

## **STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**March 23, 2016**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, March 23, 2016, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Tom Coen in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Apicella (arrived at 6:46 p.m.), Coen, Bailey, Rhodes, English, Boswell, and Vanuch

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

### DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Coen: We move next to declarations of disqualifications and disclosures. Anyone have anything they need to declare or disclose? Seeing none, alright. We move now to Public Presentations. Public Presentations, we invite the members of the public to come up and talk about any topic other than the Public Hearing topics which are items 1 and 2 on our agenda. We also encourage you, at this time, during Public Presentations if you wish to talk about the Comp Plan to come up at that time as well. Please speak into the microphone. When you come up, state your name and address. Please refer to the light that is on the podium while you're speaking. Green indicates you may start, yellow indicates you have 1 minute left, and then when it hits red we ask that you conclude your remarks. So, if we could start with the people on my left-hand side, if anyone wishes to come up. Seeing none, we move to the right-hand side. Anybody wishing to come up during the Public Presentations?

### PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Hornung: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, and members of the Comp Plan Subcommittee. My name is Philip Hornung. I would like very much to express my appreciation for your generosity in allowing me to participate in the process of the Comp Plan work. I'm very appreciative of that. And I would like... all of you have received a copy of prepared remarks that I've put together and it's dated today; I sent it... I think all of you should have gotten it in email. I'd like to have that put into a matter of record for that just so it registers at some particular point. And once again, I appreciate the work you're doing and glad to work with you as we go along this road very much. Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Hornung. Alright, anybody else wish to talk about either the Comp Plan or any item that is not in the Public Hearings? Alright, seeing none, we will now go to the first public hearing. Mr. Harvey, I believe Mr. Zuraf is handling item number 1, the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O16-06 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-204, "Review," and Sec. 28-334, "Review," to allow the Planning Commission to have 100 days to review zoning reclassifications and text amendments. **(Time Limit: April 26, 2016)**

Mr. Harvey: That is correct Mr. Chairman.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Alright, Mr. Zuraf, you have the floor.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, this item, the Planning Commission is to consider a proposed amendment to the County Code regarding time limits for review of zoning reclassifications and zoning text amendments. This would be to increase the review time limit from 90 days to 100 days as permitted in the Virginia Code. Currently, if the Commission does not act within the current 90-day time period, its lack of actions is deemed approval of the requested change. So the Commission is concerned that 90 days may be too short of a time period to adequately conduct a public hearing, receive public testimony, work through all the issues that come up. And on occasion, the 90-day time limit often ends on the Tuesday prior to the Commission's regularly scheduled Wednesday meeting. So, in effect, it shortens the review time period down to 77 days, unless a special meeting is called. So, the Commission had noted that it believes that 100 days is a more appropriate time limit to work through the potential issues and concerns. This has gone through the Board's Community and Economic Development Committee. And on January 19<sup>th</sup>, the Board approved a resolution to refer this ordinance to the Commission. And staff recommends approval of proposed Ordinance O16-06.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you Mr. Zuraf. Any questions for staff?

Mr. English: Mike, have you gotten any feedback from anybody about this?

Mr. Zuraf: I have not.

Mr. English: Nothing? So, no resistance and nobody for it and nobody against it, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. English: Thanks.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you Mr. English. Anybody else? Alright, thank you Mr. Zuraf. We'll open it up to the public hearing. Same ground rules apply. You have 3 minutes to make your comments to the Board. Please state your name and address, and then watch the lights; yellow means you have a minute left, red means we ask for you to conclude. So, is there anybody on my right-hand side that wishes to speak on this public hearing? Seeing none; anyone on the left-hand side? Seeing none, we will close the public hearing and bring it back up to the Planning Commission. Do we have a motion?

Mr. Rhodes: I make a motion to recommend approval of proposed Ordinance O16-06.

Mr. Coen: Alright, we have a motion by Mr. Rhodes; is there a second?

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second.

Mr. Coen: Alright, by Mrs. Vanuch. Mr. Rhodes, any comments?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir, I just strongly support the proposed ordinance. Thank you.

Mr. Coen: Alright, Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: I echo those comments.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Alright, any other members of the Commission? Seeing none, we'll put it to a vote. All those in favor of O16-06 approval say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, it passes unanimously. Thank you. And so now we move to the Public Hearing item number 2. And I believe, Mr. Harvey, it's...

2. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O16-18 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-24, "Measurements," to modify the method of measuring the height of a structure to follow the methodology used in the Statewide Building Code. **(Time Limit: April 26, 2016)**

Mr. Harvey: Mrs. Blackburn will be making the presentation for this item.

Mr. Coen: Mrs. Blackburn, alright. Mrs. Blackburn, come on down.

Mrs. Blackburn: Planning Commissioners, this is a public hearing to consider Ordinance O16-18 to amend the County Code, Section 28-24, which is measurements, regarding the method of measuring the height of a building. Recently, an issue has come to our attention that there is a difference between how the Zoning Ordinance requires the measurement of the height of a building and the Uniform Statewide Building Code requires how a building is measured. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the height be measured from the average grade to the top of the roof, which would normally be the ridge of an A-frame roof. The USBC requires that you measure it from the average grade to the midline of the roof, which is halfway between the eave and the ridge. And this requirement from the Building Code is universal throughout the Commonwealth, so it is not unique to Stafford. And this can actually make a difference in these houses with the steep-pitched roofs as to whether or not you can build them, because with the Building Code, any height deviation or whatever just requires different building techniques to make sure the structure is safe. With the Zoning Ordinance, if you exceed the building height, you are in violation of the Zoning Ordinance and you need to either reduce the height of the building or you need to file for a variance. Well, variances cannot be applied for self-inflicted issues with the Zoning Ordinance. So, staff is recommending that the Ordinance that we have before you tonight is that instead of taking the height from the entire surround of... the average grade from the entire surround of the building, we only take the average grade from the front of the building. And we would measure from that point then to the midline of the roof. That will eliminate any issues for walk-out basements or any of that type of house design. And it can make actually a difference of almost 7 feet as to whether a house can be built or not. And staff recommends that you approve... recommend approval of the ordinance.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mrs. Blackburn. Any questions for staff? Alright, seeing none we will open up the public hearing. Anyone wishing to comment on this item please come down. Seeing no one rise, we will close the public hearing and bring it back up to the Commission.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to recommend approval of proposed Ordinance O16-18.

Mr. Coen: Alright, Mr. Rhodes has made a motion to approve; is there a second?

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second.

Mr. Coen: Mrs. Vanuch has second. Mr. Rhodes, any comments?

Mr. Rhodes: Just that this is a logical adjustment to make sure to keep all things in compliance. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: Thank you sir. Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: Makes sense to me.

Mr. Coen: Alright. Any other comments from the Commission? Seeing none, we'll take a vote. All those in favor of O16-18 say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, it passes unanimously. That ends our Public Hearings. We now move onto Unfinished Business. I believe, Mrs. Blackburn, you have this as well, the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, O16-10.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed O16-10 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-55, "Planned Development-2 District (PD-2) regulations," to reduce the minimum lot width from 50 feet to 40 feet and the minimum lot area from 5,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet, per dwelling unit. **(Time Limit: April 18, 2016) (History: Deferred on March 9, 2016 to March 23, 2016)**

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes, Planning Commissioners, this is a continued... is it a continuation of the public hearing? I was not here last month.

Mr. Harvey: Unfinished Business.

Mrs. Blackburn: Unfinished Business, I'm sorry, Unfinished Business. Yes, this is for proposed Ordinance O16-10 which is to reduce the lot area and the lot width of a detached single-family home in a Planned Development-2, which is also called PD-2, zoning district. And this was a text amendment proposed by Mr. Clark Leming on behalf of NASH Stafford, LLC. And this is primarily centered on the Embrey Mill development. Now, last month you had several discussions and out of that came questions

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

that you wanted staff to answer. One of them was you wanted to compare the parking standards for neighborhood jurisdictions. I reviewed the plan... the ordinances for Stafford, Caroline, Fairfax, Hanover, Spotsylvania counties and they all required two spaces per dwelling unit. And I think Mrs. Bailey, you had asked about that. You also had asked about the Commissioner of Revenue reviewing the accuracy for the Fiscal Analysis and he had... our Commissioner of Revenue did not dispute the analysis. And another thing you asked about was the proposed on an average lot size instead of a minimum lot size. And as far as that suggestion goes, a determination we would hope would be needed to be made on the area of the average lot size and what it would encompass. Would it be for a block? Would it be for the section of the subdivision, or for the entire subdivision as a whole? And would the average only be the area of the lot or both the lot width and the area? So, there were several components going into that kind of a discussion and determination on how to best deal with those averaging of the lot sizes. There were several components of that. And staff does want to remind the Commission that the Resolution did not provide for any changes to the proposed text of the amendment. So that could actually be handled in a different ordinance amendment if you all would like to pursue that. You also asked about what was the smallest single-family detached lot size allowed in our County. On reviewing the Ordinance, the lot size in the UD, Urban Development, is 40 feet wide with 5,000 square feet in the area. And I have a caveat to that but we'll do that a little bit later. There was also a question about the lot sizes for the single-family detached homes in Woodstream. Well, there are no single-family detached homes in Woodstream. They consist of townhouses or what is called semi-detached homes. They actually have common footers running between the houses, so they are not technically single-family homes... or detached single-family homes. Yes, it is... yeah. When you drive down the streets, you do not have any idea that that is what it looks like on paper. And you also had concerns about the Fire Department with the smaller lot size. And the Fire Department did not have any concerns, as long as the 10-foot distance remained between the homes. And you also wanted to have information concerning Ladysmith Village, and we did provide you with copies of their various lot sizes. And it appears that the smallest lot size for a conventional detached single-family home is 42 feet wide and 100 feet deep, which would give a lot size of 4,200 square feet. Mr. Apicella's here.

Mr. Apicella arrived at 6:46 p.m.

Mrs. Blackburn: And staff is recommending approve of this because it does provide the diversity that is required through the Comp Plan with affordable housing and just allowing it to be more diverse for all of the development. And do we have any questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Go ahead Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Rhodes: I know the staff package said that this is the only current PD-2. I just want to confirm; are there any other PD-2 applications in the pipeline or in the process that we're aware of?

Mrs. Blackburn: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So this is the only application for the foreseeable future that this would apply to?

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Do we want to give the applicant a chance to provide any more information? Mr. Leming?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, while Mr. Leming is proceeding to the podium, I would like to point out to the Commission that we received a letter from him dated March 18<sup>th</sup>. We sent it to the Commission via email on Monday, and we have a hard copy at your desk. It includes his comparison report, as well as some PowerPoint slides.

Mr. Leming: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and good evening members of the Planning Commission. As Jeff has indicated, we did try to put together a summary of other developments which we're trying to imitate, at least insofar as appearances are concerned. I did want to, and there are a number of developments that we have cited with our pictures that feature in some cases even narrower lots than what we're proposing here. But the most important point I think that we're trying to make with the photographs is the comparison of the varying lot widths and varying house widths... comparison of that and the uniformity between the houses which we think enhances the overall appearance of the development. We included Woodstream; Woodstream is an interesting development because it creates the appearance of single-family detached units. In reality, they are duplexes. Back in the 1990s, one of Mrs. Blackburn's predecessors came out with a zoning interpretation basically saying that a duplex unit didn't have to be physically connected as most duplex units are, but could be connected simply by an underground footer. And this was used in a number of instances before some of our planned development ordinance to create the appearance of small single-family homes. And we included this picture because it does show the difference in the gaps between the homes. You'll notice that two homes are closer together and, Jeff, I don't remember what the distance is where those footers have to be, but it doesn't look to be any more than about 15 feet. The... on the other hand, there are other homes that show a fairly significant gap in between. This is the appearance that we're simply trying not to create. And think that the uniformity creates a better looking community. And, just to reiterate what we went through briefly at your last meeting, generally a family looking for a smaller home also wants a smaller yard. And somebody asked the question last time, well can't you put 40-foot wide homes on 50-foot... 30-foot wide homes on 50-foot wide lots. And yes we could. But then you have the Woodstream type appearance and I think some of the sales attraction for the smaller home accompanied with the smaller yard is diminished. Not to say that nobody would want those, but...

Mr. English: Mr. Leming, are you familiar with Widewater Village?

Mr. Leming: Yes, uh-huh.

Mr. English: Is that kind of what you're going to?

Mr. Leming: Well, it's more and that's another interesting example. And I think we talked about that briefly last time. Some of you -- Mr. Boswell probably remembers -- this was originally zoned as a mobile home park. It had the R-4 zoning, and the County didn't want to see a mobile home park there so they worked out, I believe, the zoning interpretation -- Jeff may remember exactly -- that permitted manufactured homes to come in in the R-4 zoning district. So, basically you had smaller single-family homes instead of a mobile home park.

Mr. English: But the issues that I see with Widewater Village is that I think the parking issues in there and the streets are so narrow.

Mr. Leming: Well, we would have to comply with all of the County's ordinances as far as parking spaces... I think we addressed that last time... parking spaces are still controlled by your ordinance and

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

the street width is controlled by your ordinance. So the only thing that changes here is, rather than having minimum 50-foot lots, there would be the option of a minimum 40-foot lot and a narrower house. But the street width doesn't change, the requirement for parking doesn't change. And most of these, I believe, are alley parked anyway. So, you know, we don't anticipate that parking would be any issue given the location of the single-family detached homes within the development. How many of you have actually been out to Embrey Mill? You know, I mean, the streets are what the streets are going to be. Nothing is to change about that. And whether you have a 30-foot wide home or a 40-foot wide home or a 50-foot wide home, the requirements for parking are still the same. Now, we also tried... so the purpose of the pictures is simply to give you illustrations of what this looks like. And there are a number of communities with the same width that we're proposing here throughout the Northern Virginia area. Staff noted the one in Caroline County which you asked about, which is the same developer, on a 42-foot wide lot, that being the narrowest. We also tried to give you other zoning districts that permitted narrower lots. And staff is correct with regard to the UD-1 District; this is your Zoning Ordinance that is limited to your UDAs and was developed for that purpose. Of course, the PD-2 is also a planned district, as TND is. And we listed TND and RDA-1 because there's a minimum lot width of 18 feet. And there's nothing under the ordinance that says that that can't be a single-family detached home. Now, I don't think that many people would want to buy a single-family detached home that was that narrow. But certainly it would permit the lot width that we're talking about here, or even a somewhat narrower lot width in those zoning districts.

Mr. Rhodes: Ten-foot distance between homes would be difficult too.

Mr. Leming: Yes, that could well be the case. The other zoning districts that we have found fairly consistently permit narrower lots. There are some variations, for instance, in the City of Fredericksburg; difference between corner lots and interior lots. In Fairfax we don't have a minimum lot width at all. Loudoun County and Caroline you have districts that permit the narrower lots. So, I don't think that what is being requested here is unusual, and Newland also has a community in North Carolina with these widths. They think that there's a market demand for it. There was discussion at the last meeting about the possibility of averaging these lots so that there would be no less than a 5,000 square-foot average for the lots. You'd still have a minimum lot width. Now, I understand from discussions with some of you and with regard to the staff report that, two issues -- one raised is how you measure the 5,000... the average 5,000 square-foot. Our position would be the most helpful way to do it is with regard to the entire development although all the single-family detached homes, although, you know, I don't think we would adverse to something... a smaller area than that. There is... and then there's a comment, if an average lot size is used, the... I think this means actual size of the lot can be smaller than 40 feet wide. Well, not if your ordinance doesn't permit that. So, I think that's the point. And then there's a procedural issue. It says staff does want to remind the Commission the resolution does not provide for any changes to the proposed text amendment. I've been appearing before Planning Commissions for a lot of years and I don't think I've ever known a Commission to feel constrained like that, regardless of the issue that was put before it. Now, if you do feel constrained by that and you think that the average 5,000 square-foot lot, or would not be less than 5,000 square-foot, is workable, then I would suggest that whatever you end up doing with the actual resolution before you, you simply include that as a resolution... or as a recommendation. I do think that there is some wisdom behind that that prevents the scenario where you have an entire community of these and forces there to be variety along a given street. So, that's our position. I don't think there's... I think the analysis that Dr. Bellas put together, Scott Mayausky looked at it and agrees with the analysis. So, we understand that there is a fiscal impact of this. The 5,000 square-foot average, the less than 5,000 square feet does address that to some extent, because it means that you're not going to get an entire neighborhood of the smaller lot widths, which we conceded at the last meeting are going to be assessed at a lower value which was part of the point. Part of the point is to have a more affordable home, that single-family detached home, in

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

the Embrey Mill development. And maintain the overall appearance and cohesiveness of the community which is why we want the same distance between the homes, the same side yard setbacks that are currently maintained. In any case, that is our... that is our position and the basis for our request. Anything that you wanted to add Gary or Mark? So I think I've responded to the staff questions. I note that if there are further issues, I think Mr. Rhodes, at the last meeting, suggested that we come back on this occasion because you do have one more Commission meeting before you have to act on the resolution.

Mr. English: Mr. Leming, I've got a question for you.

Mr. Leming: Yes.

Mr. English: What's going to be the price difference? What's the range? Because you're saying that they're going to be a lower, more affordable housing in there. The average price of the house in there is what? What's the average price in Embrey Mill?

Mr. Leming: That's in Dr. Bellas' report.

Mr. English: I know, I just want it for the record.

Mr. Leming: Yeah, come on up Dr. Bellas if you would. I'll let him give you a little more detail on that. As I recall, it was about a \$30,000 difference but being you... explain the figures that you used. Now, of course, he's using figures based on... ranges based on current market.

Dr. Bellas: The average price of the...

Mr. English: What's the average price now going for a house in there in Embrey Mill? What's the average?

Dr. Bellas: Based on lot size?

Mr. English: Yes, based on lot size.

Dr. Bellas: Right, so for the single-family homes on the 60-foot lots, the average price \$524,653.

Mr. English: And that's a 60-foot width?

Dr. Bellas: I was going to read them all down.

Mr. Leming: He's going to go sequentially.

Mr. English: Okay.

Dr. Bellas: Sixty-foot. The next size, the 50-foot lots, the average value \$425,351. For the 40-foot lots, the average value \$370,000. For the townhouses, the average value \$335,580. And for the multi-family units, the average unit \$255,000.

Mr. Leming: If we just look at the difference between the 50-foot and the 40-foot lot, I think that's primarily what his question was.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Dr. Bellas: Yeah, there's a \$55,000 differential.

Mr. English: So there'd be a \$55,000 lower price for that?

Dr. Bellas: Yes sir.

Mr. Leming: But they do compare to the townhouses. What's the difference between the 40-foot lot and the townhouse?

Dr. Bellas: The difference is... the townhomes are 335, the 40-foots are 370, so that's about a \$25,000 differential in price.

Mr. Leming: The townhouses are priced a little bit (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: But, just to be clear, you've got a mix of housing that's been approved at a certain number. So you've already got X number of single-family development homes and X number of townhomes. And those numbers aren't going to change.

Mr. Leming: The townhomes are fixed under the proffers. You can have no more than a certain number of multi-family homes.

Mr. English: What's the average square footage for the townhouses, because that's 3-story right? So the average is...

Dr. Bellas: The townhouse, the average is 1,950 square feet.

Mr. English: Because it's stacked up.

Dr. Bellas: Yes sir.

Mr. Leming: Right, it goes up. Did we answer all of your questions?

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Just one. I noticed in your chart on page 3 of 36, you point out that in the P-TND the minimum lot size is 18-foot and you discussed that. One question I keep getting asked of me is that if you can already go down to 18, why is it that you're asking us to codify a different number if it already can be done?

Mr. Leming: Well, we're not in that zoning district.

Mr. Rhodes: It's not PD-2.

Mr. Leming: That's the only reason, yes.

Mr. Coen: And I just say, it's sort of like what Mr. English was saying, you know, we'd like to have it for the record. I've had numerous people sit there and say, well but, well but. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: But I think your point is well taken. This is not a P-TND, this is not a UDA; it's PD-2, albeit the only one, but set up with a certain set of parameters.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Leming: At the... and just to follow-up on that, at the time that Embrey Mill was zoned and became a planned development in 2001, there were two PD districts -- PD-1 and PD-2. The others that you see listed here, the P-TND, the RD-1, the UD, have all come about since that point in time. And I suppose, hypothetically, you could say well, go get another zoning category. Well, that's not going to happen. What we have is a community that is occurring at some point later than the zoning occurred and we simply want the ability to have a more diverse range of units, particularly in this area of single-family detached units.

Mr. English: Mr. Leming, if this is approved, will you be getting more housing in there, if that's the case?

Mr. Leming: We are... as we talked some at the last meeting, we have an approved preliminary subdivision plan. There is also a number that we cannot exceed under the proffers.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Leming: Now, we did not utilize that cap in the preliminary subdivision plan. But we didn't get there because of the configuration of the development, the land bays, the RPA that we had to deal with, and, as I indicated at the last meeting, the developer has no plans to change any of that. You know, the last thing I think they want to consider at this particular point is coming back in for another preliminary subdivision plan so that they can increase the density. That's not the point here.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Leming: The point here is to assist with current sales and provide more options for prospective purchasers.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm going to bring this back to the Commission for discussion. But, before I do that, I just want to clarify something with Mr. Harvey. I've been on the Commission now for five years; I think Mr. Rhodes, you've been on here twice as long. I don't recall circumstances, as much as I might like to, where we went outside the boundaries set by the Board of Supervisors. In this case, the referral was, I would call it restrictive, and they gave us very specific language we had to deal with and didn't give us the ability to make an alternative recommendation or change the language that they gave us. Is that sort of your train of thought?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the County Code requires that the Board must first refer a zoning text amendment to the Planning Commission. And in their referral it usually stipulates if the Commission can make changes as it deems necessary or not. In this case, it was silent; therefore, it doesn't allow for changes.

Mr. Apicella: So, at best, in those kind of circumstances, to indicate to the Board of Supervisors that we have an alternative path, at best we would have to vote no on the specific language and make a recommendation indicating some other approach that we would prefer. Is that...?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Commission could vote either for or against the amendment, but in the recommendation to the Board stipulate whatever desired outcome the Commission would like to see, as far as the specifics on the lot averaging or things of that nature.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. So, what's the will of the Commission?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Rhodes: Well, I would just share, if I might Mr. Chairman, I would just share with my fellow Commissioners the overarching position I have on this is that it is consistent with the PD-2. That's the intent of the PD-2 is for variety, for a range mixed use, and I think this just adds another tool in the range of options that are there. That said, in the discussion that we've had, a couple of I think very relevant points have been raised. One deals with the parking and frontage. I know this is rear-load so you'll have the two cars in there and therefore you've got the full frontage of this that should allow for a couple more cars. I think that opens an interesting point. I don't know that it's relevant to this particular ordinance. I think it's something to be considered about all; do we want a minimum amount of space whenever there's a greater density? But I think that's further thought. I don't know that that applies targeted to one single ordinance, but it is certainly something I think we ought to consider how it might apply (inaudible). And then the other one was the thought on the averaging and that is, again, an interesting one. I know it could have some complications from staff's perspective; they're not sure how exactly it would apply. Certainly it would help to minimize some concern over a little bit of loss evaluation from a tax base. But I think that discussion on those couple points could be whether we recommend approval or disapproval, it could be points that the staff can be sure to raise to the Board as they go forward and they take their further consideration on the issue. So from that perspective, my inclination is to recommend approval. But again, whether that passes or whether we recommend disapproval and it goes forward, the Board's going to make the ultimate decision. And I would just encourage staff to ensure that in their presentation they raise those couple points. Because I think they're relevant considerations in the process, in the dynamic there.

Mr. Apicella: So, is that a motion Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: So, if there's no other comment, I would make a motion to recommend approval of item number 3.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mrs. Bailey: I'll second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion and a second to approve the language in proposed Ordinance O16-10. Any further comment Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir; thank you very much for the opportunity.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comment Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No further comment.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay, I can't support that motion. I think, more often times than not, when we signal... it's about the signal that we send to the Board. So if we tell them yes but, I think it's more likely that the Board is probably going to go with the version that's sent to them. I have concerns about reducing the amount of width and size. I don't think it's necessary. I have looked at other developments. In fact, as I indicated at the last meeting, I went to Fauquier County and I walked the property there; it's called Mintbrook. The lot sizes are average 6 to 7,000. It seems to be fairly similar to what the applicant, the developer wants to do here. I think it's... there are other opportunities if a developer wants to build a smaller home on a smaller footprint in Stafford County. They can use the, as was stated in the applicant's material, they can go try to do a P-TND or they can try to pursue a UDA. And, in fact, this would be a great area for a UDA. I think there were some conversations with the developer some time ago and they decided they didn't want to make this larger project into a UDA.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Again, I think going to a smaller lot when it's not required and they could build a smaller house on these lots, I'm not persuaded by the Woodstream picture; it looks to me as if the distance between the houses is much more than the 10 feet required. Maybe that's part of the reason why it looks the way it does. And, even if you go to any other subdivision, you'll see gaps between houses. So that, in and of itself, doesn't persuade me. I also don't think that many people who are buying homes are going to say no because it has an extra thousand feet or an extra 10 feet in width. So, for those reasons, I'm going to vote no. Is there any other comment? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Nay. The ayes have it.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Staff is not clear on how the vote finally worked out. We feel that it's an affirmative vote but we would like to ask if you'd consider polling the Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'll poll the Commission. Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: Here... aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Nay.

Mr. Apicella: Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Apicella: Myself, no. So, 4-3.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

4. Comprehensive Plan Amendment - UDA/TGA and 5-Year Update

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, the next item on the agenda is the Comp Plan Amendment. I'm going to turn the meeting over to Mr. Coen who chaired the subcommittee to chair this section of the meeting.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Apicella. At your desk and you received in the mail, via your email, the agenda for this part of the meeting. Basically, the subcommittee had finished its work. We proposed numerous elements. We sent... came up to this body with them, then this body went to the Supervisors for their input on those elements. Two weeks ago we talked about what the Supervisors came back with. So we're at a point where staff is ready to start working on the actual language of the Comp Plan revisions and amendments. And so, what we need to do is tonight give them some definitive action points from which to go forward so that Mr. Zuraf knows what he's going to be writing. With that in mind, you received, the first thing that we have is a timeline. And we wanted to make sure that you understood where we stood as far as a timeline of getting things accomplished. Part of what, and Ms. McClendon can let me know if I'm misspeaking, but the feeling was that when we actually go to a public hearing, we needed to have the actual wording and the language of the Comp Plan for that rather than just tonight saying we like X and then scheduling a Comp Plan meeting... public hearing.

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Coen, actually I would suggest that the Commission have the wording available. Once the advertisement hits the paper, it needs to be available for public inspection.

Mr. Coen: Right. Thank you. So tonight it's sort of the idea we give staff the guidelines of what they need to do, then Mr. Zuraf will do his work. He will then write things up and bring it back to us so that we can have the official language for the advertisement as Ms. McClendon said. So, the first item on our agenda is to look at the timeline alternatives just so that you understand what we're looking at as far as trying to get things moving forward. Remember, we are tasked to give it to the Board of Supervisors by the end of June. And so I'll turn this part over to Mr. Zuraf so he can sort of walk you through. On your table this evening you have a more linear version of the timeline than what we had initially to try to help you visualize it. So, Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Thanks Mr. Coen. If I could have the computer please? The timeline is... we put it on the screen so people can see. So, here we are tonight on March 23<sup>rd</sup> reviewing some of the amendment issues and, you know, we know that what you have tonight is not ready for prime time yet. There are concepts and we still have work to do with writing detailed text and mapping. So, we believe that, you know, you need to defer the issue to either the next meeting or April 27<sup>th</sup>. I do think staff will need until April 27<sup>th</sup> to have a complete document ready for advertising a public hearing. So, if there are any issues where we maybe need to discuss at the next meeting on April 13<sup>th</sup>, we can definitely do that. But plan on, at this point assuming everything goes smoothly, we would have amendments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. So the idea there would be for initiation of a public hearing that would be on May 25<sup>th</sup>. And with a May 25<sup>th</sup> public hearing, the Commission could vote that night or they could have two additional meetings, June 8<sup>th</sup> and June 22<sup>nd</sup>, for additional consideration. If things are not ready to be initiated on April 27<sup>th</sup>, then on May 11<sup>th</sup>, if you initiate the public hearing then, you would have a June 8<sup>th</sup> public hearing with an additional meeting to make a decision. Or the final chance would be May 25<sup>th</sup> to initiate a hearing with June 22<sup>nd</sup> being that date. And this is following your regular meeting schedule. You could always schedule a special meeting if we get to that point, if it's necessary. And I'll turn it back to Mr. Coen.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. And then I'll just let the Commission know that at the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, two members of the Commission so far have indicated that they have out-of-state commitments at that meeting. And so, just so you're aware of all parameters as we go forward. Again, this doesn't preclude people from asking staff for more time or more information, but we wanted to let you know what the impacts of that would be. So with that said, we move to number 2 on the agenda which is the growth projections. It seemed to be a good place to start since a lot of the plan sort of tumbles from that. Items

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

from this, by the way, were... are basically approved by the subcommittee. And while there were 3 voting members of the subcommittee, other members of the Planning Commission served on the subcommittee and we made many of our decisions -- I think all of them quite honestly -- by consensus. I don't think we actually ever voted on anything because everybody came to consensus on issues. That doesn't mean that they can't be changed, but that just lets you know where things came from. So, the first item of depth that we're looking at is the residential projections for growth. The normal number that the County has used has been from FAMPO and Mr. Zuraf has prepared, in attachment 1, that information with the estimates. When we went forward to the Supervisors and at their work sessions, they indicated a desire to see if there were other options of growth estimates that might be a little bit lower. And so, when we met last time, we sort of tasked staff to look into this. And so Mr. Zuraf created, interpreted, looked at information to try to come up with another method. And so I'll turn it over to Mr. Zuraf to explain the Zuraf Method.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. If we could go the computer please, we have the comparison information available. The FAMPO information is across the top that we've been using is we've been considering the latest amendments. With the population projections from FAMPO, that would result in a dwelling unit increase of 33,620 future units over the next 20 years. So, at one of the previous committee meetings staff was asked to kind of evaluate a potential population projection based on the information we know. So, what we've done is worked on a projection based on the latest growth trends that we've experienced with occupancy permits in the County. And also compared that... looked at the past 20 years of growth as well to try to follow the same trends that have happened over the last 20 years. And I'm just going to advance for a moment. So, here's kind of the evaluation that we worked on year by year. The red line kind of shows the approximate trend from 1996 to 2016, and you can see the peaks and valleys of the boom and bust time in residential growth. So, we kind of followed that as a model but, as we move forward the next 20 years, we didn't necessarily want to project out such an extreme boom or extreme decline in the amount of residential growth. So we followed the same kind of peak and valley in the trends, but didn't go to quite the extremes that we experienced over the last 20 years. And this again, this population projection is based solely on residential dwelling unit growth, so it doesn't necessarily take into account in and out migration or birth and death rates, those types of factors, or maybe other economic factors that might come into play. It assumes that information kind of goes constant as we've experienced. Yes.

Mr. English: Do you get some of your information from the Commissioner of Revenue, is that where you get some of your information too?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, a lot of this is just our past permit trends and occupancy permit trends.

Mr. English: Can you go back to the next slide or so? So you get about 10,000 less than FAMPO, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, for the dwelling units it ends up down to 20,840 compared to 33, 620, as a total amount of population growth. So when you look at that, the bottom chart then looks at the distribution of dwelling units over the different areas in our future plan. The Targeted Growth Areas would drop from 16,810 down to 10,420; Suburban areas would go down from 10,000 to 6,000; and Ag also 6,700 down to 4,100. So, that would be the reduction that would be resulted from this other alternative projection that we've come up with.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you Mr. Zuraf. Any other questions for Mr. Zuraf? Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Zuraf: And I guess to let the Commission... a question we have is, with this information, is does the Committee want to do anything with this or should we proceed with the FAMPO projections or not?

Mr. English: Do you need a motion or something?

Mr. Coen: Yeah, what I envision is sort of take motions.

Mr. English: I would like to make a motion that we accept Mr. Zuraf's numbers instead of FAMPO. I think he looks like he's more in line. I mean, he's got the pulse of what's going on, so that's my motion.

Mr. Coen: Alright, is there a second for using the Zuraf Method?

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second for the Zuraf Method -- as long as we trademark that right now.

Mr. Coen: I think so. Alright, so we have a motion and a second; is there any discussion on using the Planning Department's methodology? Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes sir. I'm concerned about the use of the projection. I appreciate the work of staff and they were tasked to try and find some other alternatives. And certainly the desire and intent and motivation of the alternatives were to find ones that are at lower growth. And I think he approached it and he tried to come up with a model, and that's fair. But I think if we just look over history, we've never seen anything like what even the FAMPO projections are showing, let alone what we've got represented here. And just because we want it to be lower doesn't mean it'll be lower. And it certainly makes life a lot easier when you look at the distribution that goes into the TGA, what we would have to fit into there. But that doesn't mean it's necessarily what we'll experience. Again, if you go back since 1965, every 20-year period we've had anywhere between 104% growth to 150% growth in a 20-year period. It doesn't mean that's going to keep up, but that's what it's been; every 20-year period you pick out there you've got that type of growth. We've had the lowest average growth of any time to the mid, oh, 2000s. There's never been a period of that. You can go out from 1965 to 2015 and you look at every 5-year period they've got in there; the only ones that have ever been single digit have been in that 8, 9, 10 timeframe. So, we had a unique... we all experienced it so we know it was there. And so we never had that experience; the rest of the time it's been that size of growth. Now I say that to say that 100 to 150, and I'm not saying it's necessarily going to continue, but when you look at the FAMPO projection, the FAMPO projection only represents over 20 years a 65% growth; historically low growth that they're projecting in the FAMPO projection. And so, to take another model that even drives below that I believe is overly conservative and concerning to me from a planning perspective. Thank you sir.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you Mr. Rhodes. Any other comments?

Mr. English: But, Mr. Rhodes, don't you think you'd consider that he's in a Planning office and he sees these permits coming in, that they kind of have a pulse of what's going on with the County other what FAMPO is? That's where I'm going to go with it because I think they know, they see a trend and they know a trend; I think by going with his numbers, I think it's safe to do that.

Mr. Rhodes: I think if you went to the next (inaudible)... you'd find some different things that would round it out differently probably. And I don't disagree that there's some math behind there, but we've always gone with the set of figures, they've always been the ones we have planned off of. Right now they are projecting, while they're not satisfying to the Board of Supervisors because there's still growth, the fact is they're projecting historically dramatically lower growth over a 20-year period than we've

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

ever seen. And so then to find another model that actually takes us down by another third from that worries the heck out of me on a planning perspective.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you. Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: Yes, Mr. Coen, I would agree with Mr. Rhodes. Certainly looking at a more conservative figure, based on to me it looks like the Planning Department is more historical data. When we look at FAMPO, possibly they're looking at other areas or things that will affect growth in the entire region and the impact it'll have on the different counties that are surrounding it. So, I'd rather be more prepared, especially when it comes to our infrastructure, transportation, schools, than to be not prepared. So, that's how I see that.

Mr. English: I understand.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you Mrs. Bailey. Any other comment? Alright. My only comment would be that we have the good fortune of updating the plan periodically, and so that if we go with the Planning Department's numbers and at the next juncture it seems as though they are too low, we can certainly adjust to it. And if we are going on the premise that we seem to have been going through, that we will have phasing; that gives us ample opportunities to sort of make that type of adjustment. Alright, so we have a motion on the floor and that is to accept the Planning Department's numbers. All in favor say aye.

(Inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, I think we need to poll.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Alright, Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: Nay.

Mr. Coen: Okay, so this is the motion to accept the staff's planning numbers; Mr. Rhodes says nay.  
Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: Nay.

Mr. Coen: Mrs. Bailey says nay. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yea.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Apicella says yea. Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yea.

Mr. Coen: English says yea. Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: Nay.

Mr. Coen: Boswell says nay. Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: Yea.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Mrs. Vanuch says yea. And I say yea, so that makes it 4 to 3 to use the Planning Department's numbers. Okay. That gives Mr. Zuraf guidance to use numbers for the rest of the plan. We now move to item 3, which is the Urban Services Areas. If people remember, there was some, when we had a public input sessions, we had some input by the public into this. When this issue was taken to the Board of Supervisors for their work session, they made two suggestions that were separate and then they supported one of the suggestions that had come... that had been germinated from the public input sessions. And so, Mr. Zuraf, if you'd like to summarize or detail the three.

Mr. Zuraf: Sure. If we could go to the computer again please. I just have the screen shots of the three areas that would be proposed for changes. And the subcommittee has seen these and this is how the map would be changed. The first area, this is along the Ramoth Church Road corridor on the south side of Courthouse Road. The area... the map on the top is the current Future Land Use map; it kind of highlights the area with the black dotted line. And then the map on the bottom shows that area getting added into the Urban Service Area with a Suburban land use designation. And we also talked about adding in a commercial note at the intersection where Ramoth Church and Winding Creek are planned to be reconstructed to tie in directly with each other. So that would be a crossroads where there may be some opportunity for some commercial development in the future. You want me to run through each of them?

Mr. Coen: Any questions on that one while it's up? Seeing none, yes sir, go onto the next.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. And then the next area is the southern part of the County along Holly Corner Road just to the west of Stafford Lakes Village. There's a street in Stafford Lakes Village that T's into the one property, the one larger property in this area. And so this highlighted area is planned to be included into the Urban Service Area also as Suburban land use, under the Suburban land use designation.

Mr. Coen: Alright, any questions for Mr. Zuraf? Seeing none, we move to number 3.

Mr. Zuraf: And the last change area is recommended along Kings Highway, on the north side of the Kings Highway and east side of Forest Lane Road. This is an area that includes the Sherwood Farm site and former Virginia Renaissance Faire site. And this area is recommended to be removed from the Urban Service Area. The current designation of Business and Industry would be changed to Rural/Agriculture. And so that's the change.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you. And I'll bring it back to the committee. Is there a motion pertaining to the USA changes?

Mr. Rhodes: I recommend we accept all the changes as proposed.

Mr. Coen: Alright, Mr. Rhodes has made a motion to accept all of them as proposed. Is there a second?

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second; he beat me to it.

Mr. Coen: Okay, Mrs. Vanuch has seconded. Any comments from...?

Mr. Rhodes: I would just share that those have been a couple quirky spots for a long time and it only makes sense.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Mrs. Vanuch?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mrs. Vanuch: Yeah, I think the same thing.

Mr. Coen: Okay, any other members? Alright, seeing none we'll put it to a vote. All in favor of accepting the changes to the USA say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, it passes unanimously. So we now move to the Airport Overlay District. And if we all remember, last year there was a subcommittee with Mr. Apicella and Mr. English who did diligent work to try to draft a plan. Staff did a massive amount of work as well, I think it's fair to say. On the Overlay District, what we recommended initially to the Supervisors was that it would be a standalone component to the Comp Plan. They did not seem to be in favor of that suggestion; they were more inclined of working it into the Comp Plan itself. We looked at this as a subcommittee, the subcommittee agreed with the idea of working it into the Comp Plan in total rather than having it as a standalone, which then becomes a question of, you know, is that the will of this committee to use... the Commission to make it... work it into the full Plan. We received some input today from the Airport Commission on it, so basically the question before us is do we put it in... keep with the idea of a standalone, do we put it in just work it into the existing Comp Plan, and do we make any changes to what the subcommittee and this full Commission approved before? I'm not sure if you feel you need to add any or...

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, just to mention that a few subcommittee meetings ago, I talked to the subcommittee about the concept of how this can be integrated in. We would... what we were proposing was under the Land Use section in Chapter 3 we would highlight just in general the airport compatibility issues as it relates to land use. And then underneath the Land Use recommendations, map out the subareas that correspond with the different zones that were established, and identify what uses that might otherwise be allowed that might not be permitted because it's within the proximity of the airport. And so that's something that we are still working on, adding that in, and we'll work that language into the document. Then the previous Airport Compatibility Plan, that would be an appendix to the overall Comprehensive Plan in its entirety. So, it's there for reference if people want to refer to it.

Mr. Coen: Alright. Okay, any feeling by the Commission or motions?

Mr. English: I make a motion to accept the Airport Overlay embedded into that.

Mr. Coen: As an embedded element?

Mr. English: Yes, to go along with the big document.

Mr. Coen: Is there a second?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second.

Mr. Coen: Okay, Mrs. Vanuch seconds. Any discussion?

Mr. Rhodes: Just for clarification -- so is this all narrative of that Plan is now going to become a component of the Comp Plan?

Mr. English: We'll work it in.

Mr. Rhodes: Because, I mean, there is a lot of points in that narrative and while I agree with a lot of concepts in it, the scope and scale of the narrative was rather vast and concerning. So, how would we address that?

Mr. Coen: I think Mr. Zuraf, and correct me if I'm wrong, but when you sort of talked to us about this before, the elements would be written in and then a large portion would be an appendix.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that more detailed document would be just an appendix for reference, and then... but within Chapter 3, the real focus is going to be what land uses have we identified that might need additional review and additional consideration should a site be considered for rezoning.

Mr. Rhodes: So, I just want to confirm that when we're making a motion, we're making a motion for both aspects; that all the narrative of what was handed to us would all be an appendage as part of the Comp Plan.

Mr. English: Right.

Mr. Coen: Yes. That's what you're envisioning Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Yes, alright. And that's what I think we have been discussing all along, but it's great to have a clarity. Alright, any other discussion? Seeing none, we'll put it to a vote. All those in favor of embedding the Airport Overlay into the Comp Plan with an appendix to include the other elements of it all say aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed?

Mr. Rhodes: Nay. Sorry, I was fencing it there for a moment; sorry, I couldn't get it out. I was trying to think what I wanted.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Okay. Alright. So now, also on line 4 of the agenda, Mr. Zuraf has called in the Central Stafford Planning Area. To some of the rest of us it's more familiar with the business district that Mr. Hornung has brought forward, and it's sort of in the same situation whereby the subcommittee looked at it, we... Mr. Harvey and Mr. Zuraf -- I think it was actually just Mr. Harvey -- brought it to the Supervisors at their work session. They were supportive of it but felt that it should be truncated from the initial proposal. The subcommittee looked at it, made some boundaries to the north, south, and east. Mr. Apicella raised an issue about the flight plan to the west, so that we were going to look at and ask staff to look into that element of it. And so we're sort of looking at putting that into the Comp Plan. And I believe, and correct me Mr. Zuraf if I am wrong, is the same mentality of working it in, embedding it into it rather than having it specifically as a standalone element. So that'd be our conceptual argument for many of us is that we do it as a work along.

Mr. Zuraf: It's embedded into an element of Chapter 3, similar to other planning areas.

Mr. Coen: Alright. Okay, did you want to say anything about that Mr. Zuraf? I know Mr. Hornung sent us some information today or yesterday, so I don't know if anybody on the Commission has any questions for Mr. Zuraf or...?

Mr. Zuraf: I'll just add, I know the discussion at the last meeting was about adding and highlighting an area to the west of the airport in the growth area -- and if we could go to the computer please -- I've highlighted the planning area. And you have the two boxes represent the kind of inner and outer flight pattern areas around the airport. And the orange shaded to the area to the left or west of the red line would be the extra area that would be highlighted as part of this planning area. And, you know, it doesn't exactly follow the boxes and the intent here is we wanted to try to follow some known geographical boundaries, so we follow Abel Reservoir and then Kellogg Mill Road as kind of breakpoints for that subarea. And then we included some language that we would add in to identify that, you know, these are primary rural residential areas so you have a lot of rural residential uses. And this doesn't prohibit the continuation of those residential uses, but it highlights that maybe residential is not going to necessarily be the most compatible use and, maybe at some point in the future, commercial use, if developed appropriately, might be compatible. So that language was added in... would be added in to the overall kind of discussion of this Central Stafford Planning Area. Some of the comments we received from Mr. Hornung in particular referred to wanting to see the kind of larger mapping of those flight patterns with the full buffer area around those. So we can easily... in this image we just dropped that layer on today and we can add the mapping with that to show the full traffic patterns around the airport as a separate inset.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. Mr. Apicella, since you're the...

Mr. Apicella: I have no comment.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Alright, any other members have any comment? Is there any motion?

Mr. English: What are the TGAs growth numbers? Can we add that as a total?

Mr. Zuraf: That would be an element of this area that we were going to talk about that too. There would be, and I can highlight those where those would be within this district. The areas where it was suggested was in the northeast corner, in this location, and then down in the southwest corner where there are already development rights existing on this property. So, there were two areas and the idea was to be able to accommodate all the projected amount of growth that we ended up kind of working our way into this district. And we felt kind in locations that were not too far from what we have in the

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 23, 2016***

Courthouse Area or down in the southern part near the kind of community facilities that are down in England Run for example.

Mr. English: So we should just probably use the growth numbers that you have then?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, there could be some modification. Maybe when we get to that issue, we can consider whether... if there are reductions, should they be from this area or from other areas? Because the overall idea of the Central Stafford... you know, the majority of this area, the remainder of the area is going to be recommended for, you know, business related uses, industrial uses, and we're working on draft language to kind of capture a lot of that in line with the Central Stafford Plan that was presented. So, a lot of that, with the exception of these two areas where residential might go... the main intent of the area is for business.

Mr. English: Right, okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman? Just for clarity, the areas you circled were what?

Mr. Zuraf: They're planned for... areas where residential could be supported through this draft.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. English: They're going to be the only two areas, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Alright, so do we have any motion about creating the Central Business District or Central Stafford Planning Area or whatever we want to name it as? Either yes we put it in or a motion that we don't put it in.

Mr. Zuraf: Or would the Commission want to wait and see the language until we bring it to you?

Mr. Coen: Wait on that and come back in two weeks?

Mr. English: Yeah, I would prefer you do that.

Mr. Coen: Okay. For staff's perspective, anything in particular you would like them to look at over the next... before the next meeting so they know what to sort of get a feel for?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I'll be good. You know, I have an idea of what we're providing. We'll get more input as we talk about the TGAs and make adjustments there too.

Mr. Coen: Alright. So we move next to the TGAs and that would be attachment 3 I believe. And I'll just give it to Mr. Zuraf to sort of explain. The attachment number 3 that you gave to us is based on the FAMPO numbers, if memory serves?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So that our decision earlier to use your projections would necessitate altering those to some degree.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Rhodes: By a third.

Mr. Coen: Yeah. Alright.

Mr. Zuraf: So, we have to go to the computer again. This first slide provides a comparison table with the amount of growth projected under the current Urban Development Areas. That's the top chart. And then the bottom chart would be under the proposed Targeted Growth Areas. And we have new boundaries and new districts, so they generally correspond with the areas that were already in place but, for example, the Courthouse Area takes in the northern part of the George Washington Village UDA. And so that is much larger. And the Centreport area would kind of fall into the Central Stafford Planning Area. But we'll go through the details and the big change and the big thing that I've ended up having to do with these proposed targeted growth areas was you'll see the amount of multi-family was a lot more to be able to get that to fit within these locations; the 3,000... over 3,000 more units... multi-family units from what was previously recommended. So, that we could be just talking about and evaluating what we have and what we've proposed, you know, for the Commission to consider if the amount of multi-family... if that's much more than may be realistic. And so maybe that's a spot where we would do some reducing as one consideration. Looking at each area individually, here's the Courthouse Targeted Growth Area, and since it's such a large area we've broken it out into three sub-areas, the east sub-area, to the eastside of Interstate 95, called the East or Downtown Area which is the Stafford Redevelopment... includes a lot of the Stafford Redevelopment Area around the courthouse. And then to the west you have the northwest sub-area with Embrey Mill and the southwest area. And so we have unit breakouts for those sub-areas that are proposed. So that's for the Commission to consider whether they're okay with these sub-areas and the breakout that's provided, and if you're okay with the sub-areas, are the amounts of... number of units okay as well or should we make some reductions?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Coen: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Zuraf, a couple quick questions just to clarify, to make sure I understand context. These are, just for clarity, these are units in addition to those already planned, right?

Mr. Zuraf: This would be... actually, no, it would include for example, it would account for some units that are already approved. You know, so like units in Embrey Mill that are not built that can be included as future units, as part of the future units.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, so some of these are approved but not built units that are already on plans. Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, like Abberly in the east that can fall...

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, and that's what I was trying to get in my head here. So, Abberly would be part of these.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: How many multi-family do we have in the County right now? Does anybody know? Roughly?

Mr. Zuraf: I'll have to check.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Rhodes: I was just trying to get context on that one too.

Mr. Zuraf: Five thousand maybe? That may be high, but 5,000 for some reason...

Mr. Rhodes: So, what this is projecting is double what we already have in the County, or two times more than new than what we already have in the County, because it's like 9,000 units?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Don't quote me on the 5,000.

Mr. Rhodes: No, no, I was just trying to get an order of magnitude.

Mr. Zuraf: It might be a little high.

Mr. Harvey: About 4 or 5,000; probably around 10% of our stock which is right now around 44,000 homes.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you. And that's what I kind of thought so I was just making sure I was not off base on that thought when I was putting it in context. And then the last quick question is, just so I keep my scale, the box around the airport that we were last discussing is south of the body of water here, correct? It's outside the scale.

Mr. Zuraf: It encroaches a little bit into this southwest area.

Mr. Rhodes: It does actually hit into that?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. So it would affect... some of that non-housing would affect that area? Okay, thank you.

Mr. Coen: Our discussion back when there was something before us, (inaudible) on the bottom.

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah, I was trying to remember where that went.

Mr. Coen: And then, Mr. Zuraf, these numbers wouldn't necessarily change based on using the Planning Department numbers?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: We would go back and ramp the numbers down. If there's specific direction, we'd probably kind of take... first probably look at multi-family, get some of that down and then make some equal breaks or reductions elsewhere.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Anybody else have any questions on the first, the Courthouse one? Alright.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, and this is just a conceptual map we threw together that we may... we discussed this at the subcommittee meetings to provide a little bit more specificity as to what might be recommended in these areas as a general concept of where commercial, mixed use, and residential might be supported in these sub-areas. So that's a concept that, you know, this is how it may appear as we move forward. So this is the Central Stafford Planning Area. And we have the two areas of residential I discussed, the southwest section near the Centreport interchange. That is a property that has 600 units by-right, allowed by-right. And then the northeast corner we've added in 900 units of mixed... of 900 units of...

Mr. English: Can you circle that on there?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. English: So that's by-right you said, in there?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, that would be a new... people would have to come in and... Now part of that area includes where the Old Dominion Village application was proposed and that's going to be coming back to the Planning Commission. So that's within that area. So, we have these two sub-areas, a remainder of this district would be Business and Industry types of uses. And also if the Commission wants to consider if the name is appropriate, Central Stafford Planning Area, or would there be a desire to have an emphasis on this being a business district too?

Mr. English: Central Business Stafford?

Mr. Coen: Central Stafford Business Area?

Mr. English: Is that okay, Mike, maybe Central Business Area?

Mr. Coen: Central Stafford Business Area?

Mr. English: Central Stafford Business Area?

Mr. Zuraf: Sure.

Mr. Coen: Alright, any other questions on this one? Seeing none, we can move to West Claiborne.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. So this area was the lower part of formerly what was known as the Centreport UDA. And it expanded; I think it previously was generally along this location. So this is expanded down to Truslow Road. And this would be more of a primarily residential area, south of the Centreport interchange, most of it outside of the Airport Overlay. And so you could have a mix of residential units in this area, not far from England Run as well, and the library and schools in this location. And this is another area we'd likely ramp down the number of multi-family units in this district, but still have a mix.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Any questions? I just have a quick question. Mr. Zuraf, I noticed on this one there's no delineation between north, south, east, west, and where some do. Is it possible to have it that all of them are such as this one where it's just a generalized without anything specific designated for any particular area? Or is it desirable to do it the other way?

Mr. Zuraf: We had that with some of them that were larger. We didn't have it on this one because it was smaller than the others. But yeah, we can definitely do it any way. We can keep it open or just have a total for number of units for the entire district for all of them if that's the desire.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Rhodes: Do you need the... I would just wonder if you need the Stafford Central Business descriptors to stay outside the Airport Overlay elements. So you need some way to describe that because the rest of that's remaining mainly commercial. And so you really are targeting the home areas

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, if there's a special consideration for location, then yeah.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, some of the Targeted Growth Areas will have a different complexion. Some of them may only have one type of use, like the Central Stafford Area would be mainly business. The same with Boswell's Corner. This area may be mainly residential so it may not have any other designations.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there a feeling by anybody on the Commission whether one way or the other about subdividing it or keeping it whole like this one versus the subdivisions elsewhere?

Mr. English: I just say keep it whole like it is.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Any disagreement with Mr. English's idea, just keeping them whole? Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Not a disagreement; I think we are damned if we do and damned if we don't. It'll be used one way or another. You said all those homes had to be in this area or it'll be, well you have all these homes available, you can put them anywhere, so it won't matter.

Mr. Coen: Right. Alright. So it seems as though everybody's okay with just keeping broad, without having the sub...

Mr. Zuraf: For all of the TGAs.

Mr. Coen: For all of them, yes sir. Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Thank you Mr. English. Okay, so now we move onto Warrenton Road Planning Area.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright, if we could go the computer again for this next... this has the four different quadrants or districts around Warrenton Road and Interstate 95. This is the... this used to be the Southern Gateway UDA and we've expanded the area to the east along 17. And so this is a much larger area; it can accommodate more units. We likely will ramp down the number of units though in this area as well. And we'll take away the sub-areas.

Mr. Coen: And just for clarification, this zone includes the area east of 95 that... two areas that the Supervisors sort of indicated to us that they wanted included in the TGA. Correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Coen: And then if, just for everyone's sake, it went down farther along Warrenton Road solely for the standpoint that along Warrenton Road, many of those parcels are already business already. So that...

Mr. English: Does that take it up past Walmart?

Mr. Coen: Up the other direction?

Mr. English: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Zuraf: Only out to Celebrate Virginia, just past International Parkway.

Mr. Coen: Yes. Okay. So I don't think we expanded to the west, did it?

Mr. Zuraf: Not... slightly; it expanded a little bit just to account for the redevelopment area.

Mr. Coen: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And it did...

Mr. Coen: Right, because that was one of the things that the... that we had raised a long time ago sort of combining the redevelopment areas with the other things so that it wasn't so many different colors on the map.

Mr. Zuraf: And it did incorporate... it did extend to the southwest to include the properties along Celebrate Virginia Parkway in this location.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Any other questions on this one? Alright, thank you Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Zuraf: And the last two, this is the Leeland Station Targeted Growth Area, which is the same limits as they prior Urban Development Area. The amount of growth is less than what was recommended in the Urban Development Area because you have a lot of by-right development happening to the south side of the CSX rail line and then some potential area for new development to the north towards Morton Road.

Mr. Coen: Alright, any questions? Comments? Seeing none, we go to Brooke Station.

Mr. Zuraf: And this is the last one of the Targeted Growth Areas; the lowest amount, just 270 single-family residential units in this area. Originally it was recommended for multi-family and townhomes, so those were removed under this latest iteration. And there had been discussion of possibly removing, but there was still desire from the Board to keep this in as a Targeted Growth Area for way out future phase potential development in the outlying years.

Mr. Coen: Alright. Any questions? Comments? So, on this one, other than we deciding to use whole zones rather than having subsections, what we'll need is the new updated numbers using the Planning Department methodology. So we really wouldn't... I wouldn't think it would be wise to sort of vote on anything now on this until we see the new numbers. Is that a fair assessment from everyone? Alright, so that will...

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, one comment I would just share for consideration. As we work through the eaches in developing a plan and the logic, and I know everybody works real hard at that, sometimes when you aggregate it, it shows a different picture than you thought it was going to show. And when you look at the aggregate on this, we've got, of all our 20-year growth, we've only got 24% of that plan to be single-family homes. We've got 76% of it planned for townhome and multi-family, and that has never been the complexion of this County and I just don't know how well that would be received. Last time we had a plan up there, we were well under 50% of multi-family, and that was received very negatively as perceived as being inaccurate. So, as you aggregate this, suddenly it's like ooh, wait a second. So I just highlight that out.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Right. And I think Mr. Zuraf sort of hinted at when we look at using the Planning numbers newer version, they would hit the multi-family first. Which is exactly what you're hitting at. So we're all on the same page on that one. Alright?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I think we would try to shoot for the goal of trying to replicate our current mix of housing within the County as best we can. We may not be able to do that, but that will be our goal.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Zuraf: And also, this is more intensely... the concept is the more intensely developed areas. So the mixes may... can trend more towards the higher density, but it's not going to...

Mr. Rhodes: And the open urban growth will be all the single-family homes. This is skewing off further than we've looked at before so I wanted to raise it.

Mr. Coen: Thank you sir. I believe this is a valid point. Alright, so now we move to the next element which is the Planning Area Concept/Consolidation of Zones. Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: So, we've discussed this concept and for this issue I just have the overall future land use map. And this Planning Area Concept would include the six Targeted Growth Areas that we've gone over. But then also include other areas in the County that have some sort of special kind of considerations for their location. A lot of the others are more economic development focused, including Boswell's Corner and Aquia Town Center to name a few. And so we'd highlight those just as we highlight the Targeted Growth Areas and then we have a side table in the corner though that would identify whether the Planning Area is a Targeted Growth Area for residential or a kind of an economic development priority focus area. And each area will get some kind of discussion within Chapter 3 to explain why it's identified as a special Planning Area. Some of the other areas we've discussed were the Marina District along Aquia Creek where we have a consolidation of several marinas that was identified in the Economic Development Plan as an area they wanted to provide a little focus for some development potential. And another addition we made since the last subcommittee meeting, just like we've highlighted other recreation areas along the Rappahannock River, we added in highlighting the Widewater peninsula for the Widewater State Park as to reflect the planning that's occurring in that location. So, we can, you know, right now it makes it a very generalized map but in the inset in the discussion and Chapter 3 can provide more description as to what kind of land uses are recommended in each area.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you. Any comments? Everyone's alright with this? Okay, thank you Mr. Zuraf. So, now we move to Development Phasing, which would be attachment 6.

Mr. Zuraf: This is a potential phasing plan that we... when this was considered last year, we proposed a phasing plan. And this phasing plan was taken forward to the Board also at their retreat and they seemed to be in favor of establishing this type of phasing plan. And so we've modified the phasing plan to kind of correspond with the latest Targeted Growth Areas that we've been working on. We identify in areas phasing that is based on undeveloped areas versus redevelopment. For example, in the Courthouse Areas that already have some development that are in place, but areas also that are raw land that can be developed; we've split up the Courthouse that way. The Central Stafford Area; we've divided that phasing up by location because much of the land is already... is raw land so the phasing divide there is more of an issue of getting utilities to areas, specifically north of Ramoth Church Road versus south of Ramoth Church Road. West Claiborne Run, that's a midterm proposal; not a lot of

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

development there currently. Warrenton Road, similar to Courthouse where we break up the phasing by undeveloped areas versus redevelopment. The redevelopment areas are out in the outlying areas because that's often just going to take longer to assemble property for redevelopment and also for existing uses, to maybe get to that point where they're ready for redevelopment. And Leeland Station is more of a location phase and Brooke Station is identified as a long-term phase. This was discussed at one of the previous subcommittee meetings too.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, if I can just ask, it's a different but related question. On our first TGA submission of the concept, we also talked about redevelopment area for the 610 corridor, which is not part of the TGAs but we introduced that as a concept. And I just never thought to look at it and I apologize. In any of the modified language, do we address that as a redevelopment emphasis area?

Mr. Zuraf: We don't.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay. Because we did have it in our earlier proposal and now we've gotten really focused on TGAs and I just forgot to even think about it for a while, how we do infill and redevelopment in places that were already built out.

Mr. Zuraf: We can definitely add that in because those are within... you know, that area is within the Suburban Land Use; we can add some discussion.

Mr. Rhodes: It wouldn't be inconsistent with our past submissions; it just hit me, seeing the redevelopment here.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: And there is... there was some discussion about the suburban area and how that discussion evolved with the Board in their retreat. We talked about infill properties and whether they should all be single-family detached or not. And the recommendation was that they could change unit types provided they kept the density the same and the new use was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. But it did get to that to some degree.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So we could now add that in where it needs to be, using that language, and since they gave us that it's acceptable. Right, Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, staff would contemplate putting that in and I don't know if Mike's going to get to that later on or not.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Rhodes. Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Alright, any other questions on the phasing? Alright, and so now we move to the next part which is a smaller lot size element.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. This was a discussion during the subcommittee that we include smaller lot sizes for single-family detached as a means to meet some of the density requirements and projected amount of growth. So, we've included some new language; you have that in your staff report that we would add to the Targeted Growth Area section. We would note that the single-family... you know, variety of single-family units are supported and to achieve higher density, smaller lot sizes, and typically found, are encouraged particularly when located in mixed use areas in close proximity to multimodal transportation. So that would be additional language within the Targeted Growth Area discussion and

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

text, and then we would add to the Suburban Land Use that lot sizes less than a quarter acre in size may be supported if located adjacent to higher density residential or commercial development. So there's two parts to that.

Mr. Coen: Alright and I guess the question before us is, and we sort of had a vote earlier this evening on the concept thereof, is there a feeling that the idea of looking at smaller lot sizes in the TGAs is something that is worth putting into the Plan as an element or not. I'll throw it out to the Commission and see what they think.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, but these would all just be dependent upon what zoning area they're in, right? So it still goes back to the underlying zoning? Like the PD-2?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rhodes, since this is going to be language in the Comprehensive Plan, it would give guidance going forward as to how we shape our zoning districts. So we would probably continue on the discussion we had, similar to what we did tonight on PD-2 and whether we should have higher density or smaller lot sizes in some of the other zoning districts that could support development in the Targeted Growth Areas.

Mr. Rhodes: So what this language is somewhat saying is, it encourages considerations of things like P-TNDs, like PD-2s, like other ones that would be able to tap into those zoning capability for smaller lots.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, or if there is an individual project that comes in that's adjacent to an apartment complex that's in a suburban area and there's a zoning district that would support the smaller lot sizes, then, if that detail is proposed then this policy would support that.

Mr. Rhodes: Okay, gotcha.

Mr. Coen: Any thoughts?

Mr. English: Does there need to be a motion or we just go with it?

Mr. Coen: I would guess, I think there probably should be a motion. I mean to a certain degree it's a major change, I'm thinking, for the County. So I guess we'll ask for a motion, but I know, for example Mr. Apicella felt strongly on this, so I don't know if we want to wait till he comes back in. Is there any additional information people need on this issue to make some type of determination? Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: To me it's consistent with the concept of TGA.

Mr. English: (Inaudible - microphone not on) motion to accept it?

Mr. Coen: I mean, if it's... we can. We can hold it until Mr. Apicella comes back and then we can take a vote on it. We'll just... it's okay if, everyone, we just jump right back up to it? Okay. Alright, so the next is the residential building types in suburban areas.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, this was the issue that Jeff touched on just briefly, just a moment ago about suggesting adding some criteria in the Suburban Land Use district that might support townhomes and multi-family dwelling units. And this was discussed at the Board retreat and they were okay with it as long as the density of 3 dwelling units per acre is not exceeded. So, we've provided in your package, in attachment 7, language that already exists in the Suburban Land Use district that talks about special conditions for townhomes and multi-family units and we've added this... this language was added in under two

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

previous amendments. One was first for the Whitson Woods project and then for the Stafford Village Center project where criteria was added in in special situations where a higher density was supported for those cases because they were surrounded by higher density development in that location. So we added in a third criteria that if those prior special situation issues on sub-section A and B are not met, that other dwelling unit types would be allowed on a case by case basis, provided they're compatible with existing nearby development and don't exceed the 3 dwelling unit per acre density. So, if you don't meet all the special criteria, you might be able to have the higher... the townhomes and apartments, but you have to go at a lower density.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there any discussion or feeling about that? Alright. So do we have a motion on that to include that into the Comp Plan?

Mr. English: I'll make a motion.

Mr. Coen: Okay, Mr. English made the motion. Is there a second?

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Coen: Alright, second by Mr. Rhodes. Any conversation?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Alright, all in favor say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright. So now we move to adequate public facility policy.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, there was at the last sub-committee meeting discussion about the newly adopted proffer legislation which limits the ability to collect offsite proffers and concern about what affect that's going to have on the County if we're planning for all this growth. So there was a desire to kind of get some language in to the plan to ensure that development didn't occur until the facilities were, you know, and improvements were in place or planned to support the growth that's going to be occurring. So there is an existing policy in the Comp Plan that we saw somewhat related to this issue and we worked to modify that as Policy 1.7.2 and I'll just read through it. That would be: New development proposals for projects within the Urban Services Area boundary and for the Targeted Growth Areas and any new development at intensity above what is permitted by-right that are dependent upon the future infrastructure and services should be rejected until the projected infrastructure and services have been implemented or appropriately scheduled. Scheduling of future improvements can be achieved through proffered contributions and/or improvements by the developer, scheduling improvements in the

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

County's Capital Improvement Program, or establishing other funding mechanisms such as a Community Development Authority or Tax District. So, this policy lays out alternatives that would allow development to occur if the needed improvements are appropriately planned for, either through proffers, CIP, or special taxing district. And we'd recommend that this language also be added, not only in the policy section, but in the language within Chapter 3, under Future Land Use as well. Because the Sub-Committee said get this, you know, in the plan and often.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there a motion...

Mr. Rhodes: A comment Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: Yes sir.

Mr. Rhodes: I understand the concept and I'm supportive of the concept. My concern is, what is it, and this is only guide, it's the Comp Plan, it's only a guide, but how do we interpret it? So, I'll try and go to two extremes purposely. But if we say that it's dependent upon future infrastructure changes, so could... is the intent here, or is the thought there that everything will be at level C... for road infrastructure is what I was thinking for this... so is everything going to always be a level C or better no matter the time of day? Or if the growth of another 200 homes at a location is going to make an intersection go to F an hour a day, and when the flows are two hours a day, does that have to wait till that entire road is...? There's a little bit of definitional concern, because it could be seen as a broad direction or a narrow direction, and that's just the one bit of a little bit of discomfort I have with the language. Thank you.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you. Any other discussion? Mr. Zuraf, do you have anything to respond?

Mr. Zuraf: I know the issue came up when we were talking about the... at the sub-committee meeting where we were looking at adding in the land along Ramoth Church Road. And the discussion was on transportation and the condition of Ramoth Church Road in that area is, you know, very narrow, windy two lane road and we're going to be adding this area into suburban to support higher density development. But, you know, there would be a strong desire to really get... have Ramoth Church Road improved before a lot of development comes into that location. So that's kind of the impetus along with just the overall concern with the new proffer legislation, but that was one prime example of how the new proffer legislation might hamstring the County and keep the County from being able to get the necessary improvements in place.

Mr. Rhodes: And along those lines, again, the broader interpretation then, it could be 30 years till we get around to Ramoth Church, so we just will plan to not have anything there on the broader extent of it.

Mr. Coen: Alright, anything to add? Mr. Harvey or anybody?

Mr. Harvey: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Alright. So now I guess I will ask, is there a motion to include such language into the Comp Plan? And seeing no one. Or is there a desire to think about it and come back in two weeks?

Mr. Rhodes: I think there is something about this that has strong merit and I think that's why it was suggested and reinforced throughout the process. I just think there's a little bit more scoping and I'm trying to think of exactly where, but to me, maybe if we go work this to scope it or more strongly define what the intent behind it is. Almost a little bit of definitional intent to the scope of where would it be

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 23, 2016***

applied, again, it's still a guiding document, it's not directive or the ordinance. And if we could maybe have another stab at it for the next time we get together, that might be beneficial.

Mr. Coen: Okay, is that the will? I see nodding heads, alright, so that's for to come back in two weeks. So that brings us to goals, objectives and policies.

Mr. Zuraf: The last attachment you received, attachment 8, is the entirety of Chapter 2 of the Plan on the goals, objectives and policies. We've made several modifications within that chapter just to reference, you know, any references to Urban Development Areas were amended to Targeted Growth Areas. That was a change that we worked on last year. Added some new changes under goal 3, under the environmental section, the sustainability section; it was modified to address the need to plan for sea level rise which was a more recent amendment to the state code that we were required to address it in our Comprehensive Plan. And then we've added in some reference to Widewater State Park as well in the amendments, so you have all those in front of you. I'm not going to go through each one.

Mr. Coen: Right, and that one doesn't necessarily need any type of motion. That's just to give us an eye of what type of re-write you have to do and why it will take you until basically the 27<sup>th</sup> of April to integrate. That's the only negative of trying to embed things into this. It means it's more work for Mr. Zuraf to do to get it in throughout the document. So then that brings us to last item, number 12, other amendments/next steps. I'll let you bring up anything and then I'll just summarize what I have as the next steps and see if you're agreeable that we'll do it by next meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: We have the one item we were going to circle back on.

Mr. Coen: Yes, thank you. We had the topic of the smaller lot sizes and whether or not to put that into the document, and I believe we sort of waited for a motion to actually put it into the document. Is there a motion?

Mr. Rhodes: I'll make a motion to put that in the document because again it's really just emphasizing consideration of those different tools that are available, but it still will be based on the underlying ordinances of the different zoning districts.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Is there a second?

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Any other discussion? Alright, all in favor say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Coen: Aye. All opposed? Alright, so that's in there. Alright, so now we go to next steps. Go ahead Mr. Zuraf and then I'll just sort of touch on what I have written down as the things that we need to do next, for the next meeting and then we'll be done on this item and we can give it back to the Chairman.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the big thing, we'll modify the Targeted Growth Area numbers and provide some additional mapping for you to, you know, so we can get those areas defined. And the big thing though, in the meantime we'll also, we'll get the policy on adequate public facilities, get that language redefined and get that back and any new amendments that we have available by the next meeting, we'll bring those. Otherwise we'll be really shooting for getting all the details written up for the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of all the Targeted Growth Areas and I think it probably would be could to, at the next meeting, also get you some more detailed language on the Central Stafford Planning Area as well.

Mr. Coen: And then the only other thing that you didn't mention, and I'm not certain that we need the language by the next meeting, but the only other item that I have is about the 610 element and how that would fold into it. But quite honestly, if you think that that would just work into the regular document on the 27<sup>th</sup>, that probably could fit there, but just, that was the only other thing other than what you mentioned that we sort of need to addressed. Anything else from the Committee?

Mr. Rhodes: If I could beg the indulgence on two quick items. One is back to my belated, blurted out no on the Airport Overlay. I just wanted to clarify; I agree and support the concept. When we had an extended discussion in the ABC room on it that one Saturday, I think everybody was, but we also talked about scaling it, and I just haven't seen any language that scales it. And the original verbiage which I think is what we're still talking about just had a lot of very broad applications and so I wanted to just share, so I was trying to think that through and I was late to the game, but that's the no. It's nothing about the concept, but I do believe that the verbiage that came with the original proposal did have a very broad application of things and if we're going to adopt that under there, we might merit re-reading just to make sure we're all comfortable with that. I just share that for one point. Second point, if I had it to do it over again, I'm too late to the game, but if I had it to do over again, my comments on the population growth projections would actually have been targeted this way; and that is since 1950 every 10 year, 10 year period that we've had of growth in this County has been between 40 and 65%. The average of all those 10 year periods has been almost 50% and we're adopting a 20-year plan that's going to be at 40.8%. And from that perspective is what I reinforce, we're adopting less than a 10-year model in any other period of time and that was what my concern was about.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Thank you Mr. Rhodes. Any other comments? Alright. Seeing none I turn it back to you Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Coen. New Business? None. Planning Director's Report.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

\* Yearly Expenditures

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My report mainly focuses on the Commission's expenditures. We're well within current expenditures. I will note that there is a little over \$5,000 in advertising funds

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

left. The Comprehensive Plan, when it's advertised, will be fairly costly due to the maps that are required as well as the text. So we still think we should be in budget, but I'd request permission from the Commission, if it appears that we're going to be close to exceeding that line item that staff have the ability to transfer funds from the printing and publishing line item over to advertising to cover any cost gaps.

Mr. Apicella: Do we need to take a vote on that or can just do it by consensus?

Mr. English: I think you have to make a motion on that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. English: On any budget transfer, is that correct? Is it like a budget transfer type thing?

Mr. Harvey: Correct. Our department would do a budget transfer between those two lines if necessary.

Mr. English: I'll make a motion that he has the authority to do that.

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. There's a motion; it's been seconded to allow the Planning Director to move funds around as necessary for advertising purposes primarily. Any further comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes? Were you the second? Any other comments? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. The motion passes 7-0. Anything else Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Board of Supervisors recently approved the Royal Farms applications on Route 17 for the proffer amendment as well as the conditional use permit application. And that concludes my report.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 23, 2016***

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

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. We've already gone through the Comp Plan sub-committee. Chairman's Report. I have nothing. Other Business? I assume everyone's got their TRC information; it looks like mostly Aquia and Hartwood. Is that correct? Mr. English, you have yours?

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

4. TRC Information - April 13, 2016
  - \* Chapel Ridge - Aquia Election District
  - \* Brooke Point Cluster - Aquia Election District
  - \* Estates at Rocky Penn II - Hartwood Election District

Mr. English: Yes sir, I do.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Approval of minutes, March 9, 2016; is there a motion?

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*March 9, 2016*

Mr. Coen: So moved.

Mrs. Vanuch: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, motion to approve, seconded to approve the minutes from March 9, 2016. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Motion carries 7-0. I'll take a motion to adjourn.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Bailey: So moved.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 23, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, meeting adjourned.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

---

Steven Apicella, Chairman  
Planning Commission