

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
July 18, 2007

The work session of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the County Administrative Center.

Members Present: Cook, Kirby, Pitzel, Mitchell, Carlone, and Di Peppe

Members Absent: Rhodes

Staff Present: Harvey, Judy, Stepowany, Ennis, Hornung, Schulte, Schultis and Gregori

Declarations of Disqualification

None

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE:

1. Life Care/Retirement Community Zoning Districts

Brice Hendrick, Smith Packet, stated lifecare was full continuum care and he would like to introduce some language to the proposed Ordinance. He stated Smith Packet had been developing lifecare facilities for 25 years and had developed 150 long term communities. He stated the communities could consist of cottages, duplexes, condominiums, and apartments. He stated the residents could progress through the levels of care as their needs change. He stated the average age of a resident was 78 years old and the average age of a nursing home resident was 83 years old.

Mrs. Kirby asked the location of the closest facility.

Mr. Hendrick stated there were 2 facilities in Richmond, Crossing at Bon Air and University Park. He stated residents preferred the lifecare facilities because of the efficiencies of the services and additional amenities. He stated currently there was one nursing home in Stafford County and the state recently said there needed to be 350 nursing home beds available in the County. He stated residents would have to leave the County in order to find care and it was difficult on extended family to travel to visit relatives. He stated couples with different care needs could reside on the same campus to support each other. He stated lifecare facilities usually have no impact on schools or parks and recreation and minimal impact of emergency services since there would be medical staff on site. He stated lifecare facilities were low traffic generators, except for visitors and the site would be pedestrian friendly. He showed the Commission pictures of other facilities. He stated he appreciated staff's help and the Planning Commission's input.

Mrs. Carlone asked if there would be high rise buildings.

Mr. Hendrick stated the largest building was four stories.

Mrs. Carlone stated the Ordinance read the maximum height would be 75 feet.

Mr. Judy stated this was nothing more than a proposal.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

July 18, 2007

Mrs. Carlone asked if there would be a non-denominational place of worship.

Mr. Hendrick stated there were some faith based lifecare facilities.

Mr. Judy stated they were trying to be broad.

Mrs. Carlone asked if some residents would be driving cars.

Mr. Stepowany stated there were 3 different levels of care so some residents may have cars. He stated the residents would not own the cottages or duplexes, but would rent or lease them.

Mr. Di Peppe stated it would be a co-op situation.

Mr. Judy stated the residents could own the condominiums. He stated 55 and older communities were growing.

Mr. Pitzel asked if onsite housing would be available to the staff.

Mr. Hendrick stated the staff would live off site and drive to work.

Mr. Stepowany stated there would need to be special regulations for signs and how it related to landscaping.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the medical offices were for emergency medical care.

Jay McManus, engineer stated none of the condominiums were offices.

Mr. Hendrick stated any offices for staff would be on an out parcel.

Mr. Stepowany stated offices were not permitted on the use table.

Mrs. Kirby asked what the general price range was.

Mr. Hendrick stated the prices vary, but cottages usually go for 250,000 to 500,000 dollars and apartments were generally 180,000 – 275,000 dollars. He stated residents would purchase a life long lease.

Mrs. Kirby asked what happened to a resident who started off in a cottage but a few years later needed to be in the nursing home.

Mr. Hendrick stated lifecare facilities were an upfront investment, than the residents pay a monthly maintenance fee.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about a fire in a tall building.

Mr. Hendrick stated the buildings would be fully sprinkled.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

July 18, 2007

Mr. Judy stated he thought Mrs. Carlone was concerned that Stafford County did not have sufficient rescue apparatus for taller buildings.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was thinking of the safety of the residents.

Mr. Judy asked Mrs. Carlone if she was suggesting the 75 feet maximum height be reduced.

Mr. Stepowany stated the Ordinance would be brought back to Committee for further discussion regarding signs, landscaping, and loading issues.

Mr. Di Peppe stated Mrs. Carlone had a legitimate question.

Mrs. Carlone stated elevators in the buildings could not be used during a fire.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like limited on site residency for staff because lifecare facilities had 24 hour functions.

Mrs. Kirby stated hospitals were 24 hour businesses.

Mr. Pitzel stated lifecare facilities already had residential components.

Mr. Di Peppe asked Mr. Stepowany if he could research the possibility of on site residences for the staff.

Mr. Judy stated it could possibly be done under a special exception.

The Planning Commission thanked Mr. Hendrick for his presentation.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to recognize Mr. Stepowany for writing the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) Ordinance. He stated at the July 17, 2007 Board of Supervisors meeting Mr. Dan Sloan, who helped write the Smart Code, stated the Smart Code was a template and localities could modify it. He stated Mr. Sloan told the Board that Mr. Stepowany did exactly what he was supposed to do with the Smart Code and it would be an excellent service for Stafford County.

ITEM 2:

Mr. Stepowany stated the Board of Supervisors recommended Resolution R07-305 changes to the TND Ordinance.

Mrs. Kirby asked why special exceptions would be given to certain groups.

Mr. Stepowany stated in order to receive a variance; the owner had to claim a hardship. He stated Mt. Ararat Baptist Church was denied.

Mr. Harvey stated it was deferred, not denied.

Mrs. Kirby stated the Eagles Lodge did not ask for a special exception.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

July 18, 2007

Mr. Stepowany stated the Eagles Lodge had a lower open space ratio. He stated Agricultural Zoning District have higher open space ratios. He stated the justification for the special exception was parking.

Mr. Judy stated institutions can grow.

Mrs. Kirby stated in residential areas.

Mr. Judy stated they were expanding within their property.

Mr. Pitzel stated Bethel Baptist Church received a special exception when they expanded their building. He stated each case could be examined on its own merit.

Mr. Cook made a motion to set Item 2 for Public Hearing. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Judy stated Item 3 was initiated by a resolution from the Board of Supervisors, so no motion from Mr. Di Peppe, the Ordinance Committee Chairman, was required.

ITEM 3:

Mr. Stepowany stated the Board of Supervisors had 4 amendments to the TND Ordinance which were the maximum height requirement, density in the T-6, Transect Zone, minimum tract size, and a provision to not require residential units. He stated the Planning Commission had 120 days to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Cook stated he would like staff to present the recommended changes and the Planning Commission could have an opportunity to study the changes. He stated he would like to have a public information hearing in September for public comment. He stated the Ordinance could be set for Public Hearing possibly in October. He stated, in his opinion, he did not want to rush the Ordinance and he would like good input from staff.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if there would be any recommendations from the Planning Commission prior to the public information meeting.

Mr. Cook stated yes. He stated staff should provide their recommendations on the changes at the first meeting in September.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the public should be able to provide comment prior to staff's recommendations.

Mr. Cook stated the Planning Commission was going to make 4 changes recommended by the Board of Supervisors. He stated, in his opinion, removing residential development from the Ordinance was not the best idea.

Mr. Di Peppe asked Mr. Stepowany if he had any other comments for the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

July 18, 2007

Mr. Stepowany stated the Private Access Easement (PAE) Ordinance had to be re-advertised because the section on the number of allowable PAE's in a Minor Subdivision was inadvertently left out of the advertisement.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the two issues could be separated. He stated, in his opinion, the width issue was separate from the number issue.

Mr. Stepowany asked if it would be possible to still forward the width of the easements to the Board of Supervisors and only advertise and hold a public hearing on the number of PAE's allowed in a Minor Subdivision.

Mr. Judy stated, in his opinion, as long as the public hearing only addressed the part that deals with the width of PAE's, but he was not sure if the County wanted to go down that road. He stated, in his opinion, even if it was split into two Ordinances, both should be advertised and sent to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Di Peppe asked why there were so many requests for PAE's recently.

Mrs. Kirby stated there were people who would try to circumvent the Subdivision Ordinance.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the Ordinance Committee was complete and he would give the gavel back to Mr. Cook.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

2. PAE2700372; Bennett Division, Private Access Easement – A private access easement to serve one lot located on the west side of New Hope Church Road between Rabbit Road and Camp Selden Road on Assessor's Parcel 55N-2, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Cook stated the request meets all regulations.

Mrs. Kirby stated, in her opinion, just because it meets all regulations does not mean it is a good idea.

Mr. Harvey stated the PAE meets the Ordinance requirements. He stated PAE's were an administrative action by the Planning Commission. He stated the best way to remedy the situation would be to amend the code.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would vote no.

Mr. Cook stated Mr. McAllister purchased the property and was creating 3 lots.

Mrs. Ennis stated a Minor Subdivision was 5 lots or less.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

July 18, 2007

Mr. Judy stated the Ordinance says “approval of such subdivision and access easement shall not be construed to approve any further use of said easement or further subdivision of the land.”

Mr. Pitzel made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

3. P AE2700373; Roundtree Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Belle Plains Road north of Newton Road on Assessor’s Parcel 56-78, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Judy asked if there was a minimum Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) width between the easements.

Mrs. Ennis stated she checked with VDOT and they were okay with the location of the PAE’s.

Mr. Pitzel made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

4. P AE2700375; Kensington Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Storck Road south of Hartwood Road on Assessor’s Parcel 25-34B, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

5. P AE2700377; Tacketts Mill Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Tacketts Mill Road at Walnut Ridge Drive Assessor’s Parcel 8-15, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 18, 2007

The regular meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the Stafford County Administration Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cook, Kirby, Pitzel, Mitchell, Carlone, and Di Peppe

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rhodes

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Judy, Baker, Gregori, Schulte, Hornung, Zuraf, Ennis, Stepowany, and Schultis

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATIONS:

None

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Mr. Zuraf asked if Items 1 and 2 could be presented together.

Mr. Cook stated yes.

1. Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – Centreport Gateway – A proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan map component of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment would redesignate Assessor's Parcel 37-25 from Light Industrial, Suburban Residential, and Resource Protection land use to Urban Commercial and Resource Protection land use consisting of 51.25 acres, located on the west side of Interstate 95 separated in two parts by Centreport Parkway within the Hartwood Election District. The Urban Commercial designation would allow development of commercial retail and office uses. **(Time Limit: October 16, 2007)**
2. RC2700199; Reclassification – Centreport Gateway - A proposed reclassification from A-1, Agricultural to B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to allow for the development of a commercial office park to include a mix of offices, retail commercial uses, and a hotel on Assessor's Parcel 37-25 consisting of 51.25 acres, located on the west side of Interstate 95 separated in two parts by Centreport Parkway within the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Light Industrial, Suburban Residential, and Resource Protection uses. The Light Industrial designation would allow light industrial, light manufacturing and office uses. The Suburban Residential use would permit single family residential development at a density of three (3) dwelling units per acre. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses in the B-2 Zoning District. **(Public Hearing continued from June 20, 2007 Regular Meeting)(Time Limit: September 18, 2007)**

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

Mr. Zuraf presented the staff report. He stated the proposed development was for office, hotel, restaurant, conference center, and retail uses. He stated the site was currently wooded with two residences to the north and the site was undeveloped. He stated staff believes the commercial and retail use proposed would be suitable for the area given the visibility of the site from the new interchange. He stated the site was a gateway to the regional airport and there would be minimal impact to residential uses and a majority of the land was still undeveloped with a buffer of the Resource Protection Area (RPA). He stated the request was consistent with the goals and objectives of the Land Use Plan. He stated the request meets the intent of the Draft Comprehensive Plan and keeps with what was envisioned for the area. He stated the site fronted on Centreport Parkway, Mountain View Road, and Pine View Drive and the proposed access was primarily off of Centreport Parkway. He stated the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) envisioned a six lane limited access roadway. He stated staff was concerned with the potential access point due to the proximity of Interstate-95 and the ultimate build out of Centreport Parkway. He stated the applicant would need to get an access permit from VDOT, if denied they would have to gain access through adjacent parcels. He stated staff believes the Urban Commercial Land Use would still be appropriate in this area, even if it did not have immediate and direct access off of Centreport Parkway. He stated the site was currently in the Urban Service Area but was not served by public sewer. He stated there was minimal water availability. He stated the Urban Commercial designation would decrease future demands on schools and parks and recreation and the site includes pedestrian trails and sidewalks with connections to off-site properties. He stated staff did not identify any cultural resources within the area based on the available resources. He stated there could be potential for Native American sites due to the high ground and perennial streams, as well as Civil War resources due to the proximity of a nearby Civil War encampment. He stated the County's Groundwater Management Plan shows potential for groundwater pollution in this location. He stated there could be a lower potential for impact to the environment with office and retail development than with an industrial site. He stated staff recommends approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He stated the applicant provided proffers and a Generalized Development Plan (GDP) to the Planning Commission. He stated the revised GDP was very similar to the previous versions. He stated the applicant addressed all the concerns mentioned at the previous meeting and the applicant proffered the GDP and the types of uses that would be provided. He stated 80% of the total gross area would be office, hotel, or non-retail uses and they would proffer two additional through lanes through the site. He stated the primary access would be limited to Centreport Parkway with inter-parcel connections subject to a sector plan being approved. He stated the applicant proffered to install fire protection sprinklers and incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Standards (CPTED) into the design of the site and would proffer design guidelines.

Mr. Di Peppe stated, in his opinion, the Planning Commission does not vote for projects without elevations. He stated he would like to see building elevations.

Mr. Zuraf stated staff felt comfortable with the proffer of specific uses and the proffer which would bring the specific guidelines back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Cook stated the Planning Commission had always required elevations and a material list.

Mrs. Kirby stated the term "general conformance" with the GDP was not clear. She stated she would like to see some upscale retail. She stated VDOT should be signing off on the plan first,

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

which makes her think it is premature. She stated there was not a proffer for a Phase I Study. She stated she would like to know whether the pedestrian trails would be mulch, rock, asphalt, gravel, or concrete and how the applicant intends to mitigate adverse impacts.

She stated she would like to see the design of the buildings prior to approval. She stated she was concerned that VDOT had not mentioned anything and some of the additional retail uses were not proffered out.

Mr. Pitzel stated he was concerned about the pedestrian pathways and how people would cross Centreport Parkway. He stated an overhead pedestrian bridge was the best solution. He stated he was concerned VDOT would put in a stop light and crosswalks on a 4 lane road.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the applicant had contacted Clyde Hamrick, VDOT, because the limited access placed a lot of emphasis on inter-parcel connections. She stated she addressed some of the road issues at Technical Review Committee (TRC). She stated the two perennial streams which feed into the pond were not addressed and she did not understand the 10 foot space along the retaining walls.

Mr. Zuraf stated any retaining walls would have to be 10 feet off of the edge of the RPA.

Mike Finner, The Cox Company, stated he would like to thank Mr. Zuraf and Mr. Harvey for their help. He stated they have been hard at work since the last time they were before the Planning Commission, preparing the proffers and modifying the GDP. He stated there were 13 proffers and they have tried to take out specific uses permitted in the B-2 Zoning District. He stated the intent was to provide a gateway project. He stated he had examples of 3 and 4 story, brick and glass buildings to show the Commission. He stated they would be happy to provide inter-parcel connections. He stated development within general conformance would allow flexibility in the plan to respond to future tenants or if the building placement or road needed to be shifted. He stated right now they did not know who the tenants would be for each individual building. He stated there was not an answer for the Planning Commission regarding the limited access breakthrough. He stated the project meets most of the requirements in the Comprehensive Plan and survey results showed that 58% of respondents agreed with this type of product and 70% of respondents agreed that Stafford should increase business development. He stated staff did address the pedestrian access at Centreport Parkway and the applicant was concerned about the costs of a pedestrian bridge, as well as the look of a pedestrian bridge at a gateway to the County. He stated the applicant had hoped to accommodate pedestrians at grade in consort with the signalization of the traffic signals. He stated they were happy to proffer and agree to a pedestrian path as long as something could be worked out so the paths could be shifted according to the buildings.

Mrs. Carlone stated the applicant had said he would discuss the inter-parcel connector with the adjacent land owner and had shown possible flexibility in stubs because the adjacent parcel would be residential.

Douglas Darling, Centreport Gateway LLC, stated he had several conversations with the adjacent property owner and have agreed to work together on inter-parcels connections. He stated the potential retail was closer to the airport. He stated the adjacent property owner was willing to cooperate in any way possible. He stated the adjacent property owner was not as far along in his

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

planning as Centreport Gateway was, so it was hard to commit to anything in writing. He stated there was a meeting scheduled on July 24, 2007.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the maps provided were to full scale. He stated as far as the pedestrian access an overhead or underpass were possibilities to get pedestrians from one side of the street to another.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the applicant was willing to do a Phase I Survey on the property.

Mr. Darling agreed to the Phase I Study.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would like to see color renderings of the buildings.

Mr. Darling stated he was very aware of the importance of this parcel and was intent on developing the site within the highest quality and standards.

Mrs. Carlone asked if that could be written into the proffers.

Mr. Darling stated there would be architectural standards.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would like to see the architectural designs before she voted on the project.

Mr. Darling stated the Planning Commission could be partners with Centreport Parkway on the design standards.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the hotels would be a Motel 6 or a Hyatt Regency.

Mr. Darling stated, at this point, there were not designated tenants. He stated this property warrants good tenants and he would make more money with higher scale tenants.

Mr. Di Peppe asked Mr. Darling to contact D. P. Newton regarding possible Civil War encampments. He stated he would be going out to the site to view the RPA and he would like the RPA protected to the furthest extent.

Mr. Darling stated he was fully appreciative of that aspect of our history.

Mr. Di Peppe stated, in his opinion, developments which found historical sites and incorporated them into the development, made their site much more desirable.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

Mike Phillipe stated the road he lived on was adjacent to the property. He stated he lost a lot of neighbors because of Centreport Parkway and he lost his home, but he built a new one in the same area. He stated right now he lived on a nice, quiet, dead end road and he was told the road would remain closed. He stated, in his opinion, he would not like a back road entrance into the proposed site and the traffic would be horrendous and it would become a major mess. He stated, in his opinion, VDOT did not really want this development and the only way to fix it would be when the Mine Road extension was completed.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

With no one else coming forward, Mr. Cook closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Finner stated the applicant would provide a sector plan with the adjacent property owners which could be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. He stated he would like to know exactly what the Planning Commission would like as far as design standards.

Mrs. Kirby stated, in her opinion, Virginia colonial would not date the building and would look just as nice in 10 years, as it does today.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the recharge area for the aquifer runs along the middle of the County which is why there was a high potential for pollution.

Mrs. Carlone stated Tri-County Soil and Water Conservation could work with the applicant. She made a motion to put Item 1 in committee. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

3. CUP2700265; Conditional Use Permit – Taylor Bott Industrial Park Lot 5 Quarles Petroleum- A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow vehicle fuel sales in a M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District and in the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 38C-5 consisting of 0.71 acres, located at the end of Blackjack Road approximately 400 feet west of Jefferson Davis Highway within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: October 16, 2007)**

Mrs. Schulte presented the staff report. She stated the site was currently undeveloped and the area around the site was recommended for Light Industrial Use. She stated this would be a 24 hour operation serving commercial accounts only. She stated there would be two fuel canopies approximately 20 feet in height and all of the traffic in and around the site would be one way. She stated the use was consistent with the established development pattern. She stated the Land Use Plan recommends Light Industrial use for this area which would include industrial development. She stated the proposed use was consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and compatible with adjacent uses. She stated staff has noted conditions which may mitigate potential negative impact. She stated the request meets the standards for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). She stated minimal traffic impacts were generated from this type of fueling station and there were no apparent negative aspects. She stated staff believes the application meets the standards for issuance of a CUP and recommends approval of the application with the conditions outlined in Resolution R07-309.

Mrs. Carlone asked if there would be someone on duty.

Mrs. Schulte stated this was not a manned facility, which was why there was no parking.

Mr. Pitzel asked if there was any place he could look up the Highway Corridor Overlay District (HCOD).

Mr. Harvey stated a map could be emailed to Mr. Pitzel.

Mrs. Kirby stated the landscape buffer was only 20 feet in width and asked if the tall trees would be planted.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

Mrs. Schulte stated the tree height would have to meet the minimum standards in the Landscape Ordinance.

Mrs. Kirby stated she had a problem with the word “minimum”. She stated she would like to have something nicer than that for the County. She stated, in her opinion, she would like to see some mixed, deciduous trees.

Mrs. Carlone stated she would like to see mixed evergreen trees.

Mr. Mitchell stated he was concerned because if someone pulled out of Blackjack Road, made a right turn onto Route 1 and a left turn onto Perchwood Drive, in his opinion, there was a potential hazard.

Greg Napeg, Chief Operating Officer for Quarles Petroleum, stated he was available for any questions.

Mr. Pitzel asked if the site was gasoline or diesel sales.

Mr. Napeg stated there would be both. He stated Quarles projected less than 100 trips per day at the site. He stated this location was to serve the people within 2 miles of the site and was not designed to bring more traffic into the area.

Mr. Mitchell stated traffic uses Route 1 as an alternate route when I-95 backs up.

Mr. Cook asked if Quarles owned Watch Card.

Mr. Napeg stated they were a competing company.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing. With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval with the condition that there was heavy landscaping along I-95. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

4. Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – A proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan text and map component of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed map amendment would redesignate existing and proposed parks and recreation facilities as Park Land. The map amendment would also redesignate the former Fritter Park site from Park Land to Office. The proposed text amendment would update information regarding parks and recreation, and add a description for Park Land. Park Land use permits the development of active and passive recreation facilities and preservation of open space. Office use permits professional offices and low intensity commercial retail. **(Time Limit: October 16, 2007)**

Mrs. Baker presented the staff report. She stated the Board of Supervisors requested an amendment at the June 19, 2007 meeting because several existing and proposed parks were not currently designated as Park Land. She stated the amendment would update the Land Use Plan to reflect current and proposed parks. She stated the parks that would be updated were the Abel Lake Boat Ramp, Autumn Ridge Park, Courthouse Community Center, Rowser Complex, Smith Lake Park, Prince William Forest Park, Isaac Walton League Property and Little Falls Boat Ramp. She stated

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

the proposed parks that would be designated were the Chichester Property, Crow's Nest, Embrey Mill Site, Government Island, Musselman/Jones Property, Patawomeck Park, Stafford Recreational Soccer League Site, Vulcan Quarry Site, Widewater State Park, and North Stafford YMCA. She stated the Fritter Park site would be modified from Park Land to Office, as it was currently under development as the Quantico Corporate Center. She stated the text revision would include adding a description of Park Land. She stated the amendment would provide updated information and was consistent with the draft Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the schools were being used as parks.

Mrs. Baker stated there were schools sites that have recreational facilities, which were include in the text of the land use plan

Mrs. Kirby stated those fields were not available to the public. She stated she could visit Curtis Memorial Park anytime but that was not the case for the fields at Rock Hill Elementary.

Mrs. Baker stated the schools would still be designated institutional.

Mrs. Kirby stated Vulcan Quarry was not a public park.

Mrs. Baker stated it was proffered as a park site to the County. She stated when the property was rezoned; there was a portion that was designated as a park.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would object to the YMCA being a park.

Mr. Pitzel stated the Stafford Recreational Soccer League Site was a private organization.

Mrs. Baker stated that was correct. She stated currently the south Stafford YMCA was designated as Park Land.

Mr. Judy asked if that included the ball fields. He stated you do not have to be a member of the YMCA to use the fields.

Mrs. Baker stated the ball fields were no longer there.

Mr. Cook stated, in his opinion, the YMCA property was strictly private.

Mr. Judy stated the YMCA sits on property leased to them by the County.

Mr. Cook stated it was still not a public park.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing. With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Baker stated the Board requested the Planning Commission orchestrate the amendment and could make changes as the Commission sees fit.

Mrs. Kirby asked why this amendment was not included in the Comprehensive Plan.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

Mrs. Baker stated this amendment was requested at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Mitchell stated as the Planning Commission representative to the Parks and Recreation Commission he would like to make a motion for approval excluding the YMCA site for North Stafford. Mr. Di Peppe seconded.

Mrs. Kirby stated she was concerned that this was not part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would prefer to put Item 4 in committee.

Mrs. Kirby stated she would like to make a substitute motion. She stated she was concerned that the Commission had not seen the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and that the Comprehensive Plan was still being revised. Mr. Pitzel seconded.

Mr. Harvey stated the Board of Supervisors was concerned that the County had not kept Park Land current on the Land Use Map. He stated there could be some impacts in the CIP if there were parks which not have been fully identified.

Mr. Judy stated the Commission needed to vote on whether or not to bring the substitute motion to the floor.

Mr. Harvey stated there was a time limit of October 16, 2007.

Mrs. Kirby asked if it was essential to vote on this tonight.

Mr. Di Peppe stated if this land was not designated park land, than it might hurt the County in the future.

Mr. Cook stated the motion should be amended, with the condition that this becomes part of the new Comprehensive Plan.

The motion to bring the substitute motion forward was denied 3-3 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Mitchell stated he would amend his motion to state that the amendment would become a part of revised Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like the soccer league removed, as well as the YMCA.

Mr. Mitchell stated the soccer league was involved intently with Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Pitzel stated, in his opinion, the intent of the amendment was not to designate public park land, but park land in general.

Mr. Harvey stated the Land Use Map was being amended and this was how the County anticipated the land be used.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

Mr. Mitchell stated the Director of Parks and Recreation was in negotiations with Vulcan Quarry about a proffered park site. He stated the former Fritter Park site should be redesignated because it was being developed as a commercial entity.

The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

5. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-38, Performance Regulation, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-40. The amendment shall permit the increase of the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements for any building or structure by review and approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The amendment also corrects the location of the text for (h) Density regulations to follow its title. The current ordinance shows the text for Density regulations as additional paragraphs in (i) Exceptions for floor area ratio regulations.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the development of the property would be subject to standards for height, setbacks, landscaping and buffering, parking, open space and Floor Area Ratio (FAR). He stated the FAR was the total floor area of a building on a lot divided by the gross area of the lot. He stated Section 28-38 permitted an increase in FAR by the issuance of a CUP for hotels. He stated the proposed amendment would allow the same provisions for all buildings. He stated the issuance of the CUP does not allow for an increase in height or a decrease in the open space ratio. He stated the requirements of a CUP provides an opportunity for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to discuss, and make conditions for architectural elements, landscaping, screening, access, signs, or CPTED standards to ensure that a project is compatible with the surrounding community. He stated the proposed amendment does not limit the percentage of increase which could be granted by a CUP. He stated each application would be reviewed on its own merits. He stated the Board would establish FAR limits for each application based on the scale of proposals and potential community impacts. He stated staff recommends approval of O07-40.

Mrs. Kirby stated there was a reason to have the FAR and asked why the FAR no longer mattered.

Mr. Stepowany stated the FAR mattered which was why there was a provision to require a CUP for increase to the FAR. He stated in some cases the County may be required by House Bill 3202 to change the FAR.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing. With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

6. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance – Amendment to Section 28-25, Definitions of Specific Terms; Section 28-122, Certain Types [of signs] Prohibited in all Districts; Section 28-123, Types [of signs] Permitted in A-1 District; Section 28-124, Types [of signs] Permitted in A-, A-2 and R-1 Districts; Section 28-125, Types [of signs] Permitted in R-2, R-3 and R-4 Districts; Section 28-127, Types [of signs] Permitted in RC, SC, B-3 and RBC Districts; and, Section 28-135, Repair and Removal of Signs. Enact, Adopt and Ordain Section 28-136, Severability Clause; and, Section 28-137, Substitution Clause, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-46.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

Mr. Stepowany stated the Planning Commission had concerns about new technology being used on billboards. He stated the Commission prepared a Resolution to the Board of Supervisors and at the February 6, 2007 meeting the Board referred the request to the Planning Commission for a recommendation. He stated he met with Jim Barrett of VDOT, which does not classify a sign as non-conforming unless the County submits a request to VDOT to certify the Zoning Ordinance. He stated the County has since submitted a request to VDOT to certify the Zoning Ordinance to show that in the current Ordinance billboards or outdoor, general advertising signs were prohibited or limited in size in certain zoning districts. He stated VDOT requested additional amendments in the Ordinance. He stated in response to the letter from VDOT in certifying the Zoning Ordinance, the amendment defines model home signs and deletes the provisions for general advertising signs from the Agricultural and Residential Zoning Districts, making them prohibited in those zoning districts. He stated the amendment revises the definition of subdivision signs to permit a section of a subdivision to have its own sign as recommended by CPTED standards. He stated staff recommends approval of the Ordinance.

Mr. Judy stated there were some grammatical errors in the Ordinance. He addressed those errors to Mr. Stepowany and the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Kirby stated the RBC was not like any other zoning district and she would like it removed from the Ordinance.

Mr. Stepowany stated he understands the Recreational Business Community Zoning District, but staff feels that since it was a residential subdivision, that the RBC should be entitled to the same benefits as any other residential subdivision.

Mr. Cook stated Dell Webb was advertising that their development was in Fredericksburg, not Stafford.

Mr. Stepowany stated half of Stafford County has a Fredericksburg address.

Mrs. Carlone stated, in her opinion, it helps to have each section of a subdivision marked with a sign.

Mr. Stepowany stated the Ordinance amended the definition of subdivision sign under Section 28-25.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing. With no one coming forward the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval with the grammatical changes. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

7. Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Living Hope Lutheran Church - A request for review to determine compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Section 15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended, for the extension of public sewer service outside of the County's designated Urban Service Area, to Assessor's Parcel 28-117

Planning Commission Minutes

July 18, 2007

within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: August 7, 2007)(Deferred to September 19, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Cook stated Item 7 was deferred.

8. SUB2501506; Bridlewood Estates, Preliminary Subdivision Plan – A preliminary subdivision plan for 17 single family residential lots, zoned A-1, Agricultural, located on the west side of Hartwood Road approximately 2,500 feet north of Shackelford Well Road on Assessor's Parcel 35F-A, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 12, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Regular Meeting)**

Mr. Harvey stated staff believes the plan meets all requirements of the Code.

Mr. Pitzel asked about the white spot on the plan.

Mr. Harvey stated there was a telecommunication tower on the site.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the drainfields on lots 6 and 10 could be moved around.

Mr. Pitzel asked what a drainfield could not be used for.

Mrs. Carlone stated a homeowner could not build on it.

Mr. Judy asked what difference it made if the drainfield was in the front or the rear of the home. He stated there were many houses which have drainfields in the front yard.

Mrs. Carlone stated she would like the applicant to adjust the drainfield so there was more open space in the front yard.

Ahmed Hashish, DCS, stated he would attempt to shift the drainfields.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval with the adjustment of the drainfields on lot 6 and lot 10. Mrs. Kirby seconded.

Mr. Pitzel made a substitute motion to approve the plan as presented. Mr. Di Peppe seconded.

Mr. Cook asked for a vote on whether or not to bring the substitute motion forward. The motion passed 4-2 (Mrs. Carlone and Mr. Mitchell were opposed) (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Cook asked for a vote on the substitute motion. The motion passed 4-2 (Mrs. Carlone and Mr. Mitchell were opposed) (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

9. PAE2700372; Bennett Division, Private Access Easement – A private access easement to serve on lot located on the west side of New Hope Church Road between Rabbit Road and Camp Selden Road on Assessor's Parcel 55N-2, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mr. Pitzel seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

10. PAE2700373; Roundtree Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Belle Plains Road north of Newton Road on Assessor's Parcel 56-78, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Pitzel made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0. (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

11. PAE2700375; Kensington Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Storck Road south of Hartwood Road on Assessor's Parcel 25-34B, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0. (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

12. PAE2700377; Tacketts Mill Division, Private Access Easement – Two private access easements to serve one lot each located on the east side of Tacketts Mill Road at Walnut Ridge Drive Assessor's Parcel 8-15, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2007) (Deferred to July 18, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mr. Pitzel seconded. The motion passed 6-0. (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

NEW BUSINESS:

13. SUB2600625; Williams Subdivision, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 13 single family residential lots, zoned A-2, Rural Residential, consisting of 14.55 acres located on the north side of Enon Road approximately 1,500 feet west of Wyatt Lane on Assessor's Parcels 45-125 and 45-125B within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: February 28, 2007)(Deferred to September 5, 2007 Regular Meeting at the applicants request)**

Mr. Cook stated Item 13 was deferred.

14. SUB2700146; Waypointe, Revalidation, Preliminary Subidivision Plan - A revalidation of an approved preliminary subdivision plan for 6 single family residential lots, zoned A-1 consisting of 32.59 acres located on the north side of Warrenton Road approximately 1,800 feet west of Richland Road on Assessor's Parcel 25-23B within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: September 25, 2007)**

Mrs. Ennis presented the staff report. She stated the preliminary subdivision plan was reviewed at the March 28, 2007, Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting. She stated the Planning Commission previously approved this preliminary plan in October 2005. She stated the preliminary plan proposes 6 residential lots on well and septic. She stated access would be through a proposed state maintained road. She stated stormwater management would be maintained through bio-retention ponds. A conservation easement located at the rear of the property has been previously recorded and includes RPA and associated wetlands. She stated staff recommends approval.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

Mr. Pitzel asked if all the lots met the 5 to 1 lot ratio.

Mrs. Ennis stated all lots meet the 5 to 1 lot ratio.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

15. SUB2700091; Woodlands at Berea Section Two, Revalidation, Preliminary Subdivision Plan – A revalidation of an approved preliminary plan for 27 single family residential lots, zoned A-1 and A-2 consisting of 51.03 acres located on the north side of Sanford Road approximately 1,600 feet east of Greenbank Road on Assessor's Parcel 44-87A within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: October 15, 2007)**

Mr. Schultis presented the staff report. He stated the preliminary subdivision plan was reviewed at the February 28, 2007 TRC meeting. He stated the preliminary plan proposes 27 single-family dwellings on a parcel totaling 51.03 acres. He stated the site was zoned both A-1 and A-2 and septic and public water would serve all dwelling units. He stated all lots contained within the subdivision would have state road frontage. He stated the primary entrance would be off of State Route 670 (Sanford Road). He stated the secondary entrance was a connection from Woodlands at Berea Section One on Natchez Lane. He stated wetlands have been delineated at the northeast corner of the site and the proposal indicates that the wetlands would be preserved within the RPA. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the RPA was very close to lot 115.

Mrs. Kirby stated the homeowner would be able to use less than half the property on lot 116.

Mr. Di Peppe stated there would be little or no respect for the RPA.

Mr. Cook stated it looked like a drainfield, not RPA.

Mr. Schultis stated the applicant said he would comply with posting the RPA signs.

Mrs. Kirby stated she was concerned about the steep slopes.

Mr. Mitchell stated he thought “way” and “lane” were usually straight through streets.

Mr. Harvey stated the Zoning Ordinance did not establish a hierarchy for street names.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would like to see where the houses were going to be on the lot.

Mrs. Kirby stated there was no regulation requiring the houses be shown on the preliminary plan.

Larry Caruthers, ATCS, stated he was available to answer any questions.

Mrs. Kirby asked why the houses were not shown on the plan.

Mr. Caruthers stated the houses do meet the criteria required with the Ordinance.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

Mr. Schultis stated the houses would be shown on the construction plan.

Mr. Cook stated that was too late.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to put Item 15 in committee. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Cook stated Item 15 would be discussed at the September 5, 2007 Planning Commission Work Session.

Mr. Schultis asked if Items 16 and 17 could be presented together.

Mr. Cook stated that would be acceptable.

16. PAE2700339; Wirman Division, Private Access Easement – A private access easement to serve lots 1 and 2 of a minor subdivision located approximately 1,000 feet west of Joshua Road on the north side of Mountain View Road on Assessor's Parcel 18-17, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: October 15, 2007)**

17. PAE2700340; Wirman Division, Private Access Easement - A private access easement to serve lots 3 and 4 of a minor subdivision located approximately 1,000 feet west of Joshua Road on the north side of Mountain View Road on Assessor's Parcel 18-17, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: October 15, 2007)**

Mr. Schultis presented the staff report. He stated the size of parcel 18-17 was 10 acres zoned A-1, Agricultural. He stated the Private Access Easement (PAE) would serve 2 lots. He stated the PAE was 750 feet in length and 10 feet in width. He stated the second PAE would serve two lots. He stated the size of the parcel was 37.15 acres and was zoned A-1, Agricultural. He stated the PAE was approximately 890 feet in length and approximately 50 feet in width. He stated both PAE's meet the County regulations and staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Carlone stated she could not approve the plan right now.

Mr. Pitzel stated on the first PAE there was a very sharp turn and he asked if the PAE meets the turn radius requirements.

Mr. Schultis stated when the minor subdivision plat was submitted the PAE could be on the property line as long as there was a note on the plan saying it would serve only those two lots. He stated there was a 20 foot buffer between the property line and the PAE.

Mr. Pitzel stated the incursion depth was 70 feet.

Mr. Schultis stated yes.

Mr. Pitzel stated the property owners had 60 feet to manage.

Mr. Schultis stated if the PAE goes along the property line the incursion would be to whatever width it was built to. He stated if the requests for the PAE's were approved than the PAE could be

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

made as wide as it was on the plat. He stated the PAE's did not have to abide by that width on the final plat.

Mr. Pitzel stated if a 50 foot easement was granted to someone, than you can't take 20 feet away from them.

Mr. Harvey stated the diagram was drawn to demonstrate which lots were being served. He stated when the plat comes in the PAE would be set on the property line.

Mr. Cook stated the PAE to serve lots 1 and 2 looked like it was serving lots 4 and 5.

Mrs. Kirby stated, in her opinion, this looked liked a way to circumvent the Minor Subdivision Ordinance.

Mr. Cook stated he thought a minor subdivision required a road.

Mr. Harvey stated a minor subdivision was five lots or less and did not require public improvements.

Mrs. Kirby stated the five lots were all one subdivision which was being split up to create PAE's.

Mr. Harvey stated in this particular case it was presented as two different subdivision plats for the future.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to put Item 16 in committee. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to put Item 17 in committee. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Cook stated both items would be discussed at the September 5, 2007 Planning Commission Work Session.

Mr. Schultis asked if Items 18 and 19 could be presented together.

Mr. Cook stated that would be acceptable.

18. PAE2700443; Bourne-McKinney Division, Private Access Easement – A private access easement to serve one lot of a proposed minor subdivision located approximately 1,800 feet northeast of Camp Selden Road on the southeast side of New Hope Church Road on the northwest corner of the parcel adjoining Assessor's Parcel 47-70 on Assessor's Parcel 55N-5, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: October 15, 2007)**
19. PAE2700444; Bourne-McKinney Division, Private Access Easement - A private access easement to serve one lot of a proposed minor subdivision located approximately 1,800 feet northeast of Camp Selden Road on the southeast side of New Hope Church Road Approximately 400 feet northeast of the front corner of the subject parcel at 55N-4 on

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

Assessor's Parcel 55N-5, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: October 15, 2007)**

Mr. Schultis presented the staff report. He stated the size of parcel 55N-5 was 113 acres zoned A-1, Agricultural. He stated the PAE's would serve two lots each and were 995 feet in length and 20 feet in width. He stated the PAE's meets County regulations and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Pitzel made a motion for approval of Item 18. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Pitzel made a motion for approval of Item 19. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Discussion of Items 16 and 17

Mr. Harvey stated the applicant for Item 16 and 17 indicated to him there was some information not presented in the staff report.

Andrew Hicks stated lot 4 was for his family, lot 5 was for the Allen family, and lot 2 was proposed to the Naser family. He stated lots 1 and 3 were already existing properties with houses on them. He stated the proposed subdivision was for lots 2, 4, and 5. He stated the PAE going through lot 4 was for his property and the Allen's. He stated the second PAE was proposed for the Naser family.

Mr. Cook stated the home on lot 1 did not show up on the plan.

Mr. Hicks stated lot 1 already had a driveway.

Mrs. Kirby stated it was still a subdivision and should be treated as such.

Mr. Judy stated 5 lots or less qualifies as a minor subdivision.

Mr. Pitzel asked if lots 1 and 3 were separate lots.

Mr. Judy stated the applicant indicated that lots 1 and 3 were pre-existing.

Mr. Cook stated lots 1 and 3 were already platted lots.

Mrs. Kirby stated they were not shown as platted lots.

Mr. Harvey stated the plan did show the current property subject to these proposals exists as three parcels.

Mr. Judy stated lots 1 and 3 already existed as separate tax-map parcels. He stated the only parcels being subdivided were 2, 4, and 5.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to reconsider Items 16 and 17. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007*

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval of Item 16. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval of Item 17. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

MINUTES

May 16, 2007 Work Session

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 4-0-1 (Mr. Pitzel abstained) (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

May 16, 2007 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 4-0-1 (Mr. Pitzel abstained) (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

June 6, 2007 Work Session

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

June 6, 2007 Regular Meeting

Mr. Pitzel stated on Page 6 the sentence should read "Mr. Judy stated that language was already in the Ordinance exempting these lights." He stated at the bottom of Page 6 the word should be "surface", not "service". He stated on Page 9 it should read Living Hope Lutheran Church, not Ling Hop Lutheran Church.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval with changes. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

June 20, 2007 Work Session

Mr. Pitzel stated on Page 6 the top sentence should be switched with the second sentence.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval with changes. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

June 20, 2007 Regular Meeting

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated the Comprehensive Plan summary minutes would be included in the next mail out. He stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting a Comprehensive Plan Compliance review was referred to the Planning Commission for a telecommunication tower for the Public Safety Building.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to hold a public hearing on the telecommunication tower. Mr. Mitchell second. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

Mr. Cook stated the Public Hearing would be held on August 15, 2007.

Mr. Harvey stated there was a resolution sent to the Planning Commission regarding naming sections of the roads in Carter's Crossing to South Gateway Drive. He stated the Board requested the Planning Commission take into account House Bill 3202 regulations as they apply to Urban Transportation Service Districts and urban development area. He stated the Board of Supervisors approved the TND Ordinance but referred 4 items back to the Planning Commission. He stated Living Hope Lutheran Church had an application in front of the Board for pump and haul which was deferred to the August meeting. He stated the Board was continuing discussion to its next meeting regarding the mandatory connection requirement for water and sewer. He stated there were several subdivisions which have lost vesting or minor subdivisions that are in the Urban Service Area and are required to connect to public water and sewer but for various reasons it was cost prohibitive, in those particular cases, to utilize water and sewer from the applicant's perspective.

Mr. Di Peppe stated Mr. Schwartz was going to request that the County ask the General Assembly for permission to regulate Recreational Vehicles (RV's) parked on public streets.

Mr. Judy stated there was a list of items and after a vote to determine which items were sent forward, the Board of Supervisors had four top choices and RV's were not one of the choices.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if that meant RV's would not go forward.

Mr. Judy stated the list would still go forward.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Judy stated he had nothing further to report.

SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

No report

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Pitzel stated there was a Comprehensive Plan meeting on July 16, 2007. He stated the Commission discussed some of the Land Use items and parts of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the next meeting date was August 13, 2007, the day after the Board Chambers renovations were to be completed.

Mr. Cook stated the meeting would be moved to August 20, 2007.

Mr. Pitzel stated he may not be able to make the work session on August 15, 2007 due to a work engagement.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for a public hearing with the Planning Commission for Ordinance 007-66 to amend Sections 28-35 and table 3.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to modify the lot coverage percentage requirements in the A-1 and A-2 Zoning District. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for a public hearing with the Planning Commission for Ordinance 007-58 to amend Sections 22-5 and 22-176 of the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Rhodes was absent).

CONSENT AGENDA

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2007

None

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

No report

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

No report

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for adjournment. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 p.m.

DRAFT