

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**September 23, 2015**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 23, 2015, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Steven Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rhodes (arrived at 7:50 p.m.), Apicella, Coen, Bailey, English, Boswell, and Gibbons

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes will be here probably in the next hour. Are there any Declarations of Disqualification concerning any agenda item?

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, I met with the folks with the Celebrate Virginia North, and also I met with Charlie Payne in reference to the Colonial Forge Proffers.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else?

Mr. Gibbons: Same two items.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Coen: And I met with the representatives from items 5 and 6, and also with people who live down in that same area.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay, thank you. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Coen: Yes, if we could, I'd like to deal with the subcommittee work. Is that what you wanted?

Mr. Apicella: Okay, yes. So, you'd like to move that to what portion?

Mr. Coen: It's pretty much open to the committee. We thought we would... we discussed this at our meeting the other day that we would have sort of an update about the subcommittee on the Comp Plan and then allow citizens to talk about it as their own sort of a public comment just on the Comp Plan prior to our meeting, and then that way we can get public input on that issue.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, if I may suggest...

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to take VDOT before that, in case it runs over.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I also have a change to the agenda. With regard to item number 3, the applicant has requested a deferral until November 18<sup>th</sup>. So, without objection...

Mr. Gibbons: Do you need a motion for that?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Do we need a motion for that? No. Okay, so we'll start off with Public Presentations. It's the Public Presentations portion of the meeting. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to speak on any item or topic other than the items listed for Public Hearing on today's agenda. There'll be an opportunity to address the Public Hearing items as they come up. When you come forward to speak, please address your comments to the Planning Commission as a whole, not to any specific member. When the green light comes on you have 3 minutes. Start by identifying your name and address. When the yellow light comes on that indicates you have 1 minute left. And when the red light comes on please quickly wrap up your comments. So if anyone has anything that they'd like to talk about, please feel free to come up to the podium. Okay, seeing no one coming up, the next item on the agenda would be VDOT's presentation on I-95/Route 630 Interchange. And I believe the reps from VDOT are Ms. Shropshire and Ms. Parker, is that correct? Thank you.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Presentation - Interstate 95/Route 630 Interchange

Ms. Shropshire: Good evening. My name is Michelle Shropshire. I'm the Assistant District Administrator for Preliminary Engineering at VDOT. I've been invited this evening to give you an update on the 95/630 projects that we have ongoing. We actually have two projects: at Exit 140, we have both the interchange reconstruction and we have the widening project that we'll be advertising together here in the next coming months as a design build project. I'll start this evening with going through the interchange portion. We have a new design alternative that we are pursuing with the interchange project. It's a diverging diamond. It might be a little bit hard to see on your screen, but we've been working on this since last winter. Diverging diamonds are kind of new, an innovative design. This new concept reduces the overall footprint in the interchange area. We were able to preserve kind of the key aspects that were important to Stafford County with this one being the intersection with Route 1 over at Hospital Drive. We are still making a connection back to existing Courthouse Road, and we are still going to be able to relocate the existing commuter parking lot.

Mr. Gibbons: So, you're going to connect this reversible diamond to the existing 630?

Ms. Shropshire: We'll be relocating Route 630 to the south of the present roadway, where it is today, but on the east side of the interchange there'll be a roadway that connects just east of existing Wyche Road that'll connect up to existing Route 630 today.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay.

Ms. Shropshire: So, going through the presentation, kind of looking ahead, I'm going to tell you why we selected a diverging diamond for this location; kind of give you a brief history of diverging diamonds. I'm going to go through it at high level some of the traffic analysis we looked at; give you kind of a milestone update where we are with the project; kind of a look ahead at where we're going; and in the last couple slides I have are relative to the widening projects that's adjacent and to the west. So first you might ask, what is a diverging diamond? A diverging diamond interchange is very similar to a traditional diamond, except for one important difference is that traffic crosses briefly to the opposite or the left side of the road as it passes through the interchange. And once traffic passes to the opposite side of the road, it's able to make its movement to and from the intersecting roadway without any conflicts. There are pavement markings, there are signals, and there are signs directing traffic through the interchange once it makes this cross. Diverging diamonds are safe. They reduce conflict points over traditional interchanges because cars don't have to make those left turns against opposing traffic. Crashes are reduced, again, because you're not making conflicting movements against oncoming traffic.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

They're very efficient for areas where you have a high volume of left-hand turns such as at the 630 interchange, where you have a large volume of traffic that is heading eastbound on Route 630 trying to make that move to northbound 95. The signals that are at the two cross-points of the interchange have relatively short phases because they're two-phase signals. That means they're only controlling traffic that moves in two directions, instead of a traditional 4-way intersection. And they traditionally have a smaller footprint and therefore are more cost effective than some other traditional interchange designs. We have several diverging diamond interchanges in Virginia right now. The first one was actually constructed in Louisa County, and that's I-64 in Zion Crossroads area with Route 15. That was completed in the spring of 2014. And since that time in Virginia we've had several others that have moved through the design phase and are currently under construction, and those include one in the Roanoke area at Interstate 581 and Valley View Boulevard. They have another one under construction near Virginia Tech in Blacksburg at Route 460 and Southgate Drive. And there's another one at I-66 and Route 15 in the Northern Virginia area. To give you a brief history of where the diverging diamond kind of evolved from, it was first originated in France in the 1970s; it made its debut in the United States several years later. It was actually kind of reinvented by a gentleman named Gilbert Chlewicki in the early 2000s. He was kind of inspired by the design of the 95/695 interchange; this is a freeway to freeway interchange near Baltimore. And the actual first diverging diamond that was actually built in the United States was in Missouri, and that was completed in 2009. So this is a newer concept, but since this concept has been introduced in the United States, it has caught on pretty quickly. Forty-five states have DDIs that are either built or are in the planning phases or under construction at this time. And as I mentioned, in Virginia we have four already; one constructed and three more under construction at this time. The next couple slides I have, I have a simulation that would kind of...

Mr. English: Ma'am?

Ms. Shropshire: Yes sir.

Mr. English: In reference to the regular cloverleaf and this diamond interchange, what is the... how long does it take to construct? Is it a shorter time to do the diamond or is it about the same length of time for both?

Ms. Shropshire: It depends. In certain instances, certain areas like at Zion Crossroads, we were able to utilize bridges that already existed. So that shortened that construction timeframe. For 95/630, we'll be building bridges. So, construction timeframe, while it won't be any longer than we had anticipated for our traditional interchange design, it'll be about the same.

Mr. English: What about the cost? Is it cheaper?

Ms. Shropshire: This will be cheaper than the original design that we had proposed for the I-95/630 interchange.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Shropshire: So, you might ask why we're recommending this for the 630 area here in Stafford. One of the reasons I just mentioned was cost; it meets the budgetary constraints we have for the project. We're able to reduce the overall right-of-way footprint for the interchange over the original alternative we had. So when we can reduce the right-of-way footprint, we can also reduce the environmental impacts we had. We had a substantial amount of wetland and stream impacts with the original alternatives. We were able to reduce that impact. We can achieve the operational goals which is traffic analysis, how this interchange will function, and I'll get to that a little later in the presentation, and we

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

can maintain those key components of the interchange that were important, like I mentioned, the connection with Route 1 at the hospital, maintaining the park and ride lot, or actually relocating it, and being able to connect back to existing Route 630. If you wonder, kind of, why we didn't come up with this alternative originally when we started looking at the 630 interchange, as I mentioned, they didn't really gain prevalence in the United States, until, especially in Virginia, until about 2009. VDOT began work on the 630 interchange doing traffic analysis in late 2008, early 2009, and diverging diamonds were just not an alternative that we considered at that time, but however, since we've kind of moved through some budgetary constraints with the project, and we were looking...

Mr. Gibbons: You keep saying that, but what was the budget constraint?

Ms. Shropshire: We had a budget reduction in the 6 year plan. The original alternative was more expensive. We lost some funding for the project. It was reduced by about 35 million dollars. We had to look for a way to make sure we could still build the project, maintain the key components, and deliver a project that would work, so we looked at reducing the original alternative or coming up with something different, and the DDI was a way that we felt we could reduce all of these impacts and come up with something more innovative that would work better. So the next slide I have is from North Carolina DOT. It shows a simulation of how you drive through a DDI. Let's see if I can... (Played video from presentation.) The next video is the DDI Zion's crossroads. This is a computer simulation of that DDI. This will kind of take you through, again, how cars would drive actually through a diverging diamond. So we'll watch this one just for a few seconds as well. This kind of shows the cars on the approach. As they're approaching the first signal, that would cross cars to the left hand side of the road. And then from kind of looking down, you can see that traffic is making movements off of the interstate, which in this case is I-64. From the left they're joining the traffic that crosses through at the traffic signal. They're making their way through the interchange location, approaching the next signal location, or they can make their move onto the interstate which is an unrestricted left. And then, once the next traffic signal is green, they can make their move back to the right-hand side of the road and continue on.

Mr. Gibbons: Ma'am, when you're using signals, what is the volume of the Zion Crossroads interchange compared to 630? When you start using signals around here, you can back up for miles.

Ms. Shropshire: Well, Zions Crossroads does have a different traffic volume than 630/95, but I'll get to this in my presentation where we've looked at this. So, to let you know kind of where we are with the 95/630 project, we have updated our interchange modification report which is our traffic analysis that we do, and I'll go through that in just a few minutes. We received the final draft of that in late August. We have updated our environmental document. We received our draft EA, updated just last week, and we have a public hearing and a citizen information scheduled for next Tuesday evening. I'll give you the more specifics on that later on in the presentation. So our IMR or traffic analysis, the supplement we did to this, to analyze the diverging diamond, the original traffic analysis we did for the interchange was completed in 2011. That's when the FHWA, the Federal Highway Administration, approved that document. The traffic counts that we took for that document were taken in 2009. So when we wanted to update this document, we didn't want to have to revisit all the traffic counts, so we went through a process of validation for those traffic counts. So what we did to validate those is, we looked at some studies, various studies, that had been done since that time, various traffic impact analyses that had been done for some proposed developments and we also used counts from our permanent count stations along I-95, and we took that information and we compared it to the information that was in the IMR from 2011. And what we found was that the majority of the volumes for the main line of 95, the main line of Route 630, and the ramps and the intersection, that the volumes that we had used in that IMR document were higher than the counts that we were seeing in the field today and that the areas that were different were in an acceptable variability. The next chart I have kind of displays the results of that. You can see

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

the original IMR volumes that we had for the various intersections. We have the latest counts, whether they were from the permanent count stations, the various other studies we looked at, the deltas, if they're negative, that means that the numbers that we are seeing from our IMR from 2011 when that document was approved, are actually higher, which means, the numbers we use from the traffic counts and the traffic projections in our original IMR are really conservative. We presented this information to the FHWA in June and they concurred with our findings. And so we used those volumes to proceed with the rest of our traffic analysis that we used in that supplement to the IMR to move forward with the other traffic analyses that we did for the diverging diamond. So we moved forward with our supplement to our traffic analyses and that IMR document, and what we did is, we used the FAMPO model which is a travel demand model. A travel demand model is a computer model that is used to estimate travel behavior. It looks at trip generation; those are the number of trips that are going to be made. It looks at trips distribution, where trips are going to go. It looks at mode choice, how people are going to make those trips, and it looks at trip assignment, and that's predicting where people are going to go. It takes into account land uses, current and future projected, and it also, we code in background developments that are approved, that aren't already in that travel demand model, in that FAMPO model. And then we project out the traffic to our design year, which is 2037.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman? Just, if I could, so you looked at, it says approved projects. So they're not really things that either are by-right, could happen or plans of sort of germinating, it's just what has already been approved through the planning?

Ms. Shropshire: Yes, already have been approved.

Mr. Coen: So, because we had something where it would have been a lot of cars, but it hadn't really been figured in to your scheme, your calculations, so that if, for example, one of the numbers was minus eleven, if in theory we take these things that we know are percolating through, it might not be minus 11, it may be over that, but you just use what you know?

Ms. Shropshire: What we know, things that are approved today.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Ms. Shropshire: Okay. So they look at, they use the travel demand model, forecast out to 2037, which is our design year for our interchange modification report. The outcome of that report was the DDI, which we use letters for our alternatives, which in our report is alternative F, it performs equal to if not better than our original design alternative, which was alternative A2. Additionally, they look at the queue length, how many cars are going to back up on the ramps, and it was found that, we verified that all of those storage links are adequate to handle the queue length that we will have for the interchange.

Mr. Gibbons: How did you do that?

Ms. Shropshire: It was through that computer model that we did and that traffic analysis.

Mr. Gibbons: Are you going to meter the traffic as it comes on the interstate off of the diamond?

Ms. Shropshire: Well the traffic per se won't be metered. Once it crosses into the diverging diamond, it will be able to make a free left-hand movement onto the interstate.

Mr. Gibbons: Right now the interstate backs up to 630. So how are you going to... well, that's what I think is confusing.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Ms. Shropshire: I'm not sure if I understand your question. You're saying the interstate backs up... the ramps back up? You mean the interstate ramps back up?

Mr. Gibbons: Especially between May and September, October on the southbound lanes, they start locking down around noon time on Friday and it doesn't ease up until about 9 o'clock on Sunday morning. So when you're starting to stack and putting it on the interstate, are you going to meter is like they do in Fairfax, or you're just going to, once it gets past the light, they just stack and queue up on the one ramp going in?

Ms. Shropshire: Well if the main line of the interstate is backed up for some reason, the general purpose lanes on the interstate, if they're already backed up with traffic sitting there, then yes, cars will have a hard time making a move onto the interstate. If the main line of the interstate is not backed up then we do not... there will not be a problem with cars getting onto the interstate. The table that is on this slide illustrates the Level of Service comparison between the new diverging diamond and the original alternative. And in almost every case you can see that the Level of Service is as good as, if not better than, the original alternative that was presented for the interchange. One additional step that we did take, because we knew there was some apprehension about a diverging diamond, it's kind of a newer style interchange, so we did what we call sensitivity analysis. This is really a capacity test. It kind of determines the threshold at which the volumes for different intersections within the DDI will show failing Level of Service. So what we did in our analysis for this is, we took the design year forecasted volumes which are the 2037 volumes, we incrementally increased them by percentages to a point where we show failing Level of Service at these intersections throughout the interchange with the diverging diamond concepts, and the results of that analysis were that all of the movements within the DDI had some reserve capacity, and that's over the 2037 volumes. And the next two slides just illustrate those results. The first slide is for the a.m. peak hour. You can see the various intersections that were looked at. Again, it was an incremental increase, a percentage based increase of those volumes over the design year which is 2037. The next slide is the p.m. We will be submitting that final IMR supplement document for final approval to the FHWA in the coming weeks.

Mr. Gibbons: Can we ask questions on the interstate now? On your diamond...

Ms. Shropshire: Yes sir.

Mr. Gibbons: ... where do you put the access point coming off the express lane?

Ms. Shropshire: Well, the express lanes terminate north.

Mr. Gibbons: Yeah, but we plan to go all the way down, so where is your access point going to be in the future?

Ms. Shropshire: That hasn't been determined at this time. Will there be an access point at this interchange? Again, that hasn't been determined at this time.

Mr. Gibbons: But how much of an engineering change would it take to refit something rather than do it in the beginning? The Board's already gone in and asked for the fourth lane to be installed. I brought it in tonight, because that's what I gave everybody. I-66 has the shoulder lanes and now they're using them for congestions mitigation. We don't have that and we need that.

Ms. Shropshire: Correct. We're building all the bridges on I-95 throughout the Fredericksburg area to accommodate, so the bridges that are proposed with the DDI will accommodate the span, will

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

accommodate widening of the interstate, and will accommodate express lanes in the median. So we won't be putting piers in the way.

Mr. Gibbons: Okay, but where do you plan to put the exit point to get it off to 630? You got a disaster at 610 now; I don't want another one at 630.

Ms. Shropshire: Again, exit points for southern portion express lanes haven't been determined, and as you're aware, with the express lanes, not every interchange has an exit point. So again, that would have to be determined when that project is designed.

Mr. English: Wouldn't it be smarter to do it now, if you know, hey, this is going to be coming and we got some sort of future note what it's going to look like.

Ms. Shropshire: Well we are allowing, like I said, we are allowing room between the bridge piers to accommodate lanes, so it would not interfere with the bridges that are proposed to be built with the DDI. But as far as where the access points to and from that southern section would be determined at a later date, when that project moves forward.

Mr. Gibbons: We already have a... you got a serious problem that nobody engineered. Now you're coming in and you're going to... what are you going to do when you add it?

Ms. Shropshire: No, I understand your concerns, but...

Mr. Gibbons: But can't you do it like he's saying? Can't we do it in the beginning? How much... would it be a tremendous cost to show where you could access from the express lane?

Ms. Shropshire: Well, when they would build, say, something similar to Garrisonville, a flyover, that would exit, fly over the interstate and exit onto the right-hand side of the interstate. So that would tie into what we would be building if they built something similar to, say, the Garrisonville exit from the express lanes -- if that's what you're trying to ask.

Mr. Gibbons: No.

Ms. Shropshire: No?

Mr. Gibbons: I'm trying to beg.

Ms. Shropshire: I understand.

Mr. Gibbons: You can't get people off the interstate and express lanes tonight, so if we can't do it now, how are we going to go further south?

Mr. English: It's going to be a sad situation if you build this diamond and then you got still this backup and we still haven't solved the problem at 610.

Ms. Shropshire: Well, this project, the focus is to reconstruct the interchange at 630 and to alleviate the backup for the ramps on 630. It doesn't fix the whole main line of interstate 95, but it's to fix the issues adjacent, right at the 630 interchange and the ramps there.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: I think I'm going to say it in a different way than my colleagues. My concern would be that this DDI won't adversely impact the potential of doing hot lanes further south, perhaps all the way down to Massaponax. Am I hearing you say that it probably won't, or at least the configuration would allow for...

Ms. Shropshire: The configuration will allow for express lanes in the median if that is a future project. It also will allow a fourth lane on I-95 to be built, if that's a future project. It is built to accommodate that. So our project estimates... oh yes sir.

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly, first of all, thank you for coming. My students at VCU spoke very highly of you.

Ms. Shropshire: Thank you.

Mr. Coen: One question, and you don't have to do it now, but you mentioned about there having been comparisons to the other traffic, at the other Virginia ones and then North Carolina ones, if for, especially for next Tuesday night, and if you could send to us for those of us who are visual learners, the spreadsheet that sort of shows that. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

Ms. Shropshire: Okay. The project estimates for this, just to give you an idea, for the I-95/630, the interchange piece, we have a total project budget of around 149.5 million dollars. As I mentioned earlier, we'll be putting this project forward for construction along with the 630 widening. That project has a project budget of just under 36 million dollars. Some of our key milestone dates that are coming up for our project, as I mentioned, we're going to be having that public hearing and a citizen information meeting next Tuesday night at Colonial Forge High School. The meeting will take place from 5 to 8 p.m. So we welcome everyone who wants to attend and get further information on the project. We'll be making two brief presentations on the project at 5:30 and 6:30 that evening. As I mentioned, these projects will move forward as a design build procurement. We'll release our request for qualifications in October, so in just about a month, and send we'll release our request for proposals next spring, in 2016. We anticipate awarding this project in the fall of 2016 and we anticipate a completion for the overall project, both projects together, in the spring of 2020. The last couple of slides just walk through the 630 widening project. Just as a reminder of what we're doing on that project. That's about just under 2 miles of widening from 2 lanes to 4 lanes and providing a shared use path on the north side of the road way. We'll start on the western end. We're going to realign the intersection of Winding Creek Road and Ramoth Church Road to make that a traditional 4-way intersection with a traffic signal. We'll be moving toward the east. This is in front of Colonial Forge High School. There'll be a traffic signal installed at Liberty Knolls Subdivision and Colonial Forge High School. Moving to the east, we'll be realigning Rockdale Road and Kelsey Road to a traditional 4-way intersection. Project continues to move to the east and we end the project at Cedar Lane, where it's adjacent to the interchange project. This just highlights the typical section for the project. Again, we have a shared use path that will be about 10 feet wide on the north side. Then we'll have those four 12-foot lanes. And that's all I have for you this evening, but I'll be happy to entertain any other questions that you may have.

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chair, I do have one question. The new design, the amount of volume that it's anticipated to handle, does that handle the same amount as the original design, more, or less as far as volume goes?

Ms. Shropshire: As I mentioned, it was found to perform equal to or better than. So it'll handle the same volume if not a little more than the original alternative we were looking at for the interchange.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mrs. Bailey: And within our Comp Plan we have a certain number of units that could possibly be built within any particular area, so I think I heard you say that you only looked at currently what we have and what is approved. Do you ever take a percentage of what might be proposed in the future?

Ms. Shropshire: We look at only approved developments. Don't really look at things that are not approved yet, but as I mentioned, we did do a sensitivity analysis, so there is some reserve capacity over those 2037 volumes. So that should give us a level of assurance that we can add a little bit more traffic in that area, depending on which movement your looking at, through the interchange.

Mrs. Bailey: But I think that's the frustration and the problem, because we don't look towards the future and as we build our roads we're really playing catch up when it would be nice when we're doing CIP improvements to be able to look even further into the future to allow for more vehicular traffic, especially if you know you're in a growing area.

Ms. Shropshire: Well our design year is 2037, so that is pretty far in the future. To look well beyond that and add more lanes costs a lot more money. So we're in a budget constrained environment, so we have to work with all those constraints and try to deliver the best project that we can.

Mrs. Bailey: Thank you.

Mr. Coen: And I guess, I think what she's saying... and we understand that you can't really plan for infinity and beyond, but if a community has sort of got in their Comp Plan that they're anticipating x amount of growth, and theoretically it could be here, particularly on this road, and we sort of aim for here what's only approved and we're setting ourselves up. And then that sets you up for criticism, which may or may not be justified, but if that's the process... So that might be nice for, not so much you, but you to take back and say, we need to revisit this. And maybe it's just from my occupation, but when you do the presentation next week, if you sort of had what the A, B, C, D, F, and E stand for. I'm not really familiar with E, other than excellence, so having an E on the chart is a little weird.

Ms. Shropshire: We'll have a little bit different presentation next week for the general public...

Mr. Coen: Okay, but then if you could for me, just so I understand, you know, what you're looking at.

Ms. Shropshire: ... and we're going to take out some of these things. We'll have the IMR document available next week at the public hearing if anyone is still interested in looking at it.

Mr. Coen: Cool. Just two more things. One, just so people understand, you're going to go west to east, so that the part up by the high school be towards, closer towards 2020 and as you get closer and closer to 95, that'll be closer to 2020 timeframe, correct?

Ms. Shropshire: Well, not necessarily. How we build it, that'll be largely up to how the contractor pursues work. They could come in and start building on the east first. It was just as I described the project tonight.

Mr. Coen: Oh okay. Thank you.

Ms. Shropshire: It could happen either way.

Mr. Coen: And it sort of, the concept, if anybody's been on 17, yeah, we have a timeframe, but... and that might help people with visualizing what this would be, and just from a personal standpoint, if you

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

can reach somebody to sort of give us a schedule of 17. We hear, and staff has been wonderful, but we hear that it's on schedule and they don't really have the schedule. So that would be helpful. Just, if you could do that, I'd appreciate it.

Ms. Shropshire: I'll have someone get that to you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gibbons: I just want to make a couple of comments Mr. Chairman. This interstate is the second largest traffic hauler in America and we are at the choke point. We can't move. We can't move between May and October. We can't move in the morning. We didn't get the right design for the exit at 630, so now Quantico can't get its traffic in there with all, you know, the traffic between the airport interchange and Quantico used to be 10 to 15, 20 minutes, now it's over an hour. So to come in and design another interchange to put traffic on what is already choked up, then we really got to take another look at it and make sure that, you know... I'm not so sure traffic lights are the answer to the crossover, when you start stacking. And, you know, and I noticed that most of these DDIs are in rural areas or lightly congested areas, but 95 handles almost twice what the I-66 does. We never put shoulder lanes in. We never put signals in. We never metered the traffic coming on the interstate. Why doesn't 95 get the same care and feeding that I-66 gets? That's what I can't understand. And the Board went in and asked for a fourth lane to be done, at least between 630 and 610, and we can do it with the shoulders. We can't get it on now. Don't need 5 or 6 years of engineering. It's very, very frustrating when you live here and you see. I just... the Board went in and I back the Board 100%. We got to have capacity. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Gibbons. Anybody else? Okay, I do have a couple of questions and I'm sorry I didn't ask them earlier when you were showing the visual. The DDI is obviously something new to this area and I liken it to roundabouts, which is kind of a cultural change, if you first experience a roundabout and haven't done it before. So, my not issue or concern is, my question would be, for people who don't normally drive this area, once this gets put in place, for people who don't normally drive in this area, it's late at night and they're trying to manage their way around and get off on 630, how hard is it going to be for them to understand, this is completely counterintuitive way to get off of the interstate, and more importantly, what kind of accident stats do we have of a DDI versus what I would call a traditional interchange? Just for comparison purposes.

Ms. Shropshire: Well, the interchange, the DDI will be lit. It will have signs, have pavement markings. It will have concrete medians that delineate the traffic so it would be very easy for drivers to find their way through. As far as accident statistic, I don't know them off the top of my head. They're generally safer than traditional interchanges, because you're reducing the conflict points for cars making movements onto and off of the interstate. You know, you don't have your left turns crossing traffic. So I don't think, you know, we plan to have a pretty aggressive driver campaign in the area. I know that that won't catch all of the people you're talking about that come from out of state, but as I mentioned, they're becoming a lot more prevalent across the United States. They're in a lot of different states. There's one north of Atlanta in a highly populated area. And so, I think, more drivers are becoming familiar with their use.

Mr. Apicella: My last question is, is this a done deal? Is it going to happen? Is it a possibility it might not happen. What's the, you know, what's the likelihood that this in 5, whatever, 5 years this is going to be in place in Stafford County?

Ms. Shropshire: We are funded with the project. We are putting our request for qualifications out next month to solicit contractors, so it's a done deal. We're moving forward.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, well for my colleagues and I, we greatly appreciate you coming out tonight and giving us a brief. Thank you. So, my colleague, the secretary informed me that he'd prefer to keep the schedule as it is, so we're going to move forward with Public Hearings with item number 1 next.

Mr. Gibbons: Can we combine 1 and 2?

Mr. Apicella: Is that permissible?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC15150767; Reclassification - Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcel 46-27, zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, to adjust the maximum gross floor area of the church building. The property consists of 54.33 acres, located at 1420 Forbes Street on the east side of Forbes Street, approximately 800 feet south of Layhill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: December 22, 2015)**
2. CUP15150746; Conditional Use Permit - Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Conditional Use Permit Amendment - A proposal to amend conditions on Assessor's Parcel 46-27, zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, to adjust the capacity of the church building. The property consists of 54.33 acres, located at 1420 Forbes Street on the east side of Forbes Street, approximately 800 feet south of Layhill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: December 22, 2015)**

Mr. Harvey: Staff would prefer that, yes please.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Please recognize Erica Ehly for the presentation.

Ms. Ehly: Good evening Mr. Chair and members of the Commission; if I could have the computer please. Thanks. Can you hear me? The applicant is Stafford Crossing Community Church requesting a minor proffer amendment and a minor revision to a Conditional Use Permit this evening. The church is located on Assessor's Parcel 46-27 on the east side of Forbes Street, approximately 800 feet south of Layhill Road, in the Falmouth Election District. The site is approximately 54 acres in size. The property is zoned R-1 and surrounded by property zoned A-1, R-1, and R-2. And a little bit of zoning history on the property; a reclassification was approved for a site... for the site on November 14, 2006, for a proposed residential development known as Forbes Landing. The site was rezoned from A-1, Agricultural zoning district, to the R-1, Suburban Residential zoning district. The original proffers limited development to less than 105 single-family dwellings. The proposed construction of a place of worship in 2009 was not consistent with the proffer statement, and also a conditional use permit was required for a place of worship in the R-1 zoning district. Consequently, a proffer amendment and a CUP were approved on October 20, 2009, and it is these applications or documents that the applicant is requesting to modify -- the Conditional Use Permit and the Proffer Amendment, the amended proffer statement. The Comprehensive Plan designates the property for Suburban land use and is surrounded by property in the Suburban and Rural future land use areas. A place of worship in the R-1 zoning district is consistent with the recommended future land use. The existing conditions include a large portion of mature forest, with wetlands, located within open space areas. There are not any proposed impacts to these areas with the expansion. Additionally, Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Studies have been completed on the subject property which identified one archaeological site with a Civil War

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

encampment and cemetery component, identified by the blue dots and two isolated family cemeteries shown by the purple dots. Preservation easements have been recorded on the Civil War and family cemetery sites and preservation areas were delineated as a result of the Phase I and the Phase II cultural resource studies. The site plan, which was approved in 2010, shows playing fields in the location of the orange dot. These fields have not been completed as of yet. So, that is the site plan showing the fields in the future. A driveway, which provides access to the historic resources trail, is located to the north of the church and is paved up to the beginning of the curve. A small parking area is proposed within the circle but has not been completed as of yet. And so the primary purpose of these two applications is to modify the maximum gross floor area permitted for the church. And expansion has been proposed by the applicant, located in the area of the red dot which would exceed the maximum. The Generalized Development Plan shows the proposed 7,100 square foot 2-story expansion. The church currently has a gross floor area of approximately 15,350 square feet. The proposed expansion would result in a total of 22,450 square feet. The current proffer statement and conditional use permit limit the maximum square footage of the church to 18,500 square feet. So, in addition to removing references to Tax Map Parcels 46-21 and 46-26, as these parcels have since been combined, the applicant proposes to remove the maximum square footage threshold from the proffer statement and to include a reference to the applicable conditional use permit for the maximum permitted square footage. Consequently, any further expansions would be reviewed as part of additional conditional use permit applications. Also, the 2009 proffers stated that all four interpretive signs for historic resources would be located within the preservation area. Three of the four signs have been installed. One of the installed signs is located in the vicinity of the parking area, which is not within the preservation area. The applicant is proposing for three interpretive sign to be located within the preservation areas and for the fourth sign to be located within an area where it is visible to visitors. The current location of the sign is within the red circle on the slide and is consistent with the intent of the original proffers and is visible to visitors at the beginning of the access drive to the historic area trail. The applicant has included a rendering of the proposed expansion as part of the conditional use permit application. The interior buildout of the proposed expansion was also provided by the applicant. The proposed expansion would contain a large conference room with a stage, vestibule, smaller conference room, storage area, bathrooms, and café area on the lower level. And the upper level would contain conference rooms, a workroom, bathrooms, and office uses. The increase to 22,450 square feet would present a nominal increase to the demand for public facilities as the proposed uses within the expansion are secondary to the primary use of the church. The Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation manual identifies a church as a place “housing an assembly hall or sanctuary, meeting rooms, classrooms, and occasionally dining, catering or party facilities.” The number of congregational seats remains at 550 with this proposal, which is the variable utilized in the 2009 TIA with proffer amendment and the conditional use applications for the Sunday Peak Hour, so there is not an increase to peak hour trips. The average daily trips were calculated using the total square footage within the TIA, so the average vehicles per day would increase. With the increase in square footage, the increase is 35 trips per day. And the 2009 TIA concluded that there was not significant impact to transportation facilities and that mitigation was not required. The entrance to the site is located on Forbes Street and was constructed in accordance with the proffers and the approved site plan. And although not required, a right turn lane onto the property and left turn exiting the property were included in the design. Additionally, the applicant has stated that the timing of the signal at Route 1 and Layhill Road has been revised in accordance with the proffers. There was a slight impact to the intersection identified in the TIA. And with regard to other impacts, the proposed expansion will require a site plan and any nominal impacts to water, sewer, and stormwater management facilities will be addressed at that time. There are no proposed impacts to the natural or cultural resources onsite. Additionally, the proposal would not impact adjacent properties. The proposed expansion is oriented away from adjacent residential uses and existing conditions and the approved site plan include significant buffering between the church and surrounding properties. Also, the proposed expansion will not be visible from the public right-of-way, as it will be opposite the building frontage on

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Forbes Street. The revision to the conditional use permit proposes to amend Condition number 3 to identify the maximum capacity for the church as 550 seats or 22,450 square feet of gross floor area. And then there are three additional conditions that were recommended by staff which address existing issues on the site, including a temporary trailer which is currently being utilized as office space; several easements which have not yet been recorded; and provision of landscaping in accordance with the approved site plan. These new conditions will bring the site into conformance with County development standards.

Mr. Apicella: Did the applicant have any issues with any of these conditions?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, no.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Gibbons: Does the Chairman have any?

Ms. Ehly: Staff is recommending approval of both the application for a minor proffer amendment and the application for a minor revision to a conditional use permit, via Ordinance O15-39 and Resolution R15-336. Staff did not make any negative findings and believes that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with Sections 28-206 and 28-185 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed expansion supports the continued service of the existing place of worship to the surrounding community. The limited extent and location of the expansion should not impact adjacent residential uses, and new conditions bring the site into conformance with County development standards.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Erica. Any questions? I have a comment or a suggestion. First of all, this seems pretty straightforward to me. The bottom line is they're asking to increase the maximum square footage by 4,000 square feet. And staff and the applicant have some conditions that would be entered into the CUP, right?

Ms. Ehly: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Under the proffers, page 2 of 7, attachment 2, maximum square feet, I'm just wondering just for the sake of clarity, so the church shall be constructed to the maximum square footage as approved on the conditional use permit. I think it might be helpful, just for clarification, to add the following: associated with parcel 46-27. Just so there's no confusion about what CUP we're talking about. Obviously these are two separate documents and so, since they're going to be approved separately, I think it would be helpful just to make some reference to what CUP we're talking about. Okay, if there are no other questions, is the applicant here or somebody representing the applicant?

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, yes.

Pastor Mosley: Mr. Chairman, my name is Darryl Mosley, I'm the founding and senior Pastor at the church. Thank you for your work and the time and the staff being here tonight. Just a brief history about the congregation; we've been in existence for 13 years. We met for 10 years at Stafford High School, have been on the property here for 3 years. And God has been good to us and we're proud to be a part of the community and to serve in any way we can. Our congregation feels it is a very simple addition, basically just like you said, Mr. Chairman, about 4,000 square feet over the original footprint. So it's just that it's a double-decker instead of the single-decker, just to allow our children some space to move about and grow on a Sunday morning platform. In respect to your time, we have several of our congregants here to speak on behalf; I'd like to defer that just for the sake of your time and theirs and

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

family life here tonight, and maybe 95 will be opening by now Mr. Gibbons, so we can get home. But, the challenge is I just would like to defer in case there's some negativity they could come back and speak, but at this time, with your permission, I'd like to just have them stand in support of.

Mr. Apicella: That'll work.

Pastor Mosley: Thank you so much. So, guys, if you all would stand please.

Mr. Apicella: Just a few people.

Pastor Mosley: Just a few; a few to come out to let them know we are supportive. At this time, I'm just going to pause and answer any questions you may have directly about the project. And if there's technical questions I am not able to answer, Mr. Bruce Reese would step up beside me and do that for us.

Mr. Apicella: Just, again, for the sake of the record, what's the purpose of the expansion?

Pastor Mosley: It's twofold; it's going to be a children's area on the bottom that also could be multi-purpose use. I think it's going to be in banquet format, but primarily on Sunday morning it would be a large group space so we could teach in age-appropriate ways to our kindergarteners through fifth graders. Sunday nights our students would be in there, sixth through twelfth graders. And then during the week, if there was any kind of gatherings that would be privy to our vision of reaching our community would be used. Currently that's done more in homes than on the church campus. As consistent with the traffic impact study, we would not... we don't meet Sunday night and Wednesday night as a collective body. The upstairs would alleviate the modular office, i.e., the trailer that was mentioned there. And our staff doesn't like saying they're in the trailer, so it's a modular office for future reference. So, they would come inside and be in the building up on the top floor. So, children space and admin space.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. As part of the normal process in going through a rezoning and a CUP, neighbors are notified. Did you get any concern from any of your neighbors as this was discussed with them?

Pastor Mosley: No sir, Mr. Chairman, we have a good relationship with our neighbors, hence I think is evidenced by not being here to speak against tonight. They were here for the original in 09, but we have collaborated well. Great neighbors and I think they would say that it's mutual both ways.

Mr. Apicella: I don't have any other questions. Does anybody else have any questions? Thank you sir.

Mr. Coen: Just... you may want to... one of the euphemisms in my line of work is learning cottages for those, for trailer. So you might try that one.

Pastor Mosley: Yes, good, good. The only thing that we would put out if there were no questions, Mr. Chairman, appreciate your valuable time and, if deemed appropriate by you and your colleagues to approve this tonight, we would appreciate it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'll now open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for members of the public to address this issue. As before, please direct your comments to the Planning Commission as a whole, not to any specific member. You may have up to 3 minutes to speak. Please state your name and address when the green light comes on. A yellow light will indicate that there's 1

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

minute left. And when the red light comes on, please quickly wrap up your comments. If anyone would like to come forward, now is the time to do so. Seeing no one, I will close the public comment period and bring this back to the Board. I'm going to pass the baton over to my colleague since this is in my district.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you Mr. Apicella. And so...

Mr. Gibbons: I'm going to second Mr. Apicella's motion.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And so, is there a motion for this, for item number 1?

Mr. Apicella: I'm not quite... I can't quite remember how to do this. I would like to amend the proffer statement.

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Apicella, the proffers are offered by the applicant, so I would need the applicant to make that change in their signed document.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, um, and how would we do that at this point? Again, all it is, is to make reference to, as I indicated, adding the words associated with parcel 46-27.

Pastor Mosley: Yes, we just need to add those numbers to the document. I don't know what the legal way for that to happen, but it provides clarity and it's... we're good with it.

Mr. Coen: Ms. Ehly?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, typically we would have the applicant add, in writing, additional language to the proffer statement and then initial it.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Would staff like a few moments to go outside, visit this...? Alright. So we will... Ms. McClendon, I believe we can just sort of start moving on and then when they're ready, they'll come back and we'll revisit this. So we'll temporarily defer it. Is there a motion to defer this for this meeting for staff to go out and solidify this?

Mr. Apicella: Motion to temporarily defer the matter Mr. Chairman.

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Coen: Second? Alright, we have a motion by Mr. Apicella, seconded by Mr. English; any comments Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Coen: Anyone else? Seeing none, we'll put to a vote. All those in favor of temporarily deferring this while staff gets the words in writing say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. Opposed? Alright, passes unanimously. I'll give the baton back to you temporarily.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. RC1300296; Reclassification - Colonial Forge Proffer Amendment - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcels 29J-4-310, 29J-4-311, 29J-4-312, 29J-4-313, 29J-4-314, 29J-4-315, 29J-4-316, 29J-4-317, 29J-4-318, 29J-4-319, 29J-4-320, 29J-4-321, 29J-4-322, 29J-4-323, 29J-4-324, 29J-4-325, 29J-4-326, 29J-4-327, and 29J-4-A and portions of Assessor's Parcel 28-100, a portion of the original development known as Augustine, consisting of 41.72 acres, zoned R-3, Urban Residential – High Density Zoning District, to remove phasing requirements for the commercial development. The property is located on the south side of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Woodcutters Road, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 23, 2015) (History: Deferred on September 9, 2015 to September 23, 2015)**
4. RC15150707; Reclassification - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Proffer Amendment - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions on Assessor's Parcel 44W-2B, zoned RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District, to modify the development conditions of a multi-family residential community. The property consists of 9.91 acres, located on the west side of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, approximately 3,000 feet south of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 8, 2015) (History: Deferred on September 9, 2015 to September 23, 2015)**
5. RC15150708; Reclassification - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Community - A proposed reclassification from the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District to the RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District, to allow a multi-family residential community on Assessor's Parcel 44W-2A. The property consists of 14.73 acres, located on the west side of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, approximately 3,000 feet south of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 8, 2015) (History: Deferred on September 9, 2015 to September 23, 2015)**
6. CUP15150709; Conditional Use Permit - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Community - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow multi-family dwellings in the RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District. The site is on Assessor's Parcels 44W-2B, zoned RBC and which is the subject of a concurrent proffer amendment, and 44W-2A, which is the subject of a concurrent reclassification request from the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District to the RBC Zoning District. The site consists of 24.63 acres, located on the west side of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, approximately 3,000 feet south of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 8, 2015) (History: Deferred on September 9, 2015 to September 23, 2015)**

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'd like to move on to items 4, 5, and 6; Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mike Zuraf will be making the presentations for these items.

Mr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I've got a question, technical; what, are we on item number 4 now?

Mr. Apicella: Yes, we deferred... or the applicant asked to have deferred item number 3.

Mr. Gibbons: So can we take the 3, 4, 5, and 6 together as one discussion?

Mr. Apicella: I believe we can.

Mr. Coen: You mean 4, 5, and 6, not 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. Gibbons: Four, five, and six.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, I think that's the plan.

Mr. Gibbons: I didn't hear it.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission; Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. These three applications, these three items are associated with the project known as Celebrate Virginia North Apartments. The three applications are specifically for (1) to amend proffer conditions on parcel 44W-2B on land that's already zoned RBC, Recreational Business Campus; then to reclassify parcel 44W-2A from M-2, Heavy Industrial, to RBC, Recreational Business Campus; and then the third item would be a conditional use permit for both properties to allow multi-family dwellings in the RBC zoning district. And that...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Zuraf, I would ask you to give us a minute to maybe go back to the other item. It appears they're ready to go. Sorry. At least you can catch your breath.

1. *RC15150767; Reclassification - Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Proffer Amendment*
2. *CUP15150746; Conditional Use Permit - Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Conditional Use Permit Amendment*

Mr. Coen: Alright, Ms. Ehly, you have the floor.

Ms. Ehly: Mr. Chair, the proposed proffer statement has been revised and the applicant has initialed the change. And the statement reads, it's proffer number 3, sub d., the church shall be constructed to the maximum square footage as approved on the conditional use permit associated with Assessor's Parcel 46-27.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I move to accept the proffers with the revised language as stated.

Mr. Coen: And then Mr. Gibbons is seconding. So we have a motion and a second; Mr. Apicella, any comment?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Gibbons? Alright, and so we have a motion on the floor for approval of O15-39. All those in favor say aye.

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, the motion to actually accept the proffers because it's something presented to the committee for the first time.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So the first motion is to accept the proffers as they have just been presented. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, so that passes. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval of O15-39, RC15150767, Reclassification, Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Proffer Amendment.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Coen: Alright, motion by Mr. Apicella, seconded by Mr. Gibson... Gibbons -- really. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No comment sir.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Gibbons. Okay. Alright, so we'll put it to a vote. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Okay, thank you very much; good luck.

Mr. Gibbons: There's one more.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: No, we still have to do the CUP.

Mr. Coen: And so, go ahead Mr. Apicella, one more.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval of CUP15150746, Conditional Use Permit, Stafford Crossing Community Church Minor Revision.

Mr. Gibbons: Second.

Mr. Coen: And again, Mr. Apicella, Mr. Gibbons. Mr. Apicella, any comment?

Mr. Apicella: I would just comment that this is a minor change and I think it provides the necessary flexibility for the church and for the County to review any changes going forward. So, with that in mind, I recommend approval.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Gibbons? My only comment, I really appreciate the visuals that the staff and the applicant prepared. It was excellent. It made very clear exactly what you're doing and it was really very helpful. So, we'll put it to a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Okay, so now we say thank you very much and we wish you God speed and good luck.

From the audience: Thank you.

4. *RC15150707; Reclassification - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Proffer Amendment*

5. *RC15150708; Reclassification - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Community*

6. *CUP15150709; Conditional Use Permit - Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Community*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Zuraf, my apologies.

Mr. Zuraf: No, it's fine. Okay, so I went through and summarized the three applications that are associated with this proposed project. This would permit a 278 unit multi-family residential development. A public hearing was conducted at your last meeting on September 9th. The Commission deferred the application to this meeting to obtain some additional information, and you had several questions. There was a question directed to the applicant to provide a marketing strategy for the comparison developments that were discussed. Those comparison developments included Waterford at the Park, a project in Huntersville, North Carolina, outside of Charlotte, and Seasons at Celebrate Virginia located in the City of Fredericksburg. In the meeting, it was referred to as The Havens; that

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

was the original name of the project. It's now known as Seasons at Celebrate Virginia. We did in Attachment 1, we were able to obtain marketing strategy information for the Waterford project. So that includes kind of a good summary of what their marketing strategy is, and I won't go through all that in detail; it's in your package. We were not able to get information, marketing information for the Seasons project. The applicant does not own that property and so we were unable to get that from the people at that project. So, also there was a request for some comparison demographic information at these two projects, the comparison projects. We gathered up some information, you can see on the screen, for the Waterford at the Park project in North Carolina. That project includes 226 units. You can see the bedroom mix; 82 1-bedroom units, 123 2-bedroom units, and 21 3-bedroom units in this development. You have a total number of residents of 328. We were also able to get age range demographics. You can see there are 9 school-aged children and that equates to 0.03 students per unit. Also then you can see the other age ranges; much more predominantly younger residents in this complex as you can see in the 18 to 29 year olds and 30 - 39 year old range. Also, in the staff report we mentioned the general list of amenities that are provided at each project. I didn't include that in the slides. Then with the Seasons at Celebrate Virginia project, that has 483 units; 249 1-bedroom units, 208 2-bedroom units, and 26 3-bedroom units. We were unable to get the total number of residents and age ranges for that project. We did get some demographic information from the City of Fredericksburg on the number of school-aged students in the complex; that's 34. That equates to 0.07 students per unit. And again, we have the list of amenities in your staff report memo. There were some proposed changes. Subsequent to the meeting, the applicant noticed that one of the conditions that we had proposed talked about providing a storage locker or storage closet in each of the multi-family units that don't include garages. That was kind of a carryover, staff notes, from the previous proposal where it was the secure housing. I think that was a proposal at that point. Under this project, with the detached garage units and attached garage units, the applicant notes that more than 50% of the units would have some sort of garage space that likely could be utilized for storage. And they don't have intentions of including separate storage lockers for their units. So we kind of concurred with what they were looking for there and recommend removing that Condition 18. Also, there was talk and the applicant originally had suggested a condition to include requirements for interior design features, including the heights of the ceilings within the first floor units; 9 feet for the first floor units and 10 feet for the second and third floor units. And then also that specific 8-foot high entry doors, certain amenities such as soaking tubs and kitchen details. And staff had not suggested that that condition be in there just because of the difficulty in enforcing that type of feature. In talking to the building official, that's a detail that's not really going to be a focus of like somebody going and doing building inspections. They're going to be more of the making sure that the buildings are meeting minimum code. We did, through subsequent conversations, it was noted that if there is a desire to have that type of detail that it be provided in a proffer. And you did receive tonight a new set of proffers that the applicant has provided which includes a new proffer that would provide for these interior design features into the design of the project. And so that's for your consideration tonight. And also, a new change that was made that's not in your staff report that's included in the new proffer statement. The applicant has adjusted its monetary proffer, Proffer 1, to include a flat \$6,000 fee per multi-family unit as opposed to the variable rate amount based on the size of the bedroom units. And they can speak to that more so when they get up. And with that, I'll take any questions at this point.

Mr. Apicella: Any questions for staff? Mr. English?

Mr. English: What was the total bedrooms again for the 1-, 2-, and 3-? Do you remember what their totals were? How many 1s, 2s, and 3s? I know it's in my thing but I can't find it.

Mr. Zuraf: That were some average numbers in their impact statement that identified 111 1-bedroom units, 139 2-bedroom units, and 28 3-bedroom units.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. English: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And then there is a condition as well, sorry. Let me find that.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: There is, sorry, and there is a condition that requires a specific number of and it has some limitations to the number of bedrooms. Sorry, let me find that. There should be no more than 10% 3-bedroom units and no less than 40% 1-bedroom units. So that's required through the conditions.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Mr. Zuraf, there was only one person who commented at the last meeting. I don't see anybody here or no one commented at the beginning of this meeting. Has there been any indication of any interest in or comment on either the rezoning, the CUP, on this project?

Mr. Zuraf: I have not received any inquiries at the office from any residents nearby.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, with no further questions for staff, would the applicant like to come up?

Mr. Stuart: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I'm Richard Stuart and I represent the applicant. Specifically, we've sent all of the information with regard to this over to Del Webb to the property manager and asked that they make it available. We have not been able to schedule a meeting although we have talked with some folks who are from Del Webb. So we're trying to do that at this point. I suspect we will have that done prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing. But we have shared all the information with them. Also, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, you all heard this project in a lot of detail and just to reiterate a little bit about this, this area back here was basically I guess conceived in the late 90s and they really struggled with it. Again, we've got a lot of commercial in there that is struggling and I know Mr. English knows that because it's his district. And we want that commercial to be able to survive and they need all the people they can get to come in there and spend their money so that they will be able to stay there. They've not been able to come up with a viable project for this property and we believe this to be an excellent project. You've seen the information from the Waterford. Quite frankly, I've never seen the level, to quote Mr. Coen, of luxury apartments that they have. And this is going to be the same or better. They're putting a tremendous amount of money when you talk about 9 and 10-foot ceilings, 8-foot entry doors, 42-inch soaking tubs, and the like. The quality really will be off the charts. We also believe this may help to transition some of that M-2, Heavy Industrial zoning out there to a more compatible use with that neighborhood, because I'm not sure that that really is a compatible use with what is currently in Celebrate Virginia. I've sensed, Mr. Chairman, and I've been able to speak with some folks, that maybe there's a little bit of difficulty on our unit mix. Maybe there's a little bit of difficulty on our proffers. While we have been working on this... you know, it's funny; you start out with one thing and you don't always end up with what you start out with. But as we are here now, I am in a position to make a couple suggested amendments if Mr. Chairman and the Commission will entertain that. We are in a position to revise those proffers to \$7,000 per unit, and we worked very hard on that. And with the level of quality in this project, it makes it very difficult, I will tell you that. But we do want to be good stewards to the County and the taxpayers. And so my client has been able to come to that level with this. And we also sense there was a little bit of difficulty with the mix on the 3-bedroom units, so we would ask that that condition be amended to not more than 5% 3-bedroom units instead of 10%. And, Mr. Chairman, with that, you all have heard the information, you've seen the information. It is absolutely a great project and will be a tremendous asset for Stafford and Celebrate. And I'm happy to answer any questions that you all may have. But other than that, I would hope that you all would act favorably on this request. Thank you all.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Any questions for the applicant?

Mr. English: I just want to thank him for sending the information on the other project. It does look like an upscale, high quality apartment complex. I appreciate you sending that stuff and working with us on this.

Mr. Stuart: Yes sir.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman? I too want to thank you for the level of information, the amenities. It was very refreshing to have raised different issues two weeks ago and within twelve hours receive an email that addressed issues in a very professional and polite way. And as one Commissioner, I just found that very refreshing and very much appreciated. And then, the thing that I was concerned about, about the bedrooms, you've addressed. I mean, it's just very nice that you've addressed all the things that, you know, that people have raised. So thank you.

Mr. Stuart: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Any further questions? Okay, thank you Mr. Stuart.

Mr. Stuart: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English, this is in your district.

Mr. English: Okay. I take it one by one, right? We can't do it all together?

Mr. Apicella: I believe so and also what I heard from the applicant is that they were willing to modify the proffer statement. There are two different proffer statements so I believe we'd have to modify both of those, as well as the CUP.

Mr. Gibbons: Well, why don't we do that first?

Mr. English: He's doing it now.

Mr. Stuart: Mr. Chairman, I just gave those to Mike.

Mr. English: Oh, okay. So we can vote on that proffer.

Mr. Gibbons: Do the proffer amendment first.

Mr. English: Do we need to see that or just... I make a motion to accept the proffer change.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I've received... both of the proffer statements have been modified to change the amount from \$6,000 to \$7,000.

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

Mr. Zuraf: That would be imposed by the County.

Mr. Apicella: We would need to do that separately. So, can we approve both proffer statements at one time or do we have to take each one and approve them?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Ms. McClendon: You can approve the acceptance of both proffer statements at the same time, but you need to vote on the rezoning and the proffer amendment separately.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. English: Okay, I make a motion to accept the proffer change.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to accept the proffer change; it's been seconded. Mr. English, do you have any comments?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell, do you have any comments? Okay, anybody else? Okay, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All those opposed? The motion passes 6-0. Any other motions Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes sir. I'd like to make a motion to approve RC15150707, Reclassification, Celebrate Virginia North Multi-family Proffer Amendment.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to approve the reclassification that's been properly seconded. Any comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell? Anybody else? I do have a comment. I'm in favor of this motion. I had some pause initially when we talked about this, and a particular concern about the location of the apartments based on the previous application, based on the comments and certainly the great flexibility we've gotten from the applicant. And some of the comments that were made actually stuck with me. One of those issues is the fact that the apartments have already been effectively approved, even though it might be three years out from now at some point in time. Again, market-rate or family apartments could and likely would happen at some point in the future. Additionally, those apartments are already closer to Route 1 than the original proposal from a year or two ago where many of the apartments were further back inside the RBC District. I think also, as indicated, this complex, especially a luxury apartment complex, I think will breath great life into the neighborhood's commercial which I think has been struggling. So I think that's an important point. And the high quality will hopefully drive the same in

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

that area, as well as throughout Stafford County. This is the kind of apartment structure that we'd like to see and maybe make that the new model, if not, even better than that if that's even possible. And I did take to heart the comment that there is a lot of industrial zoning in close proximity to these parcels. And in the absence of approving these apartments, we may get exactly that. So hopefully this will drive some changes going forward. For those reasons, despite the initial pause that I had, I believe this will ultimately be a good project for Stafford County and that's why I'll support it. Okay, with that said, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All those opposed? The ayes have it. I'm assuming, Mr. Rhodes, since you're here, are you an aye or kind of holding out?

Mr. Rhodes: I'm abstaining.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So the motion passes 6-0.

Mr. English: Alright, I make a motion to approve Reclassification RC15150708.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to approve RC15150708, it's been seconded. Any comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Any comments Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else?

Mr. Coen: Just real quickly. Just a humongous thank you to the applicant for in the first round trying to put in the amenities as a proffer. I understand where staff's concern is, but that really, even though there's no teeth to it and it's hard for it to be followed through, it tells the community what they're going to get, which is precisely what somebody on this body two years ago was saying. And the fact that you not only did it, but then sort of kept pushing for that, was very much appreciative. And then the flexibility on this has been very much appreciative. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, the motion's been... there's a motion that's been properly seconded. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All those opposed? The motion passes 6-0. I'm assuming, Mr. Rhodes, you're abstaining.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, any other motions Mr. English?

Mr. English: And I'd like to make a motion to approve CUP15150709.

Mr. Apicella: Would we not want to amend the CUP, that one condition about the percentage?

Mr. English: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. I forgot about that. So I'm making a motion to accept the percentage. Do you want to read it Mike, please?

Ms. McClendon: Because it's a condition that's imposed by the Planning Commission, so you can include that in your motion to recommend approval for the CUP.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, and it's condition number 4. It's upon completion, the property shall contain a total of no more than 5% 3-bedroom apartment units.

Mr. English: Okay, I make a motion to approve the change for CUP15150709.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's been a motion that's been properly seconded. Any comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No, that's just a modification for that, right? Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Right. Mr. Boswell? Okay. Anyone else? Okay, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All opposed? The motion passes 6-0, one abstention. Mr. English?

Mr. English: And also now, I'd like to make a motion to approve CUP15150709, the Conditional Use Permit for Celebrate Virginia North.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion that's been properly seconded? Any comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No. Again, I'll just reiterate what you gentlemen have said about this. I think they have excellently come through with an excellent project for that area.

*Mr. Rhodes arrived at 7:50 p.m.*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell? Anyone else? Okay. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All opposed? The motion carries 6-0, one abstention. Mr. Rhodes, I'm passing the baton back to you. We've gotten through (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much. I appreciate everybody's indulgence with my delayed arrival. Good luck to the applicant. Just for the record, I had no reservation with any of those motions here, but having not participated in the discussion tonight I thought it would be inappropriate to vote on the items.

Mr. Gibbons: Were you with the Pope? That's the main question.

Mr. Rhodes: I stayed the heck away. But actually traffic was really easy! I think everybody stayed away.

Mr. Coen: That's because Mr. Gibbons made a comment about it.

Mr. Rhodes: He's the man.

Mr. English: Mr. Gibson.

(Laughter).

Mr. Coen: If only there were a few signs to make it clearer.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: Items 7 and 8 are deferred till later; we won't be addressing them. There is no New Business. With that, we're at the Planning Director's Report. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Gibbons: I though...weren't you going to take the committee thing first?

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, have we not already addressed that...

Mr. Apicella: Well, we talked about it and then we changed our minds. I think it's going to stay where it was.

Mr. Rhodes: Then if we're just following the agenda, we'll do the Planning Director's report and we'll get to the Committee report if it... I guess...yep.

7. 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: November 18, 2015) (History: Deferred on June 10, 2015 to July 22, 2015) (Deferred on July 22, 2015 to August 26, 2015) (Deferred on August 26, 2015, 2015 to November 18, 2015)**
  
8. 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: November 18, 2015) (History: Deferred on June 10, 2015 to July 22, 2015) (Deferred on July 22, 2015 to August 26, 2015) (Deferred on August 26, 2015, 2015 to November 18, 2015)**

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

◆ Postal Service Delivery Policy

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you maybe recall, in your iPad agenda staff provided a copy of the postal service delivery policy. There was some issue that's come up in recent discussion. Basically the delivery policy stipulates, which went into effect in 2012, that they'll have multiple delivery box locations, or I should say, cluster box locations for new residential developments. The exceptions are if there's an infill development, say for instance, you're building a house on a vacant lot on an existing street where everybody has a mail box, you'll get to continue to get a free standing mailbox, or for new neighborhoods that are relatively small in size, they're not classified as rural, they

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

will have to have the cluster boxes. In a rural situation, that's still up to the postmaster's discretion to be able to have a free standing mailbox along the side of the street. Also...

Mr. Rhodes: And that just automatically goes into effect not that they say it goes into effect?

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: It's a US postal service requirement.

Mr. English: That's no cost to the owner? The post office puts that up right? Those mail boxes?

Mr. Harvey: No sir. They're required to be put up by the developer and maintained by the home owners association.

Mr. Gibbons: So now what are we going to do? We got a request in from that developer, do we send this to the Board with the letter and ask the Administrator or...

Mr. Rhodes: You mean for Shelton Woods?

Mr. Gibbons: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know that we can do anything. I think we have to comply with the...they can deal with the...what is it? Do they deal with the postal service?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, they work directly with...

Mr. Rhodes: Postmaster general of the region, or...

Mr. Harvey: So from what I understand in that particular case the postal service requires the cluster boxes if they want to get mail delivery.

Mr. Gibbons: Should we at least go back and say this is the...

Mr. Rhodes: I mean, we can certainly provide the information. You mean to respond to the request? Yeah, we shouldn't ignore the request. We should let them know we don't control that, here's the process. No, I agree with that.

Mr. Gibbons: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: We'll figure out how to communicate that. No, absolutely.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Should we...I guess I'll ask Mr. Harvey. Is the Board of Supervisors aware of this so that any proposals that are coming forward to them, they know that that has to be addressed in it and if it hasn't been in whatever plans than they should raise it and make sure that the applicant knows this.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Coen, I'm not aware that this has been discussed with the Board of Supervisors at this point in time. As you imply, that's probably a feature that should be shown on the generalized development plan, but typically on a generalized development plan we don't get into the level of detail, at least for single family homes, as to where the mailbox would be, but this may have some effect on site design, because VDOTs going to likely require it be on a street that's wide enough to allow for on-street parking or require turn out for vehicles to enter the area to access the cluster box.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, would it be appropriate for us to ask Mr. Harvey just to make sure that the Board of Supervisors is aware of this element, so that as they go forward they can take that into consideration?

Mr. Rhodes: Do you have anything like a...I apologize I don't follow the very closely the agenda, do you have a standard opportunity to present items to the Board or would you just add it in as an information item?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we normally do that through the Committee process. They have a number of standing committees. In this case it'll probably go through the Community and Economic Development Committee. We work with the County Administrator's Office to check with the Chairman of that committee as far as items that get onto the agenda. There are some that float up from staff. Some of them are generated by the Planning Commission or some from the Board. So we can try to accommodate in that regard.

Mr. Rhodes: If you could please on behalf of the Planning Commission raise it to the CED to make sure they consider making their fellow members aware in some form or presentation. So what'll happen like for Shelton Knolls, they've already designed, they're going to modify their site plan right?

Mr. Harvey: They'll have to modify their plans for the project. I'm not sure if it'll require them to physically modify of the approved plans from the county's perspective. They do have open space within that property because it was designed that way, so it may be that they could the cluster boxes in open space. They have curb and gutter streets that are fairly wide that would accommodate on-street parking, so VDOT may not have any issues with the cluster boxes. I haven't been engaged in any specific discussions at this point in time.

Mr. Rhodes: Interesting. I hate those.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, continuing on with my report...

Mr. Gibbons: I want to thank staff for doing that.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, staff is great.

◆ R15-333 RBC Amendment

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. The Board of Supervisors' last meeting referred resolution R15-333 to the Planning Commission for an amendment to the zoning ordinance regarding the RBC zoning district. It pertains to the issues that the Commission heard earlier tonight. Staff had requested the Commissioner consider authorizing a public hearing for your first meeting in October, which is October 14<sup>th</sup>.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Rhodes: And...if we authorize it for public hearing we could always, the changes we can make afterwards based on input would be to lower the percentages right? Is that what I recall, Ms. McClendon?

Ms. McClendon: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: That would be less restrictive. Okay. So we could make some modifications if we decided to do a public hearing, just couldn't make it more expansive.

Ms. McClendon: Correct.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Very good. And so we would need to authorize that tonight to make it October 14<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: So moved Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Coen: Second.

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

Mr. Apicella: No sir. Well, we just approved a package associated with this. So we should go ahead and move it forward as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Rhodes: Understood. Mr. Coen? Okay, it has been formally withdrawn by Mr. Coen and handed over to Mr. English to second. Further comment anyone? All those in favor of the motion to authorize for public hearing on October 14<sup>th</sup> signify by saying aye. Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Any opposed. None opposed. Passes 7-0. Thank you very much. Further items Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: That concludes my report Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes: County Attorney's report?

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

Mr. Rhodes: Very good. Mr. Coen, it's all yours.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

◆ Comp Plan Committee

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Our sub-committee met on Saturday midst two members of the general public and many contractors and tar layers out in the parking lot, or asphalt, and we...

Mr. Rhodes: Tar layers.

Mr. Coen: Yeah, I know.

Mr. Gibbons: Ms. Bailey had to clean her shoes three times.

Mr. Coen: That's right. A couple of things that came up and then I'll let Mike take over. We had five members of the Planning Commission in attendance which was excellent. We, because of the basic rules and regulations, if you have a meeting of four members that would be basically a meeting of the full commission which would mean that any votes we took would have to be binding, if I understood the legal aspect. So we discussed the premise that as often as possible we will reach consensus and that if we need to take a vote then the official members would take that vote and then take that vote to the full commission, so other people would be able to have their input.

Mr. Rhodes: So to confirm, the formal committee members are the three that were the original members of the sub-committee carrying forward doesn't preclude participation and full involvement of all who choose to attend and you're going to work forward on a consensus basis, but if it comes down to the formal committee members, that's the three that were the original.

Mr. Coen: Right. And then certainly the mentality also was that if we have break out groups the other members that aren't the quote on quote official members can serve on that vote in that capacity with one member of the quote on quote official one and that way you're still having three, but we get, the mentality was we want as much public input and we want as much input from this commission and we really didn't want to just limit it to three, so that's why went that way. There was a great deal of interest in having a lot of input from the general public. Staff talked about possible things which is a specific site on the website and we really pushed the idea of some public sessions and I do not want to steal your thunder Mike, but the mentality was we would need to have some public sessions at the front end to get peoples input and then towards the back end to have it so that when we have specific plans to get input that way. And so that was one of the concepts and I'll turn it over to Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so just to add on to that, I think the end kind of decision I think at this point was to consider possibly two rounds of public input meetings and have meetings that would be located up in the northern part of the county and then the southern part of the county and we would shoot to try to get the first round of public input meetings to gather public input before too much of the product is developed and collect the initial input and then work off of that, develop a plan, and go back for a second round of

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

public input with, okay, here is what the Comp Plan Committee is thinking, what do you think. And so those are the two rounds of public input meetings. The second round, we're thinking, that might be in December timeframe and the first one in October or November. Some of the other discussion was there would potentially be up to 4 break out committees with a focus on land use, goals and objectives, planning around the airport area, and then the issue of adequate public facilities, but first the committee would focus on the overall growth construct and overall vision in addition to looking at the overall goals and the goals alongside of that and then establishing the extra side committees as we get further along in the process and if there needs to be more focused work on the side.

Mr. Coen: If I can interject. Back on the idea of the beginning meetings for a millions of fans watching who really care about us, what we talked about was the idea of what we did at the initial comp plan work where the first sessions, you had sessions where people looked at maps and gave input and things of that nature. So that would be more interactive at the beginning of it in that scope. We also peg into the thing about the breakout committees. There was a concern or an interest that many of the topics overlapped and so that you could, in theory, have a breakout commission group that is looking at X, but the one that is looking at Y really has the same area. And so there was an interest to not make that definitive just at this point, but as we go along make a determination if it needs to be four or two or whatever and not be cast into some sort of (inaudible) right away. And then staff was going to look at even different options to try to get more public input. We tried this this evening but, to people who like to come to the session, to have a session at the beginning where people can just offer comments on the Comp Plan as opposed to the other public comment section of our meeting, as well as having ways for people to submit ideas and things in writing. And I think staff did a superb job for our meeting. And in particular, by having the public comment at the end so that people could watch, sit there and listen, and then comment on what we were thinking about, as opposed to just always being you comment at the beginning and then you have to wait for something else. So I thought staff did an excellent job on many different aspects, but that was a really good concept. I'll throw it back to you Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: And the other idea was also, in the upcoming Planning Commission meetings, for staff to provide an update, you know, in advance of the public comment of what's been going on, if there are specific meeting dates that are upcoming we can provide an update at that point in the beginning of the meeting while many people, more people are watching. Also, then, just kind of going through the order of discussion points, there was a discussion of the future Land Use Plan and the overall scope of the effort. I think the consensus was really to focus on the designation of the Targeted Growth Areas and where the additional growth would go, whether it's, you know, somewhere in the same area of the TGAs, where they're being considered, or maybe they end up somewhere else. But that was kind of the discussion was to focus there. And then, also though, at this point, the committee felt that there might be a good... this might be a good time to send a message to the Board or just kind of let the Board know what direction the committee's looking at going with this and to get their concurrence, let them know the overall set of parameters and maybe even ask a question, if necessary. I know that one question was, what is the percentage of units that we're going to be shooting for in these Targeted Growth Areas? Is it anything different than... is there leeway or do we still stick with the 50% as before? Because when the Board sent this back down, there was not specific direction. And at that point we might want to turn it back over for some discussion on that.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Zuraf. There were really two action things that we were coming back to the full Commission with. One was that we would like for our next subcommittee meeting to talk about what parameters, what the scope of work, what we're sort of thinking at. So we'd like the Commission members to send to us where they think the parameters should be; how big or how small we should be looking at. And then the other one that Mike referred to is, the consensus was we'd like to ask the Board of Supervisors the question, what percentage of future growth do they envision to be in the TGA

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

to sort of get an idea of what we're going to be looking at and, you know, what mix and what numbers to sort of go to. So that's one action thing that we would like from the Commission. At your desk tonight, Mike was excellent, he submitted basically a revised possible schedule for the different meetings and the breakout meeting with the public. So if you'll look that over and give us some feedback -- Bless you, Bless you -- on that. He also gave us the numbers from the future development analysis as well as some future residential analysis, and then looking at the Implementation Plan. That was one of the things that we were looking at and we sort of felt that the Implementation Plan would be towards the end of this process, but we wanted to have people have that so they can start thinking about and mulling over it. So, the first item, Mr. Chairman, if we could see if there's either a feeling from the Board or whatever, to ask the Supervisors for some clarification about what percentage of future growth they would like to see in TGAs of whatever format of whatever space they end up looking at.

Mr. Rhodes: Now, if I could just confirm, actually from staff perspective, Mr. Harvey, how long have we driven with the... we've been using for a while the planning assumption of 50% of our growth would be in targeted areas and 50% would be absorbed in either existing already approved or the rest of the County. How long have we been using that as a planning premise?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that relates back to our current plan which was adopted in 2010.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so 2010. And then before that, did we have any construct like that that we were using? Or was it a different...?

Mr. Zuraf: It wasn't specific to (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: It was just generalized area, be in the USA, right? Okay. So, we've been doing that since 2010. I would just submit, in my mind as we communicate this to the Board, I think we'd want to make sure to give them the background perspective. Since 2010 we've been using this. The last time we engaged you, we continued with it based on your guidance. We just want to confirm, is that still... does that still seem an appropriate way? I think it's appropriate just to get the reconfirmation, but they're not as close to this as we regularly are so it'd probably be helpful to give them the perspective of how we've been doing it thus far to make sure they understand the context. But it seems reasonable to me to have ask the question again. Anyone else?

Mr. Apicella: So, is that going to be in the form of a memo to the Board similar to what you've done in the past, maybe Mr. Coen might take a first shot at it?

Mr. Rhodes: I would think so. I would think that'd probably serve us best.

Mr. Apicella: And I think some of the information in attachment 1 also provides, you know, a range of what those different percentages would look like. So, I think the context is good and this kind of presents them some options basically and what those options might mean.

Mr. Rhodes: Yep, makes sense to me. Anybody else have thoughts? Or actions? Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And if I, Mr. Chairman, if I could add some suggestions to it.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Zuraf, please.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Zuraf: If the Commission will also consider even just summarizing maybe what the process is that the committee is looking to undertake, with two rounds of public meetings, that might be also a good thing to just share with the Board.

Mr. Rhodes: That's a great point. Just, here is our plan of attack. You've given us extra time, we're taking this earnest, here's our plan of attack; we do want to reconfirm a planning parameter with you that we've been using for the last past 5 years to get your context.

Mr. Apicella: The point is, that is the driving... that's the driving parameter. Everything else kind of stems from whatever (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Oh yeah. We've got to accommodate the growth and what's the primary characteristic on how we're going to accommodate growth. Yep, I agree.

Mr. Coen: And just for clarification, I want to make sure. Was I volunteered for writing the memo? If so, I'll start, but I just wanted to make sure (inaudible).

Mr. Rhodes: Your friend, Mr. Apicella, just did I think.

Mr. Coen: But I didn't want to step on your toes Mr. Chairman. Okay, then I will start writing that note. I'll confer with you Mike and make sure it flows. If memory serves, ideally theoretically they need something by tomorrow to get in their packet for next week. But do we really feel there's a... I mean, (a) am I going to be rushing to get this to get it to them by next Tuesday's Board meeting?

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know that it has to be a packet per se. We can just...

Mr. Coen: Okay. No, to get into their packet that they get sent to them on Thursdays, that's what I was talking about.

Mr. Rhodes: I know, but I don't know if it needs to be an agenda item, right? We could just send them a letter.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. And the Board doesn't meet until October 6, so we have two weeks between now and then.

Mr. Rhodes: But I wouldn't necessarily worry about... we'll send the letter to all of them.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: We're helpful. I did have a question, Mr. Coen. You mentioned a comment, parameters. I wasn't sure if I heard all of it in context. I wasn't sure if there were two separate things. So, you mentioned about growth parameter ideas and then you mentioned about communicating to the Board. Was that all the same issue?

Mr. Coen: My interpretation from the discussion was, what we wanted from the Board was the growth picture, not the parameters. I know I spoke against asking for the parameters.

Mr. Rhodes: Just their concept are we continuing with this planning premise.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Coen: Right. What we like from this Commission, the members... and I personally would hope that people would send it in writing prior to, you know, send it to everybody and staff so that when we go to it, we will have looked at it. What parameters you think we should be looking at so that as we go forward, we know what you're thinking of. And if we get it ahead of time, we can look at it, think about it, staff can mull about it, see if they need to bring anything, I mean, Ms. Ehly, Mr. Zuraf, Mr. Harvey brought loads of great stuff last time.

Mr. Rhodes: When you say parameters, what... I just want to make sure I understand what it is we're talking about here.

Mr. Coen: I will defer it to Mr. Apicella who raised the issue.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think it's just kind of the operating parameters and assumptions we're going to work under. These are the 5 or 10 things that are beyond just knowing what the percentage is, these are the things that is going to kind of bound the effort.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, gotcha; I'm with you. Okay.

Mr. Coen: Thank you sir. And I think that (inaudible) the report from the subcommittee, I think staff did a terrific job. If you look at the revised schedule that they came forward with, they have it going out to different stakeholders, different groups, different days of the week, different ways of doing it to try to get as much public input as possible. One of the things that I think worked rather well Saturday is we started at 9:02 and we ended at 10:56, and it was very focused and it was a short period of time on a specific goal. And that was with the two public comments. And it's sort of in the mentality that it will work best if we sort of go with a laser beam on certain things rather than bouncing all over the place.

Mr. Zuraf: And just so we can bring to the Commissions' attention and the schedule, these are all potential dates so I think the next important thing will be for the committee members to kind of see if that October subcommittee Saturday meeting is a good one or if we need to look at a different day. And then, because that has specific kind of tasks that we've identified that would be important to address if we're going to then proceed to potential early November public input sessions. And so, you know, because that's going to be important at the subcommittee meeting to establish the parameters that, you know, will frame the discussion when we go out to seek public input, and then how we go about to do that. That's going to be important.

Mr. Rhodes: When does the Community and Economic Development meet from the Board?

Mr. Zuraf: The first Tuesday of every month.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, October 6.

Mr. Rhodes: And is that during the day or do they do evenings?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, they meet at noon.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Coen: Mike... Zuraf, and I don't remember off the top of my head. Is the BOS meeting on November 4 or waiting until the 11th? I know... or the 10th... I know they don't meet on Election Day but I didn't look to see if... I don't know that they would want to be at these public sessions but I just

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

thought to just have that in our head so that in case they cannot possibly meet on the 4th, we know that ahead of time.

Mr. Zuraf: It definitely is not on the 3<sup>rd</sup>. It is either the 10<sup>th</sup> or I'm not positive which.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Coen, it's on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, and the dates we've tried to avoid other public meetings of the Board and Planning Commission. There's one, you know, and we've even tried to avoid the weeks that there are Planning Commission meetings. I do have an exception in one of them as we get kind of down to crunch time in December where there might be some meetings we end up having to have the same week as the Planning.

Mr. English: Mike, is October the 2<sup>nd</sup> a date that you wanted to meet, or the 3<sup>rd</sup>? Isn't the 3<sup>rd</sup> Saturday?

Mr. Zuraf: For the subcommittee?

Mr. English: Yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: October 10<sup>th</sup> is what I had suggested.

Mr. English: Okay, I gotcha. Alright, I'm sorry. Thank you.

Mr. Coen: So, if the members of the subcommittee and the additional... any other members will let staff and I know if the 10<sup>th</sup> is okay and then we can sort of solidify that, because that will help you with solidifying the public sessions in the beginning of November.

Mr. Zuraf: We'll plan out then the gathering up all the background information to help for that meeting, and do the public notice of that meeting as well. Thanks.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Anything else from anyone else to add? Thank you all for the great work and, as always, thank you...

Mr. Gibbons: The thing that's important, Mr. Chairman, is that meeting last Saturday was recorded.

Mr. Rhodes: Good, good. So, okay...

Mr. Gibbons: All the comments of the parking lot were taken out of it.

Mr. Rhodes: About the tar people? So, very good, thank you for that and a lot more to follow but next is the communication to the Board and getting ready for the next sessions, and then inputs from any of the Planning Commission members, fellow Commissioners, on guiding tenants as they go forward. Chairman's Report -- we had a discussion last time on the staff report format. We had some suggestions that were put in there. Are there any other suggestions in addition to what the staff had and a couple comments Mr. Apicella had on the TIAs?

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- ◆ Staff Report Format

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 23, 2015*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything else at this point in time. Quite frankly, I haven't had a chance to look at it, so I wonder if we could defer any further discussion or any action until the next meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Sure, I think that's fine.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes please Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: For your knowledge, we did take the liberty of modifying some of the order of the staff reports.

Mr. Rhodes: I noticed you were playing with it. I think it's good. We'll just see if there's any other inputs and thoughts and we'll finalize and lock it down. I do appreciate that effort by staff. TRC info? We've got none; everybody's good on that. I'd entertain a motion to approve the August 26 minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. TRC Information - October 14, 2015

◆ None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 26, 2015

Mr. Gibbons: So moved.

Mr. Rhodes: Motion by Mr. Gibbons; is there a second?

Mr. English: Second.

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

Mr. Gibbons: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Rhodes: Any other member? All those in favor of the approval of the August 26, 2015 minutes signify by saying aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 23, 2015*

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Gibbons: Aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye. Any opposed? None opposed; passes 7-0. Any other items we've missed here folks? Thank you all very much. Mr. Apicella, thank you for making it a quick meeting; appreciate it. We are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.