of seventy (70) percent of its length of the lot. A streetscreen shall be built along the remainder of the length of the lot. This shall not apply to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to adoption of this ordinance.

(13) *Additional regulations for T-6 transect zones.*

- b. The facade for buildings shall be built parallel to the principal street frontage line along a minimum of eighty (80) percent of its length of the lot. The remainder of the length shall be a street screen. This shall not apply to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to adoption of this ordinance.

(14) *Additional regulations for SD-C transect zones.*

- ~~d. Parking areas shall be screened from the principal street by a building street screen or evergreen hedge.~~

(21) *Additional density and intensity regulations for specific transect zones.*

a.—The request for deviation or modification from the tables may be approved by the board of supervisors with the reclassification approval for the P-TND district

Table 3.5(c) Lot Occupancy *

Transect Zones	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	SD-C
Lot Width—Min/Max	50/none	200/none	60/120	18/96	18/180	18/700	18/none
Max Lot Coverage	.01%	10.0%	60%	70%	90%	95%	95%

* Table 3.5(c) shall not apply to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to the adoption of this ordinance.

Table 3.5(f) Heights/Number of Stories

Transect Zones	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	SD-C
Maximum Height (feet)	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story	75 at the finished floor level of the top story
# of stories - min/max	1 min/1 max	1 min/3 max	1 min/3 max	2 min/4 max	≥ 1 min/6 max	1 min/6 max	1 min/6 max

Table 3.5(g) Building Height to Street Ratio *

The building height ratio is the distance between the right-of-way line at the opposite side of the street from the building to the front edge of the building (width) and the distance from the right-of-way line at the opposite side of the street from the building to the top of the building (height). The building may terrace back each story provided the ratio is maintained.

T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	SD-C
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 (height):2 (width) ratio	3 (height):2 (width) ratio

* Table 3.5(g) shall not apply to redevelopment projects zoned P-TND prior to the adoption of this ordinance.

Sec. 28-56. - Application for planned developments.

(e) *Effect of approval.* Upon approval of the complete application submitted under this section, the applicant shall have one hundred twenty (120) days in which to submit a preliminary subdivision/site development plan for the entire development. All final plans must comply with the stipulations and concepts approved by the board of supervisors during the rezoning, and all future

development within the P-TND district shall be in conformance with the applicable generalized development plan approved by the board of supervisors at the time of rezoning, except for property zoned P-TND prior to November 13, 2014. The approval of the initial application package by the board of supervisors shall in no manner obligate the county to approve any final plan. The final plan shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with the requirements of article XIV, Site Plans, of this chapter.

Sec. 28-66. - P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development.

(d) *Parking and loading*

- (1) The P-TND shall ~~be exempt from article VII~~ comply with the provisions of Article VII of this chapter except as described in (2) and (3) directly below.
- (2) The parking and loading requirements for all uses within a P-TND shall be as set forth in Tables 3.3(a) and 3.3(c).
- (3) Shared parking for uses within the P-TND shall be as set forth in Table 3.3(b)

~~(e) — [Exemption.] The P-TND shall be exempt from article VIII.~~

~~(f)~~(e) *On-street parallel parking and detached parking garages.* On-street parallel parking shall be permitted in a P-TND district. The number of parking spaces required for off-street parking requirements specified in table 3.3(a) of this section shall be required, except that all on-street parallel parking spaces provided shall count towards the off-street parking requirements and shall be located within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the dwelling they are intended to serve. Parking spaces in garages on individual residential lots shall count toward off-street parking requirements, however, the driveway accessing the private parking garage shall not be considered towards the required number of parking spaces even if the area of the driveway is adequate for a parking space. Where on-street parallel parking is provided, a travel aisle in accordance with the Virginia Department of Transportation Subdivision Street Requirements or the requirements of Stafford County if any exceed VDOT Subdivision requirements, shall be provided, in addition to that necessary to accommodate the on-street parallel parking.

~~(g)~~(f) *Architectural design controls.* The architectural design controls shall be included with the neighborhood design standards. Technical modifications or adjustments to the neighborhood design standards may be permitted in accordance to subsection 28-56(g).

Sec. 28-137. - Types of signs permitted in P-TND Districts.

(a) *Monuments.*

- (1) Project or community identification signs may only be monument signs no larger than ~~twelve (12)~~ 30 feet above finished grade.

- (2) ~~The signage area of the monument sign shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet; for double face monument signs, the sign area for each side shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet. not exceed one-quarter square foot for each linear foot of combined building frontage or street frontage, whichever is greater.~~
- (3) ~~A monument sign may be located on both corners of the street at an intersection. Only one freestanding sign shall be permitted unless the center, park or project fronts on two or more streets, highways or public roads, in which case one sign for each such frontage shall be permitted, but the aggregate area of all signs shall not exceed the permissible area for one sign.~~

(b) *Building signs - non-residential.*

- (1) ~~No more than two (2) major user signs are permitted on the top level of any building. Within a project or community, each pad site having street, highway or public road frontage may have one freestanding, monument sign, provided that:~~

- i. The height of such sign shall not extend more than eight feet above ground level;
- ii. For a principal building, the height of such sign shall not extend more than 30 feet above ground level; and
- iii. The area of such sign shall not exceed one square foot for each linear foot of building frontage.

- (2) ~~The total area of signage for the building shall not exceed one and one-half (1.5) square foot of sign for each linear foot of the building frontage in which the sign is attached upon to a maximum of one thousand (1,000) square feet. Within a project or community, each pad site not having street, highway or public road frontage may have one freestanding monument sign, provided that:~~

- i. The height of such sign shall not extend more than six feet above ground level;
- ii. For a principal building, the height of such sign shall not extend more than 30 feet above ground level; and
- iii. The area of such sign shall not exceed one-half square foot for each linear foot of building frontage.

- (3) ~~Roof mounted signs or signs protruding above the building roof line or above the parapet wall prohibited.~~
- (4) ~~Major user signs should consist of individual, pin mounted channel letters, (illuminated or nonilluminated).~~

~~(5) For buildings up to three (3) stories, the major user sign may have letter or logo height up to three (3) feet.~~

~~(6) For buildings taller than four (4) stories, the major user sign may have letter or logo heights up to four (4) feet.~~

~~(c) *Tenant signs.*~~

~~(1) Each office building is allowed to have two (2) signs adjacent to the principal entrance that list the major building tenants. The aggregate area of all wall signs shall not exceed two square feet for each linear foot of building frontage.~~

~~(2) The total sign area for each sign shall not exceed twenty five (25) square feet. The height of each such sign shall not extend more than five feet above the wall to which it is attached.~~

~~(3) Tenant signs are only permitted on the first level or ground level of a building. One blade sign for each business not to exceed five (5) square feet, may be attached perpendicular to the facade and must have at least eight (8) feet of clearance between the bottom of the blade sign and the sidewalk and shall not project more than forty-two (42) inches from the wall.~~

~~(4) The style and height of letters should be standardized and should relate to the size of the area to which the sign will be attached. The height of the letters should be eight (8) to fourteen (14) inches. Logos are permitted.~~

~~(5) Window signs may be permitted along the first or ground level only. Consideration to the size and location of the window sign needs to be proportional to the size of the window and not to cause clutter.~~

~~(d) *Illuminated signs.*~~

~~(1) External illumination fixtures, most appropriately used for wall-mounted retail signs are advised to be permanently mounted and the light source permanently directed.~~

~~(2) Halo illumination is preferred to internally illuminated signs. Internally illuminated box signs are discouraged.~~

~~(3) Illuminated signs shall not disturb nearby uses, particularly residential uses, and should not exceed 1.0 f.c. (footcandle) measured at any property/right-of-way line.~~

~~(4) High pressure sodium vapor (yellow-orange) lighting is prohibited.~~

~~(5) Fixtures styles should complement the architectural style or character of the building.~~

~~(6) Building mounted sign conduits, raceways, transformers, junction boxes, etc. should be concealed or painted so as to make them as inconspicuous as possible.~~

~~(e)~~(d) *Address signs.* One address number, no less than six (6) inches measured vertically, shall be attached to the building in proximity to the principal entrance. Per section 28-145 of the zoning ordinance, the number shall be Arabic numerals only. Roman numerals or the spelling-out of an address is prohibited.

~~(f)~~(e) *Directional signs.*

~~(g)~~(f) *Critical resource protection area (CRPA) sign.*

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

At 8:27 p.m., the Chairman declared a ten minute recess.

At 8:37 p.m., the meeting reconvened and the Chairman announced that due to the large number of people in the Chambers present for the Stafford Village public hearing(s), Agenda items 19, 20, and 21 would be moved ahead of Item 18.

Planning and Zoning; Consider a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Allow Multi-Family Units in the Suburban Land Use Designation Under Limited Circumstances (Stafford Village Center);

Planning and Zoning; Consider a Reclassification Request from R-1, Suburban Residential to P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development (Stafford Village Center); and

Planning and Zoning; Consider a Conditional Use Permit to Allow Vehicle Fuel Sales within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District (Stafford Village Center)

Mr. Mike Zuraf, Senior Planner, gave a combined Power Point presentation and answered Board members questions about all three Stafford Village items, noting that the Planning Commission vote to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan amendment to allow multi-family units in the Suburban Land Use designation, under limited circumstances. Mr. Zuraf talked about a critical resource protection area and two perennial streams located on the property. The maximum approved building height was 60 feet, or five stories. Mr. Sterling inquired about the make-up of the apartments. Mr. Zuraf said that one-half of the apartments would be one bedroom or studio; one-half would be two or three bedroom units. Ms. Sellers asked if the street connected to Patriot Landing was removed. Mr. Zuraf said, “Not yet.” The Board discussed traffic levels of service.

Mr. Sterling asked Mr. Zuraf for examples of other developments with gas stations located in the front of the parcel. Mr. Zuraf did not have any examples to provide in response to Mr. Sterling's request. Mr. Sterling noted that it appeared that the gas station was located on the wetlands. Mr. Zuraf confirmed that was what the applicant proposed.

The deadline for the Board's decision on the Comprehensive Plan amendment was September 22, 2015, after which the entire proposal would have to be resubmitted and public hearing re-advertised.

Mr. Milde asked about T-ND on the project. Mr. Zuraf said that is was a mix of uses and elements and buildings were located in close proximity to each other. Mr. Milde asked about civic uses. Mr. Zuraf said that commercial development was considered a civic use. Mr. Milde said that it was a stretch at Aquia Towne Center but considered civic use due to the movie theatre located there. Mr. Sterling talked about residential above commercial and as it was not economically feasible at Aquia Towne Center, how it would work at the proposed Stafford Village.

Mr. Thomas asked about the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance and a needed waiver from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). He said if the waiver was not granted it would significantly change the generalized development plan (GDP). Mr. Zuraf said the waiver application was already in process. Mr. Thomas asked about the phasing language and if it would "stick" in the event of a new owner taking over the project. Mr. Zuraf said there would have to be a Board-approved proffer amendment to change the phasing language if a new owner took over. Mr. Thomas talked about fire suppression and the proposed five-story apartment building, and the closest ladder truck being at the Quantico Corporate Center. Mr. Romanello said there were also ladder trucks at Stations 4 and 10.

Mr. Snellings asked about the 435 residential units and the one-half of them that could be two or three bedroom units. Mr. Zuraf clarified that no more than 45 units could have three bedrooms (or all could be two bedroom units).

Mr. Clark Leming, for the applicant, addressed the Board, saying that Stafford Village Center was a unique development, proposed by the Pence Group, who also developed Stafford Marketplace, Dulles Expo Center, Reston Home Depot, and others in northern Virginia. Ebenezer United Methodist Church was the current owner of the property. Dr. Dean Bellis, protégé of Dr. Stephen Fuller, provided the fiscal analysis on the proposal.

Mr. Leming said that the applicant was working on a collateral agreement regarding the widening of Garrisonville Road, and that environmental permits were applied for with DEQ and the Army Corps of Engineers. Following approval of the permits, the County's Chesapeake Bay Board's approval would be the final piece for approval in terms of the two perennial streams and wetlands on the property.

Mr. Avi (last name inaudible) with TNT Environmental addressed the Board and spoke about the wetlands on the property. Mr. Sterling clarified that the wetlands becomes one of the streams. Mr. Avi said that Garrisonville Road run-off contributed to the stream, which was dry right now. He said that the DEQ permits went through its Woodbridge office and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was ready to sign off the permits to the Army Corps of Engineers, it was a joint permit process that was well underway. Mr. Leming said that if the permits were not approved, the project may not proceed.

Mr. Leming suggested that the Board only vote on the Comprehensive Plan amendment due to the September 22, 2015 deadline, and defer vote on the reclassification and conditional use permit to the Board's October 6, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Robert Pence, developer, addressed the Board saying that he did business in Stafford County for the past 15 years and named several projects in which Pence Group was involved, and measures taken outside the scope of those projects that it undertook as part of being a good corporate citizen in the County. He said that DEQ was satisfied with the permits and ready to turn them over for the next phase of approval.

Mr. Pence said the project was 800,000 square feet located on 90 acres, with 45 acres one-half retail and a 400,000 square foot office building at the front of the project, and 453 housing units. He guaranteed that there would be walking paths in open space to the rear of the proposed development and said that he was working it out with staff in advance of the possible October 6th discussion and Board vote.

Mr. Milde asked Mr. Leming about the stand-alone apartment building and the eight buildings labeled multi-family and/or retail/office/commercial (as worded on the GDP). Mr. Milde asked Mr. Leming to explain the phasing of the development. Mr. Leming said there would be no occupancy permits issued until 200,000 square feet of commercial was developed. Mr. Milde asked where in the text was that spelled out. Mr. Leming said he would clarify in the proffers which buildings were commercial use and make sure that things did not turn out like Aquia Towne Center, which he also represented.

Mr. Cavalier said that it was clear at Aquia Towne Center that residential over commercial was not economically profitable. Mr. Leming said that the GDP for the proposed Stafford Village Center was already proffered as was phasing, neither of which applied to the Aquia Towne Center. Mr. Sterling said he was doubtful that residential units paid for themselves (as stated on the Fiscal Impact Study). Dr. Bellis explained the rationale for numbers contained in the Study. Following Dr. Bellis' explanation, Mr. Sterling noted that it was an "economic non sequitur."

Ms. Bohmke talked about the market study and cited another proposal, Abberly, asking if the applicant would come back in a year or two asking to readjust the number of units, or the size of the units being built. Mr. Leming said that it was within the Board's control whether that would be allowed or not.

Mr. Pence re-addressed the Board talking about the two perennial streams and extending a bridge enabling one stream to run in front of the stand-alone apartment building. He talked about having a large retail anchor, needing parking in front rather than behind the building, and said that a letter of intent was in the works with a large theater company, and he was optimistic they would make a deal.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons desired to speak:

Rev. Mark Miller, Pastor of Ebenezer United Method Church
Shawn Genowith
Theron Peacock
Paul Waldowski

Ms. Sellers motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to keep open the public hearing until the Board's September 15, 2015 meeting. County Attorney, Charles Shumate, said that the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan could be held open until the Board's September 15th meeting, and the public hearing on the other two matters could be continued to October 6th. Mr. Milde noted that he did not feel it was necessary to hold open the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan amendment. Ms. Sellers said that she wished to keep open the lines of communications.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Bohmke, Cavalier, Sellers, Snellings, Sterling, Thomas
Nay: (1) Milde

Planning and Zoning; Consider Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Replace the 2006 Economic Development Strategic Plan/10-Point Plan with a Revised Economic Development Plan Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mr. Ralph Basile, with consultant Vantage Point, also addressed the Board.

Mr. Thomas inquired if education was included in the Plan. Mr. Basile said that a part of the SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) included research and work with regional universities, but added it was not the primary focus of the Plan.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons desired to speak:

Paul Waldowski

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Thomas said the updated ED Plan was a significant addition to the Comprehensive Plan and would further strengthen economic development initiatives and priorities in the County. He thanked staff and the consultant for the time and effort taken and the maturity of the final document.

Mr. Milde noted that the Plan was vetted by the Community and Economic Development Committee. Ms. Bohmke said she had additional questions but would get with Mr. Baroody at a later time.

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Resolution R15-281.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Milde, Sellers, Snellings, Sterling, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Resolution R15-281 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE STAFFORD COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, SPECIFICALLY TO ADD A NEW TEXTUAL DOCUMENT ENTITLED “STAFFORD COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN”

WHEREAS, the County last adopted an Economic Development Strategic Plan (ED Plan) in 2006 as an element of the Comprehensive Plan, and in 2011, the Board adopted a separate Economic Development 10-Point Plan (10-Point Plan); and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to update the ED Plan element of the Comprehensive Plan and the 10-Point Plan to reflect the latest economic conditions and objectives; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2229, the Board may amend the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board prepared certain amendments to the ED Plan element of the Comprehensive Plan, as identified in the document entitled “Stafford County Economic Development, Strategic Plan” dated April 14, 2015 (New ED Plan); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2229, the Board sent the proposed amendments to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on July 22, 2015, and pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution RCR15-09, unanimously recommended approval of the New ED Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission and staff, and the public testimony, if any, received at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the adoption of the New ED Plan will guide and accomplish a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development in Stafford County, including support of the economic vitality of Stafford County, which will, in accordance with the present and probable future needs and resources of the County, best promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the County and its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the New ED Plan is consistent with good planning practices; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the New ED Plan should be adopted;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of September, 2015, that the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, as identified in the document entitled “Stafford County Economic Development Strategic Plan” dated April 14, 2015, be and it hereby is adopted.

Adjournment At 10:52 p.m. the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Anthony J. Romanello, ICMA-CM
County Administrator

Gary F. Snellings
Chairman