

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
June 22, 2016

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, June 22, 2016, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Steven Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Stinnette, and Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualifications on any agenda item? Seeing none, are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Coen: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move that we change the agenda to slide the closed meeting till after the Chairman's Report.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Coen. Is there a second?

Mr. English: I'll second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. English. Mr. Coen, anything further?

Mr. Coen: No sir, I just think that it's a more appropriate time.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Same.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion 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. Opposed? The motion carries 7-0. It's now the public presentations portion of tonight's meeting. This is an opportunity for the public to speak on any matter except tonight's scheduled public hearing items, where we have none. There will be a separate comment period, normally when we have a public hearing. Please state your name and address before you start your

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

comments and address the Commission as a whole. You have 3 minutes to speak when the green light comes on. The yellow light indicates you have 1 minute left, and when you see the red light, please wrap up your comments. Is there anyone who'd like to come forward? Seeing no rush to the podium, I'm going to close the public comment portion of tonight's meeting. Mr. Harvey, item 1.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. RC15151046; Reclassification – Patriots Crossing Proffer Amendment (formerly known as Stafford Sports Center) - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 20-12, zoned B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, to replace a planned recreational facility with other uses and modify transportation and other site development requirements. The site consists of 23.79 acres and is located on the south side of Garrisonville Road, approximately 220 feet west of Parkway Boulevard, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: September 6, 2016) (History: Deferred on June 8, 2016 to June 22, 2016)**

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Please recognize Mike Zuraf for the staff update on this case.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. This is a request for a project known as Patriots Crossing. It's a request to amend proffered conditions to replace a planned recreational facility with other uses, and modify transportation and other site development requirements that are in place on that property. The property is 23.79 acres and zoned B-2, Urban Commercial. A public hearing was conducted at your last meeting on June 8th and the case was deferred to provide additional information in response to public comments received. Subsequently, the applicant had requested the case be deferred to your next meeting on July 13th. That request is in your package that you received. This would allow them more time to modify the proffers and General Development Plan in response to the comments that were provided. We did, in our staff memo, provide a summary of the issues that were discussed at the public hearing. Those include transportation issues, including evaluation of the revised Traffic Impact Analysis, and then also consideration of phasing of development of the site based on the estimated vehicles per day in their traffic studies. There were public safety concerns, consideration of emergency access via Wolverine Way rather than through the Park Ridge residential streets, obtain input from the school division regarding their thoughts on the inter-parcel connection to Wolverine Way, and we did provide some information. We did reach out to the School Board staff and they did provide some feedback. They noted that they would not be in favor of allowing commercial traffic through to Wolverine Way on a normal basis unless there was some sort of direct benefit to North Stafford High School. And that was probably the basis for the previous connection when there was a recreational facility. They did add that emergency access could be considered if that was desired in this location through a probably gated, secure access through the school property to their site. Hitting on some of the other highlights, also there were adjacent property impacts discussed. The applicant was going to look into modifying the proffered berm language to add more objective criteria. There were concerns expressed about the car wash use and its location. Also, there was a request to consider prohibiting other uses on the property. Also, correcting prohibited use inconsistencies that were pointed out. The applicant was going to work to make those adjustments. Also, considering hours of operation

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

limitations, and there was a preference for the office buildings adjacent to Park Ridge to be limited to 2 stories in height. So the applicant is working on those amendments. We did receive some additional comments after talking to school division staff that talked about pedestrian access between the school and the site. The HCOD... the Highway Corridor Overlay does require a sidewalk to be constructed along Garrisonville Road, so an extension of sidewalk to Wolverine Way may resolve this request. And then also, there were some other requests that a lighted pedestrian access between Park Ridge and North Stafford High School, which was in the original proffers, that that be maintained and an appropriate buffer or fencing between the school site and the development, that that be provided as well. And the applicant can, you know, these are new comments, so the applicant has, you know, may want to expand on how they may be able to comply with some of these requests. And at this point I'll turn it back for any comments or questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Any questions for staff? Seeing none, any questions for the applicant? Seeing none. Mr. Rhodes, this is in your district.

Mr. Rhodes: Would the applicant like to commentate, especially those couple late comments, because there wasn't a dialog on them?

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Patrick: Thank you for the opportunity to speak and let you know that we are looking at these things. What we ran into as we started to review them was that there are some competing priorities and we think that there are some solutions that are possibly going to resolve an issue in ways that may not have been anticipated. For example, the building height request and the height preservation of trees along the property line seemed to be addressing the same concern about visibility of the office buildings from the residential neighborhood. So, if we're able to reduce the height of those buildings we think that we've also addressed the advantage or comment that we heard from the neighbor that they would like to see the existing trees preserved in certain areas and see additional evergreen type trees. So and then, the other thing that was a little bit of a competing priority was the berm. There was a request for a berm, but if you are preserving existing trees, the berm would be in conflict with that in some areas because the berm would require clearing trees in order to construct the berm. And then we did receive some additional comments from the School Board which was requesting trails and some things that we didn't anticipate previously. So, we're just trying to balance those all into the package and work through them. We checked with the Fire Marshal about the building standpipe, the sprinkler system, and standpipes aren't required if the building is under 40 feet in height. And so again, if we're addressing the building height as a way of addressing the screening issue, then that also addresses the standpipe. So we think there's some common solutions to some of these comments. And then finally, frankly VDOT confused us and surprised us by asking that we fill out certain forms and checklists in advance of a study. We prepared the study and provided it a month ago, but they're not reviewing it because we haven't filled out certain checklist items, and so we're completing those for them. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer them. We are very appreciative of the short deferral that you gave us. We're disappointed that we weren't able to meet that deadline and if you could just give us a couple more weeks then we think that we'll be able to address all of these.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Any questions? No? Okay.

Mr. Patrick: Thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: I just wanted to remark, Mr. Chairman, that I was appreciative of the applicant's efforts. Immediately after the meeting they were getting the list of those who spoke so they can make sure and

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

can get back with the community members on their comments. I continue to appreciate that outreach with the neighbors. With that, I'd make a motion for deferral to the first meeting in July.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there is a motion to defer to the first meeting in July, made by Mr. Rhodes; a second by Mr. Boswell. Anything further, Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell? Anybody else? All those in favor of the motion 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. Opposed? The motion carries 7-0. Thank you sir.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify, that will be July 13th.

Mr. Apicella: The first meeting, well the one and only meeting in July.

Mr. Rhodes: The meeting, yep.

2. COM14150427; Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment – Old Dominion Village - A proposal to amend Chapter 3, "The Land Use Plan," of the Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030 document, dated December 14, 2010, and last amended on September 15, 2015. The proposed amendments would add a new set of criteria to the Special Conditions for Townhomes and Multi-family Units in the Suburban Area land use designation. **(Time Limit: August 7, 2016) (History: Deferred on June 8, 2016 to June 22, 2016)**

3. RC14150428; Reclassification – Old Dominion Village - A request for a reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts, to the P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District, to allow for a development consisting of varying types of residential units and commercial uses, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-101, 38-102, 38-102A, 38-103A, 38-103B, and 38-103C. The property consists of 40.273 acres, located on the east side of Jefferson Davis Highway, approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Eskimo Hill Road, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: September 6, 2016) (History: Deferred on June 8, 2016 to June 22, 2016)**

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, for the next two items, Mr. Zuraf will also provide a staff summary regarding Old Dominion Village.

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening again. So this, these two items are for one, a Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, and the second item would be a zoning reclassification to the P-TND, Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District. This would allow for a development that would include 140 dwelling... residential dwelling units with a mix of single-family detached, townhomes, and multi-family units and three live-work units and then also approximately 99,000 square feet of commercial development as well on the site. A public hearing was conducted at your last meeting on June 8th. The Planning Commission also deferred these two applications to this meeting for staff and the applicant to provide additional information. Subsequently, the applicant also has requested the case be deferred to the July 13th meeting to fully be able to address the Commission's concerns. We've also provided a staff memo that summarizes the remaining issues on these two items and provided some additional information that was requested. With the text amendment to the Comp Plan, at the last meeting the Commission had suggested some modifications to the Comp Plan language which the applicant had no opposition to. We included that language as an attachment for reference. Also, the Commission requested a map to highlight the limits of the new land use criteria, where that would apply. We've provided a series of maps to identify potential locations. The criteria generally includes major transportation corridors within two miles of an interstate exit ramp, and then also within suburban land use districts. And we identified all the properties that would be located within 500 feet of the centerline of those roads. And so we do have some maps if you want to see those.

Mr. Apicella: Any interest? They're in our package, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, they are. They're provided in your package and we note that it includes... we identified all the properties that are within that generalized range. We made a comment that not all the development, all those properties are going to realistically develop in this manner. They include a mix of older and newer developed sites and vacant parcels. So, smaller lots would have to be combined with other properties to get to a minimum of 40 acres. Also, you know, already developed lots may not redevelop, but this is just showing all the possible lots that might fall under that criteria. And then looking at the zoning reclassification, staff had noted that the project is not compatible... consistent with the TND design recommendations which include some criteria that landscape design should grow from the local topography and other criteria. And we note that a lot of the site is going to be cleared and graded. But also we note that development under any higher density suburban type of development would result in the same type of impact to the land use as this P-TND project would. Also, we would note that the latest version of the plan minimizes impacts to the natural resources, specifically on the eastern end of the site. The applicant had reduced the development footprint to avoid alluvial soils in this location. There were comments about the Spring House. The applicant has expressed the willingness to proffer informational signage for the Spring House. This change would be included in the next version of proffers when they're submitted. Also, there were some comments about the Neighborhood Design Standards. Staff and the applicant are working on modifications to the Neighborhood Design Standards. We met this past Monday and have agreed on a series of changes that will... that the applicant is going to modify in the Neighborhood Design Standards to meet staff's concerns. So, they're working on those changes and they'll be providing those to us in a week or so. Also, just hitting on some of the other highlights, their prior comments noted that the recommended cash proffer guidelines are not being met. And the applicant is proposing to offset this by dedicating lots in Crow's Nest Harbour. And in response to this and response to the requests from the Commission, the applicant is working on a new Fiscal Impact Analysis and that's anticipated to be complete in late June. And the last point was that staff was asked to calculate the number of development rights. The lots being offered in Crow's Nest Harbour might yield consistent with the TDR regulations that are currently in place. Of all the lots that are being offered, staff has estimated a range of 166 to 185 development rights. That's dependent on the method of calculation that would occur. And if you have any questions... you also tonight received

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

written comments from the Stafford Regional Airport Authority regarding this request. And I'll take any questions that you might have at this time.

Mr. Apicella: Questions for staff? Mr. Zuraf, Mr. Harvey, I have a question. It's kind of related to what happened yesterday with the Board. So they did grant our request for an extension of time; how would that affect these two applications?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that ordinance went into effect at midnight, so therefore now the Commission has 100 days total to consider the rezoning application. However, it does not affect the Comprehensive Plan application. That application has a 60-day time window as prescribed by state law.

Mr. Apicella: So, on the first one, are we allowed an extension if the Board grants it to us, or we must make a decision by the next meeting?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, that would require a decision in July, unless you want to have a special meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thanks Mr. Zuraf. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Ms. Karnes: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and staff. My name is Debrarae Karnes, representing the applicant, with the law firm of Leming & Healy. Tonight I just want to thank the Commission for allowing us to have more time so far and to request that this case be deferred at least until the next meeting. New language was proposed to the Comp Plan Amendment which encouraged a fiscal study. We have retained the services of Dr. Bellas and he promises to have a report to us well in time before your next meeting to allow staff to review and comment. The extensions granted today also allowed us to meet with staff, and I believe come to an agreement as to what would satisfy staff in terms of the Neighborhood Design Standards that will also be turned in for staff's review and subsequently your review in the next week. The opportunity to modify this application in response to staff comments, I think, has rendered a much improved application that will be a memorable P-TND development that also will present to the Planning Commission the opportunity to consider preservation of Crow's Nest lots. I will be happy to answer any questions you have and I thank you for your consideration to date.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none. Appreciate it. Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to defer the text amendment and reclassification of Old Dominion Village to the July 13th meeting. Do I need to make that a separate motion on both, or can I do that together?

Mr. Apicella: Okay, is there a second?

Mr. Coen: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to defer items 2 and 3 to the July 13th meeting. Any further comments Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No further comments.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Nope.

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion 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. All opposed? The motion carries 7-0. Okay, we have no New Business. Planning Director's Report.

CLOSED MEETING

Held after Chairman's Report

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

4. Lighting Ordinance
5. Falmouth Redevelopment Overlay
6. On-street Parking in P-TND
7. Yearly Expenditures

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Board of Supervisors has been busy during their last two meetings and have forwarded a number of items for the Planning Commission's consideration. At the July... excuse me, June 7th meeting the Board referred changes to the lighting ordinance for the chapter of the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance to make some modifications based on feedback we heard from a number of people in the design industry that have been designing commercial developments. Also, the Board referred a Falmouth Redevelopment Overlay Zone to the Commission which would essentially allow some flexibility, as well additional regulations, in the Historic Falmouth Area for redevelopment of properties as well as new development. And then finally, the Board referred on-street parking in the P-TND zone to the Planning Commission. Staff will note that that's being scheduled for a public hearing on the July 13th meeting because it goes hand in glove with the rezoning proffer amendment that's been filed for the Stafford Village Center project, which is now being renamed The Garrison.

Mr. Apicella: Has that one already been advertised? I looked in the paper yesterday; I didn't see it.

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, it's being sent to the paper... it was sent today.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: So it should run in the paper next week and the following week.

Mr. Apicella: So, before we make any decisions, I have a question for counsel on each of these. Just going back to clarify, if we were to put one or more of these particular items, and obviously one is already going to... being scheduled for a public hearing, to what extent can we make changes that are more restrictive or less restrictive?

Ms. McClendon: Chairman Apicella, it's based on two things. First, we have to look at the Resolution by which the Board sent it and if they gave modification authority, which I believe they did. In most of these cases, I'd have to look at each one individually. The Planning Commission has the ability to modify the Ordinance itself and you can make the modifications more restrictive than what's been advertised but not more expansive.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so just going to number 3 where we kind of don't have any control at this point, I'm talking about the P-TND item, staff had some alternative or some changes that they thought would be appropriate. If we decided to, if this gets advertised, say next Tuesday, we could still make those changes?

Ms. McClendon: Chairman Apicella, I'm not exactly sure of the language that staff's proposing, but I don't think there was any specific numbers in there. I think they were talking about how parking spaces are allowed and allocated and what counts, and I don't think those changes would be outside of the scope of the advertisement.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I appreciate the clarification. So, just to kind of work through each one of these, is there any desire by the Commission on the zoning text amendment for outdoor lighting?

Mr. Coen: I'm okay with going forward with a public hearing, so if you would like a motion, I can do that.

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so there's a motion and it's been seconded to move this item to a public hearing. When would that probably be, Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that would be August the 10th.

Mr. Apicella: Well it couldn't be August 10th, our meeting is...

Mr. Harvey: Sorry, August 24th. Correct, there's only one meeting in August and it's on the 24th.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes?

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion 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. All opposed? The motion carries 7-0. Item, well the Falmouth Redevelopment Overlay District.

Mr. Coen: And if I could ask Mr. Harvey a couple of quick questions on that before anybody makes a motion.

Mr. Apicella: Yes please.

Mr. Coen: First question is, how does this relate to the Comp Plan that we've sort of merged different things to? Is this going to add another layer to all our maps, or how would that meshed in? Because before we go forward with it, I'm just sort of curious.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Coen, this is one of the implementation tools that have been identified in the Comprehensive Plan with regard to the Falmouth Redevelopment Area. It recommends we have additional zoning regulations which can add flexibility for future development. But also, the Board was concerned about how the buildings would look in Falmouth and make sure that any future development is in character with the historic nature of that area. So, in the proposed regulations, building additions and new construction would be required to go to the Architectural Review Board for review in compatibility with the established historic guidelines for the overall area. Also, the Overlay District is a zoning category and a zoning district. So staff will have to provide notice to the affected owners within that area and it would be an additional designation on the zoning map for those specific properties.

Mr. Coen: And then secondly, if memory serves and if it doesn't I'm hoping you'll let me know, but couldn't by-right people do cemeteries in there? Can we pull that out after the public hearing, and we look at it, and we think that certain categories should be taken out, or is it just sort of a catch all?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Coen, the draft amendment does have some additional uses which could be permitted in the entire overlay which may not be permitted in the underlying zone. So that'll be something that certainly during the public hearing process. If the Commission felt the ordinance went too far and wanted to pull back some of those uses, you could eliminate those.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

*Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Harvey, since this affects a particular area, what kind of notice are the folks reside in or have a business in that area, what would they get to let them know there's a public hearing?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella, any property owner that would be subject to this Overlay Zone would receive a written notice from my office explaining the nature of the public hearing, and time and place for the opportunity for them to come and speak to the Planning Commission about the proposed amendment and how it affects their property.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, what's the will of the Commission?

Mr. Coen: I'll make a motion to send this to public hearing.

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion and it's been seconded to put this to public hearing. Any further comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion 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. All opposed? The motion carries 7-0. And as you indicated, the P-TND item has already been scheduled for public hearing.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir. Continuing on with my report, yesterday the Board of Supervisors referred a number of amendments to the Commission for various different things. One of them, and they're in your handouts at your desk, one of them was a proposed amendment to the Zoning regulations regarding non-conforming, non-residential structures. Currently our Zoning Ordinance allows if there is a single-family detached home that exists that is non-conforming for some reason, typically due to setback, they can continue to expand that structure as long as the expansion doesn't encroach further into the setback and create more non-conformity problems. This proposed amendment would extend that capability to all structures, whether residential or non-residential. So, this worked through the Community and Economic Development Committee and the whole Board itself, and they felt that it's worthy of conducting this hearing to allow the possibility for businesses to expand. One of the significant issues

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

we've seen over time is, our roads continue to get wider, especially along corridors like Garrisonville Road and Warrenton Road. Buildings that complied with setback requirements at one point in time may no longer because of the encroachment of the road right-of-way. So, currently under the Ordinance as it's written, those businesses can't expand. Those buildings are locked into place, they can't be significantly modified. This Ordinance would allow them to expand a business because they may not have any other restrictions as far as parking and other things on their site. So the Board felt this would probably be a good amendment to help economic development. Also, there is a proposed amendment dealing with road right-of-way. Similarly, we see situations as I described earlier with roads expanding over time. Our Comprehensive Plan identifies the various different roadways in the County that we feel need to be upgraded. For instance, from an existing narrow 2-lane road to a wider 2-lane road or maybe even a 4-lane road. In many cases, you have existing structures that are built and they may be built in today's standards to meet current setbacks. But in our Ordinances, if they're either subdividing the property to create a new neighborhood or they're submitting a site plan, for instance, to add on to a building, they're required to dedicate right-of-way. In some instances, they may not be able to dedicate right-of-way because the building is too close to the existing right-of-way. So this proposed amendment would allow some relief that they would have to dedicate as much right-of-way as they possibly can without creating a non-conformity. And then the third amendment that was referred to the Commission deals with signs. And in particular, our current Ordinance in the commercial and industrial zones allows a sign on the back of the building, but it's limited to 10 square feet. We have a number of situations in the County, specifically along major roads like Garrisonville Road and Route 1, where you have a large complex of buildings. And often times the fronts of the buildings face the parking lot which is set up like an interior courtyard and therefore the back of the building is facing the main road where it has the most visibility. And there have been concerns and complaints that in those situations those buildings are not put on equal parity with other buildings that front directly on the main road. So this Ordinance would eliminate the requirement to limiting the signage to 10 square feet. Basically, the owner of the building can put as much square footage on any one of the four walls of their building as they deem necessary, provided it meets the maximum... doesn't exceed the maximum square footage allowed for that building or in that zone. So it doesn't add any more square footage that someone's entitle to, but it does expand the opportunity for them to have more signage on the rear of their buildings.

Mr. Apicella: So, I presume the clock has started on all three of these. Do we know what the deadline is on all zoning text amendments?

Mr. Harvey: It would be 100 days from yesterday and that would be probably towards the end of September.

Mr. Apicella: So, we have some time if we decided to sit on these and kind of absorb it.

Mr. Harvey: Yes and you may want to consider some of those with the scheduling of the meetings since we have the one on July 13th and then one on August 24th. I will note that the Board felt that the sign ordinance amendment had some urgency to it and was requesting the Commission consider taking that up as soon as you can. Also, with the sign ordinance discussion there was some general discussion about whether or not painted signs on walls were appropriate and also the size of painted walls. So the Board asked the Commission to consider discussing that. It's not part of this current amendment dealing with size of signs on backs of buildings but it was a side discussion that the Board had asked the Commission to look into.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, is there any preference by the Commission in dealing with each of these?

Mrs. Vanuch: We can divide them up (inaudible - microphone not on).

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Apicella: I think we have a bit of work in July, right? So we might want to start these in August.

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the ad for the July meeting went to the paper today, so we'd have to convince the paper to allow us to modify the ad to add something on to it if we want to.

Mr. Apicella: So, is there any thought or consideration by my fellow Commissioners to put the sign changes to a public hearing?

Mr. English: I recommend we put the sign changes on the July agenda please.

Mr. Apicella: The July or the August?

Mr. English: July. If the paper allows us to do it.

Mrs. Vanuch: (Inaudible - microphone not on).

Mr. Apicella: Is that workable?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I take that as a motion by Mr. English and second by Mrs. Vanuch. A third by Mr. Rhodes, fourth by Mr. Coen. Any further comments? Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir. No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mrs. Vanuch? Anyone else? All in favor of the motion 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. Opposed? The motion carries 7-0. Which would you say is the next urgent one, of either of the two remaining?

Mr. Harvey: Of the two remaining, the right-of-way dedication and the non-conforming residential structures, they both go hand in glove. They're more technical in nature. It would be at the Commission's discretion as to when you want to schedule them.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, I would just from calendar perspective, again, the 100 days takes us to about the 30th of September, so that'll give us two sessions in September and only the one in August. If we... a consideration might be to do both in August which gives us time, if there's some reason we need to re-work on something versus jamming us into one meeting.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016***

Mr. Apicella: Is that a motion, Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mrs. Vanuch: Second.

Mr. Apicella: By a nose I'm going to say it's Mrs. Bailey. Motion made by Mr. Rhodes, seconded by Mrs. Bailey to schedule these two for our meeting in August. All those in favor of the motion 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. Opposed? The motion carries 7-0. Anything else Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman, included in your background materials was the listing of annual expenditures. This is closing out the fiscal year at the end of this month. The Planning Commission stayed within budget and we have no issues or problems.

Mr. Apicella: So, we can use the remaining funds for that retreat that we never really had outside the building?

Mr. Harvey: The remaining funds will revert to the general fund and they will be dealt with in the manner that the Board of Supervisors sees fit.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: County Attorney's Report.

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

Mr. Apicella: Okay. There are no committees. I have no report, so closed meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

CLOSED MEETING

Mr. Coen: Yes Mr. Chairman, pursuant to Virginia Section 2.2-3711(a)(7), the Commission desires to hold a closed meeting for consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Coen; is there a second?

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to go into closed meeting made by Mr. Coen, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. Any further comment Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All those in favor of the motion 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 carries 7-0.

Closed meeting 7:07 – 8:30

Mr. Apicella: I'd like to call this meeting back to order.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Chairman, I move the Stafford County Planning Commission on this the 22nd day of June, 2016, that it be and hereby does certify that to the best of each members knowledge: 1, only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were discussed in closed meeting to which this certification applies; and 2, only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the said closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed, or considered by the Commission.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016***

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Coen. Is there a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's been a motion, it's been seconded. Any further comments Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay, all those in favor of the motion 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 carries 7-0. Other Business; TRC information. Everybody has theirs I hope. Approval of minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. TRC Information - July 13, 2016

- ✧ Forest Hill Estates - Hartwood Election District
- ✧ North Stafford Office Storage Complex - Rock Hill Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 25, 2016

Mr. Coen: So moved.

Mrs. Bailey: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Motion seconded to approve the minutes of May 25, 2016. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Bailey: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
June 22, 2016

Mr. Coen: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Boswell: Aye.

Mrs. Vanuch: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. All opposed? The motion carries 7-0. This meeting is adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.