

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
August 15, 2007

The work session of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, August 15, 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, Rhodes, and Di Peppe

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Baker, Judy, Zuraf, Stepowany, Schulte, Schultis and Gregori

Declarations of Disqualification

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

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 Centerport Parkway within the Hartwood Election District. The Urban Commercial designation would allow development of commercial retail and office uses. **(Time Limit: October 16, 2007)(Deferred to the August 15, 2007 Work Session)**

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. **(Time Limit: September 18, 2007) (Deferred to the August 15, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Zuraf stated there was a proffer change regarding access. He stated Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) would not break access on Centreport Parkway. He stated the applicant proposed access off of the Mine Road extension.

Frank Cox, The Cox Company, stated their view of access to the site was altered. He stated, in his opinion, this should be a dominate gateway property at the interchange and the Mine Road extension was essential to the development of the area. He stated there was a new plan for development of the property and the revised proffers incorporated comments from the Planning Commission. He stated there would be changes to the master plan, with access off of the Mine Road extension. He stated they

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

August 15, 2007

had looked at different architectural styles and were committed to the design being a condition of zoning approval.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the recharge area of the aquifer runs through this section of the County and asked if it would be possible to get pervious materials for the pedestrian trails.

Mr. Cox stated the project was creating a site with high Economic Development potential. He stated parking garages would reduce the concrete area and there was the possibility of a water amenity on site if it passed the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). He stated, in his opinion, the best way to recharge groundwater was to slow the water down.

Mr. Di Peppe stated it was important to pay attention to recharge of the aquifer.

Mr. Cox stated they could commit to pervious pavement for trails, but not the parking lot.

Mrs. Kirby asked about the status of the Phase 1 Study.

Mr. Cox stated a copy was transmitted to staff.

Mrs. Kirby asked that 5 copies of the finished study be sent to Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Pitzel asked about a possible pedestrian walkway under Centreport Parkway.

Mr. Cox stated there was not a pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Pitzel stated, in his opinion, the two properties should have a pedestrian connection or they would be very remote.

Mr. Cox stated the synergy between the two lots was lost because access was not granted off of Centreport Parkway.

Mr. Pitzel stated people would walk a quarter of a mile. He stated the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) would need to be completely redone.

Mr. Cox stated it was important to have the Planning Commissions input and the traffic generation would not be changing.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the applicant had spoken with the adjacent parcel owner.

Mr. Cox stated he was unsure if the applicant had spoken with Mr. Melrod.

Mrs. Carlone stated once the other projects start coming into Centreport Parkway the traffic density would increase.

Mr. Cox stated it would be economically impossible to do a bridge over Centreport Parkway. He stated, in his opinion, the money would be better spent for the County on the Mine Road extension.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

August 15, 2007

Mrs. Carlone stated there are two streams which need to be looked at a little more closely. She stated the Planning Commission needed the architectural designs.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to keep Items 1 and 2 in committee. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Cook stated Items 1 and 2 would be discussed at the September 5, 2007 Work Session.

PRESENTATION:

Aquia Town Center

Ed Wisner, RAMCO Gershenson, stated there was a public forum in April to discuss the redevelopment of Aquia Town Center. He stated the site would be ground up development and redevelopment. He stated the site today was 36 acres with 300,000 square feet of single story retail, including a cinema at the rear of the site. He stated the intent was to demolish the whole site and redevelop which would then have 700,000 square feet of office space and 120,000 square feet of office over retail. He stated there would be a 60,000 square foot cinema. He stated they hoped to have the site open by spring 2009. He stated there was a large team including Brown, Craig, Turner Architects, Leming & Healy, Bowman Consulting, and Joe Besieger with RAMCO.

Bryce Turner, Brown, Craig, Turner Architects, stated the project was not just about the buildings, but everything around the development. He stated there would be 2 office buildings, state of the art cinema to anchor the development, retailers, and a feature restaurant around which the town square would be located. He stated the office building sits at the end of the street. He stated they were taking more traditional designs into consideration and there would be a lot of brick in the sidewalks, lamppost, and awnings to create a pedestrian friendly community. He stated there would be curved, arched tops to windows. He stated the site was continuing to evolve as they work with retailers and office tenants.

Mrs. Carlone asked how much acreage was in the Fairfax Town Center.

Mr. Turner stated it was 50 acres, all on grade with parking structures to be added.

Mrs. Carlone asked where the parking would be for the Aquia Town Center.

Mr. Turner stated they were currently studying three parking structures.

Mr. Pitzel stated the parking Mr. Turner showed on the slides was multi-level.

Mr. Turner stated yes.

Mr. Pitzel stated, in his opinion, they may want to consider making sure the cinema owner was THX certified.

Mr. Turner stated that was a great idea.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

August 15, 2007

Mrs. Kirby asked if they had met with the current tenants.

Mr. Wisner stated people within RAMCO Gershenson had met with all the tenants, most personally or by phone and letters.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he was very excited about the integrated design. He stated the site was located in the middle of the recharge area for the aquifer.

Mr. Wisner stated there would be a major analysis into the recharge area and they would like to do some environmental friendly designs.

Mr. Turner stated every time they create a main street project there was the discussion of angle parking versus parallel parking. He stated, in his opinion, he preferred angle parking because there was a lot more parking area. He stated parallel parking on busy streets was not easy. He stated parallel parking keeps the buildings closer together and the street was not as wide. He stated they were trying to provide as much surface parking as possible.

Mr. Di Peppe stated when he was visiting a grocery store in Beauford, South Carolina and the parking lot was landscaped with a large amount of shrubbery. He stated a small amount of attention can enhance the overall project.

Mr. Turner stated the bar was getting higher and they certainly want the site to be state of the art.

Mr. Cook thanked Mr. Wisner and Mr. Turner for their presentation.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE:

Lifecare/Retirement Zoning District

Mr. Stepowany stated he had looked at certain items in the Zoning Ordinance as they pertain to a lifecare facility. He stated there was a section in the revised Lifecare Zoning District which would require a special exception for employee dwellings for watchmen, caretakers, and various other employees. He stated a transitional buffer would surround the entire community. He stated in Section 28.127 there were restrictions for signs. He stated there would be loading and parking requirements.

Mrs. Kirby asked how many dwelling units would be allowed.

Mr. Stepowany stated the number of employee dwellings was subject to a special exception or Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Pitzel thanked Mr. Stepowany for including employee dwellings in the Ordinance.

Mr. Stepowany stated the current applicant did not want employee dwellings on site.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about the buildings being 75 feet in height.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

August 15, 2007

Mr. Stepowany stated he discussed the issue with Andrew Milliken of Fire and Rescue Services and it was determined that the higher the height of a building the more strict the building regulations. He stated taller buildings were preferred because they are safer buildings.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about evacuation of the buildings. She asked if a church group could have a place of worship on the site.

Mr. Stepowany stated hospitals can have chapels. He stated places of worship would be an accessory use.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to set Lifecare/Retirement Zoning Districts for public hearing. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 15, 2007

The regular meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, August 15, 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, Rhodes, and Di Peppe

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Judy, Baker, Zuraf, Schulte, Gregori, Stepowany, Schultis, and Woolfenden,

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATIONS:

None

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

Marie Gausey stated there has been a lot of construction with the new Public Safety Building, the Lutheran Church, and shopping center, but she did not see a connection between the parking lot at the Administration Building and the Public Safety Building. She stated there were proposed sidewalks along Courthouse Road but, in her opinion, they would be demolished for Route 630 widening. She stated, in her opinion, there should be a pedestrian pathway so that people working in the Administration Building could walk to the Public Safety Building, shopping center, and possibly their homes. She stated she was a 20 year resident of Stafford County and green space should be preserved. She stated she hoped the Planning Commission would make good decisions.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Stafford Town Station – A proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan map component of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment would redesignate Assessor's Parcel's 38-29, 38-29A, 38-121, 38-121A, 38-122, 38-122A and 38-124 from Light Industrial, Rural Residential, and Resource Protection to Urban Commercial, Urban Residential, and Resource Protection Land Use and extend the Urban Services Area to comprise the above referenced parcels. The proposed amendment would be for the purpose of developing a P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development. (**Time Limit: November 13, 2007**)

Mr. Zuraf presented the staff report. He stated there would be 1,740 homes, 750,000 square feet of commercial, active and passive recreation, civic spaces, elementary school, and a library. He stated the site was surrounded by Urban Commercial, Light Industrial, Rural Residential, and Resource Protection Zoning Districts. He stated there was a power line easement through the middle of the site and the adjacent uses were an airport, landfill, correctional facility, industrial park, and a salvage yard. He stated by-right there could be 200,000 square feet of commercial space or 145 dwelling units under the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District. He stated the preliminary plan was approved in 2005. He stated the Comprehensive Plan revision was still in review but the Urban Services Area would need to be expanded. He stated commercial would be suitable for the site but residential may not be appropriate because of the industrial surrounding. He stated there were conflicting uses with the landfill, airport, and correctional facility. He stated the Resource Protection Area (RPA) should incorporate the steep slopes and floodplains. He stated the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) was within 3 miles of the site. He stated the current land use would

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

generate less traffic. He stated a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was submitted and comments have not been received from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). He stated there was inadequate water and sewer and the proposed land use would create a greater demand on utilities. He stated the site was in the school service area of Falmouth Elementary, Drew Middle, and Brook Point. He stated the development would add 1,364 students to the school system. He stated there would be an increased demand on Parks and Recreation but the proposal included amenities. He stated 23 archaeological sites were found and there was the ability to preserve resources. He stated the Potomac Creek and Accokeek Creek water sheds, wetlands, floodplain, RPA, and steep slopes were located on site. He stated the site was located within the approach path of the airport with a 60 to 55 decibel noise contour and schools should be avoided in this area. He stated there would be a new concentrated population area. He stated staff does not fully support the request.

2. RC2700296; Reclassification - Stafford Town Station - A proposed reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District and B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District to P-TND, Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development Zoning District on Assessor's Parcels 38-29, 38-29A, 38-121, 38-121A, 38-122, 38-122A and 38-124 consisting of 562.58 acres, located on the east side of Jefferson Davis Highway approximately 300 feet south of American Legion Road and along Eskimo Hill Road within the Aquia Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Light Industrial use which would allow a variety of industrial manufacturing and office uses. The Rural Residential designation would allow development of three (3) acre lots for single family residential use. The Resource Protection designation would require stream protection buffers along all streams that exhibit perennial flow characteristics. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a complete listing of permitted uses in the P-TND Zoning District. **(Time Limit: November 13, 2007)**

Mrs. Woolfenden presented the staff report. She stated the rezoning was subject to Planned Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) requirements. She stated the TND would have four transect zones; T-1, all RPA with no residential uses, T-4 with the most civic uses, T-5 mixed use and higher density, and SDC which would consist of commercial development. She stated the TND provides mixed use housing with varied prices. She stated there could be age restricted housing and work force housing. She stated the proposed development would have slug lanes, bus routes, and pedestrian trails. She stated the applicant proffered road improvements and completed TIA recommendations. She stated there would be retaining walls for the RPA with a 10 foot setback. She stated there would be 40 percent open space with a 100 foot buffer adjacent to the landfill. She stated a Phase III Study would be conducted. She stated there would be parks and recreation amenities and a library was recommended by staff. She stated all utility upgrades were proffered. She stated the applicant proffered to sprinkle all attached homes or homes that were 5 feet or less in distance and there would be a cash proffer towards a fire station. She stated the airport recommended there be no large congregation of people. She stated the development would create a mixed use, walk able community with 200 units of affordable housing and positive economic development. She stated staff had not received final comments from VDOT and the airport. She stated the project was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Rob Gollahon, applicant Stafford Town Station, stated he had been working on a preliminary plan for 15 months, than in January staff asked if the project could be a TND. He stated there had been a

*Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007*

couple work sessions to discuss the project. He stated 9 consulting firms, with 35 people, had worked very hard to meet all the deadlines.

At this point, a movie about Stafford Town Station was shown to the Commission and the public.

Clark Leming, Leming and Healy, stated, in his opinion, this application was the most significant and innovative within the past 10 years. He stated the site was close to Interstate-95 and the VRE. He stated this project was a good way to draw development away from the concentrated areas of the north and south. He stated, in his opinion, the County would benefit significantly from this type of development and the content of the application was very important, it contains any number of features and they have tried to incorporate all ideas and requests. He stated there would be workforce housing and a retirement community with neighborhood commercial. He stated the overall density would be 3.2 units per acre with substantial open space. He stated there would be substantial improvements to Route 1, a shuttle bus service, slug lines, and trails. He stated there were 54 million dollars in cash proffers. He stated the Airport Commission did not think there should be a school site but no part of the development would violate FAA regulations. He stated the school would be built within accordance to the design standards. He stated there would not be a library site with the school. He stated there were proffers with the landfill to erect a chain link fence and sufficient buffering. He stated the water and sewer improvements were proffered, as well as the transportation improvements.

Debrarae Karnes, Leming & Healy, stated workforce housing would serve a valuable need in Stafford County. She stated the units would be sold, not rented. She stated the carriage houses would be built at affordable costs. She stated the neighborhood design standards would provide community assurance. She stated she would like to thank Sara Woolfenden, Jamie Stepowany, and Mike Zuraf for their hard work.

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing.

Jim McMath, Stafford Citizens for a Sustainable Future, stated this was the first rezoning under the new TND Ordinance. He stated the Comprehensive Plan revision was not finalized, the TND was referred back to the Planning Commission for revision, and there had not been an independent fiscal impact review of how Stafford Town Station would affect the County. He stated the purpose of long range planning was to decide in advance how the County should grow, so land use decisions such as rezoning, could be directed and the TND Ordinance not being a part of the Comprehensive Plan defeats the purpose. He stated ruling on the Stafford Town Station as a TND before finalizing the TND Ordinance in a way which conforms to the Comprehensive Plan reverses the planning process. He asked what the fiscal impact would be to the County. He stated he was concerned about the long range cost effects of long term development projects. He stated, in his opinion, a developer would not pay for a negative report.

Suzanne Guslois stated, in her opinion, the Commission should approve the project. She stated the County was moving in the right direction. She stated the local government would benefit from commercial establishments, mixed housing, and compact areas. She stated the location would draw residents. She stated the airport was progressing in usage. She stated traffic would be pooled from within the community.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Gloria Swerchek stated she was in favor of the project. She stated, in her opinion, it would get development away from Route 610 and provide affordable housing.

Ray Manning stated a lot of his friends were teachers and firefighters and he was in favor of the project because of the affordable housing.

James McCain stated he was a paid firefighter and he supported the project because of affordable housing. He stated, in his opinion, the hospital and the jobs coming to Quantico would create a need for housing.

David Winkler stated the utilities were proffered and, in his opinion, the project should go forward.

Gary Clark stated, in his opinion, the project was a good idea. He stated the VRE and I-95 were nearby. He stated the proffers would help the police and fire departments and he thought it was a good project.

Bill Gallahan stated he was a 76 year resident of Stafford County. He stated he was not against the development and it looked like a top notch community. He stated he would like to live in the community because he was very impressed with the project and the Planning Commission should approve it.

Robert Varmot stated he could not wait for the development to be built. He stated he travels to do his banking and grocery shopping. He stated, in his opinion, the Commission should approve the project. He stated the development was business friendly.

Nan Rollison, Friends of Stafford Creeks, stated the forest protect the creeks, absorb carbon monoxide, and provide oxygen. She stated local government has the ability to affect climate change by conserving natural and agricultural resources. She stated the proposal for Stafford Town Station does have some positive merits, but also could do some damage to the environment. She stated waterways which lead to the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay were public resources. She stated the County should find a way to move development off the slopes, which would help reduce damage to the creeks, reduce acreage of land disturbance at one time to prevent run off, do not clear cut acreage, conserve mature trees, and consider reviewing the interior open space areas. She stated as incentive give the developer flexibility to move units and buildings around to compensate for saving the streams, slope, and stream valleys. She stated, in her opinion, Item B, advance payment proffers, needed to be strengthened.

L. C. Taylor stated the site has remained the same for 50 years. He stated he applauded the developer for offering us a town. He stated, in his opinion, Stafford County needed employment because citizens were commuting to Washington D.C. and the Commission should approve the project.

Amy Farmer stated she would like to see a neighborhood development. She stated, in her opinion, the Planning Commission should approve the project.

Clay Mihonides stated Stafford County was situated between the nation's capital and the state capital, making a high demand for housing in this area. He stated the project was planning accordingly for growth and he was in favor of it.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Gary Michael stated he was an adjacent property owner to the site. He stated, in his opinion, the project would help commercial development and give Route 1 a face lift. He stated he supported the project.

Trista Moon stated she supported the Stafford Town Station development. She stated a TND would provide a sense of community. She stated as a former educator it was difficult to find a place to live. She stated the developer had considered the elderly, young, and families.

Amonda Moon stated when she lived in California young people could not afford homes. She stated in a community like Stafford Town Station you could see mothers and children walking and being neighbors. She stated, in her opinion, a TND would be a really terrific place to live.

Cecilia Kirkman stated she had to travel the roads which would be impacted by Stafford Town Station. She stated, in her opinion, the public hearing was premature because the required information was not available to the public, specifically the VDOT review. She stated Section 15.2-22222.1 had to do with the coordination of state and local transportation planning and had very specific and detailed requirements regarding the traffic impacts of Comprehensive Plan Amendments and rezoning. She stated Chapter 155 was 42 pages of regulations which dictate how Traffic Impact Analysis' have to be done. She stated the VDOT response was not received by staff. She stated she could not get the application online. She stated the trip generation in the Stafford Town Station Impact Analysis assumes 1,740 residential units and the proposed zoning classification allows up to 5, 625 residential units. She stated there was no study of Courthouse Road. She stated in the TIA used \$1.60 as the price per gallon of gas and if the engineers of the report thought that was the correct price of gas, than what else did they get wrong.

Alane Callander stated, in her opinion, the Planning Commission should not pass the Stafford Town Station development. She stated staff had pointed out a number of concerns. She stated when the Embrey Mill development came through, there were wonderful ideas, but they fell through. She stated the plans for the proposed development were enormous and the developer would have to pull a lot together to make it work. She stated, in her opinion, if the County had to go through all this to get affordable housing, than something was wrong. She asked why there should be housing at this site when the landfill does not have a liner. She stated there would have to be monitors in homes to measure the gas levels. She stated there were concerns about trash blowing from the landfill and off of trucks and in her opinion, this was a terrible area to be putting so many residential units. She stated light industrial and commercial were appropriate for this area. She stated she believed in the TND and knew the area needs it, but not at this location. She asked what the hurry was. She stated, in her opinion, something was going on and there were a lot of cash proffers. She stated, in her opinion, the County should do what is right for the citizens.

Paul Perkins stated he was in the construction field for 20 years and in his opinion the community would be good for everyone.

Jo Knight stated she was impressed with the plan. She stated although it was not a cure all, it would provide an option for building. She stated there would be road improvements, it was near the interchange, and it would bring young and old together. She stated, in her opinion, Stafford County was going to grow.

*Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007*

John Nagosky stated, in his opinion, affordable housing and smart growth were needed. He stated the location was bad and needed more thought. He stated, in his opinion, the Commission needed to consider the fiscal impact and the central aquifer which runs through the middle of Stafford County. He stated the TND was not appropriate at this site.

Cindy Null stated she was in support of the development.

Barney Rummels stated he was against the project. He stated the development needed to be thought out and there should not be a rush. He stated he lived next to many ecological areas and would hate to see pollution and run-off.

Guy Montgomery stated, in his opinion, this was the perfect type of neighborhood for growth. He stated he works next to a TND and always gets a community feel when he goes there.

With no one coming forward the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for committee and to hold a special meeting. Mrs. Kirby seconded.

Mr. Judy asked if the motion included Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Mitchell amended his motion to include Items 1 and 2. Mrs. Kirby amended her second. The motion passed 7-0.

3. Index of Official Road Names – Amend the Addressing Ordinance as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Current Road name</u>	<u>New Road Name</u>
At the intersection with Warrenton Road and from a point 1,000 feet northwest of Warrenton Road to its terminus	Stanstead Road	South Gateway Drive
From a point 10,000 feet northwest of Warrenton Road to Falls Run Drive	Auction Drive	South Gateway Drive
From Falls Run Drive to the eastern terminus of Tomorrow Street	Unnamed	South Gateway Drive
From the eastern terminus of Tomorrow Street to Plantation Drive	Tomorrow Street	South Gateway Drive

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the Planning Commission recommended approval to rename portions of Stanstead Road to Auction Drive. He stated the Board of Supervisors approved Resolution R07-306 to refer a request to name and rename several portions of

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

streets to South Gateway Drive, including Stanstead Road, Auction Drive and Tomorrow Street. He stated staff recommended the street names be changed creating a uniform street name. He stated this uniformity would benefit the public and visitors to the area to readily define their destinations and location within the County. He stated the use of South Gateway Drive would memorialize the redevelopment efforts for this area of Warrenton Road.

Mr. Pitzel asked what the street was currently named.

Mr. Stepowany stated Stanstead Road, Auction Drive, and Tomorrow Street. He stated the recommended approval was to name the new area and the remaining portion Auction Drive.

Mr. Pitzel asked how many businesses would be affected by the change.

Mr. Stepowany stated the original plan would affect an auto repair shop south of the Auto Auction. He stated the McDonald's and the truck wash would remain Stanstead Drive. He stated the recommendation from the Board of Supervisors would require the repair shop and the Auto Auction to change their addresses.

Mrs. Carlone stated there were problems using the prefix north, south, east, and west. She stated, her opinion, the street should remain Auction Drive.

Mrs. Kirby stated the Auto Auction had been located at this site for about 7 years and was a national business.

Mr. Di Peppe asked why the whole street could not be named Auction Drive. He stated a lot of people from outside the County go to the Auto Auction and help direct people looking for the business to name it Auction Drive.

Mr. Stepowany stated this was the south gateway entrance to the County and reflects future plans for the County.

Mr. Mitchell stated he could not support this issue. He stated the Auto Auction had purchase orders, business cards, and other documentation printed in mass and would have to reprint everything.

Mr. Cook asked how many change of address letters would have to be sent out.

Mr. Stepowany stated there were 3,400 employees at the Auto Auction. He stated there would have to be changes to human resources documentation, insurance forms, and more. He stated he spoke with VDOT and no matter which road name was approved; the street sign would have arrows directing people.

Mr. Cook opened the Public Hearing.

Tom Marino, Fredericksburg Auto Auction, stated they had just celebrated their 50th Anniversary in the business as part of the Manheim chain and moved to Stafford County in May of 2001. He stated the Auto Auction had 606 employees and 50% were part-time. He stated 302 of the employees lived in the County. He stated they pay an average of 237,000 dollars per year in taxes to the County. He stated it was very prestigious for the Auction's address to reflect the business it performs. He stated

*Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007*

the Auction assist the Sheriff's Department in setting up and performing their reaccreditations. He stated the 606 employees were very proud of their workplace and were concerned about the address change. He stated the Auto Auction was a national business which was owned by Cox Enterprises and the amount of money it would cost to change everything would be astronomical. He asked the Commission to keep the address as Auction Drive.

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

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for denial. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to reaffirm the Planning Commission's recommendation for Auction Drive. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

4. Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Public Safety Building - 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 Stafford County to erect a telecommunication facility onto the property of the Stafford County Public Safety Building, located on Courthouse Road, approximately 1,000 feet west of Jefferson Davis Highway in the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: October 8, 2007)**

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the request was to put a 125 foot mono-pole at the Public Safety Building with two microwaves on the top. He stated the Public Safety building was 40 feet tall. He stated the system had 700 megahertz. He stated there would be no transmissions sent from the tower, but the tower would send signals to other towers in the County, which would then be transmitted to emergency vehicles.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the structure could be placed across Route 630.

Mr. Stepowany stated the cost and expense for the fiber optics to another facility was too great. He stated the structure meets the setbacks of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated it was a facility the County needed to operate the 700 megahertz emergency system.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) report would be completed before the site plan.

Mr. Stepowany stated a Cultural Resource Consultant would complete the report before the site plan. He stated they would have to get a crane or a balloon test.

Mrs. Kirby asked about the time frame.

Mr. Stepowany stated it was a matter of how soon the emergency services needed to be up and running. He stated it would take a month for the SHPO report.

Mrs. Kirby asked what if the emergency services needed to be up in less than a month.

Mr. Stepowany stated emergency services knew the SHPO report had to be completed prior to erecting the structure.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing. With no one coming forward the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

5. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-35, Table of Uses and Standards; and Table 3.1., District Uses and Standards, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-41. The amendment requires the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit for an industrial school in the M-2, Heavy Industrial, zoning district.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the Ordinance was approved by the Planning Commission on May 2, 2007, but the motion needed to be clarified. He stated staff recommends approval.

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 7-0.

6. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-35, Table of Uses and Standards; and Table 3.1., District Uses and Standards, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-42. The amendment requires the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit for commercial apartments in the B-1, Convenience Commercial; B-2, Urban Commercial; B-3, Office; and, SC, Suburban Commercial, zoning districts.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the Ordinance was approved by the Planning Commission on May 2, 2007, but the motion needed to be clarified. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing. With no one coming forward the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

7. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance – Amendment to Sections 28-35, Table of Uses and Standards; and Table 3.1., District Uses and Standards, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-66. The amendment requires a minimum open space ratio of fifty (50) percent in the A-1, Agricultural and A-2, Rural Residential zoning districts for public works, cemeteries, clubs, lodges, fraternal organizations, schools, and places of worship, which is a proposed reduction from the current requirement of 80 percent open space. **(Time Limit: September 4, 2007)**

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the request was to modify the open space requirement in the Agricultural Zoning Districts. He stated currently all uses in the Agricultural districts cannot exceed an open space ratio of 80 percent unless a Special Exception has been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Carlone asked who made the recommendation to reduce the open space. She stated this would take away green space.

Mr. Stepowany stated it was a Board resolution.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Mr. Pitzel asked if there was a definition for each item in the Ordinance.

Mr. Stepowany stated there was not a definition for clubs, lodges, fraternal organizations, and places of worships.

Mr. Pitzel stated he had problems with the statement that all these, in all cases, provide a positive civic and community value. He stated he would have to be against the Ordinance as written.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he agreed with Mr. Pitzel.

Mr. Mitchell stated he disagreed with Mr. Di Peppe and Mr. Pitzel. He stated the Ordinance reads “they may request a Special Exception” and it may not be granted.

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing.

Thomas Cropp stated he agreed with Mr. Di Peppe, Mr. Pitzel, and Mrs. Carlone. He stated he was concerned about cemeteries and reducing open space.

With no one else coming forward, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for denial. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion for denial passed 6-1 (Mr. Mitchell was opposed).

8. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-295, Zoning Administrator, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O07-43. The amendment states the following: There shall be a zoning administrator who shall have the powers and duties granted to him/her by the Code of Virginia and such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him/her by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe asked what were “other powers and duties”.

Mr. Stepowany stated in the Zoning Ordinance there were certain items which could be waived or appealed by the agent, either the Zoning Administrator or the Director of Planning and Zoning.

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 7-0.

9. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance - Amendments to Section 22-5, Family and Minor Subdivisions; and Section 22-176, Private Access Easement, of the Subdivision Ordinance, pursuant to O07-58. The amendment shall require all lots including lots in a family subdivision and less than five (5) acres to be served by private ingress/egress easement at least twenty (20) feet wide, clear of any structures and vegetation. Lots being served by a Private Access Easement (PAE) five (5) acres or larger shall be served by an ingress/egress easement at least fifty (50) feet wide, clear of any structures and vegetation. The amendment limits a minor subdivision to no more than one (1) PAE per parent parcel.

*Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007*

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on June 20, 2007. He stated the Ordinance would limit the number of PAE's in a Minor Subdivision to one. He stated staff realized the advertisement did not include the provision for Section 22-176.

Mr. Pitzel stated this Ordinance was needed.

Mr. Di Peppe stated this Ordinance would help address a very serious safety issue.

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing.

Raymond Loving stated he was opposed to the Ordinance. He stated, in his opinion, the future of his kids and the monetary costs were why he opposed the Ordinance. He stated Loving Lane was only 150 to 200 feet long and if he intends to give his kids a piece of property and they have to make it 50 feet wide clear of vegetation. He stated, in his opinion, it was unfair and making a big financial impact.

Thomas Cropp stated he was opposed to the Ordinance. He stated, in his opinion, the state roads in Hartwood were not 50 feet wide clear of vegetation. He stated, in his opinion that would cause too much grading to remove the trees and vegetation. He stated one PAE on a parent tract was not good. He stated there were circumstances which may require more than one PAE either because of the contour of the land or streams. He stated, in his opinion, the message he got from the Ordinance was the County did not want people creating minor subdivisions and family subdivisions, but to sell all the land to developers.

With no one else coming forward, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe thought the easement would only have to be 20 feet wide.

Mr. Stepowany stated the PAE would have to be 50 feet for lots greater than 5 acres. He stated if it was less than 5 acres, the PAE only had to be 20 feet wide.

Mr. Rhodes asked if currently the Ordinance states the PAE had to be 50 feet clear of structure and vegetation.

Mr. Stepowany stated as the Ordinance reads now there was no instruction on how many feet have to be clear of vegetation.

Mr. Cook stated he agreed with Mr. Cropp. He stated, in his opinion, Hartwood Road was less than 50 feet wide.

Mr. Stepowany asked if there could be a clarification that 20 feet had to be clear of structures or vegetation.

Mr. Judy stated the 50 feet easement was put in the Ordinance in consideration of the potential that more houses may be put on the lots which may make it a neighborhood which required a public right of way. He stated the language following the 50 feet easement was the problem.

Mr. Stepowany stated the 20 feet needed to be cleared for emergency access.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Mr. Judy stated there should be a provision that reads notwithstanding the width of the easement there should be at least 20 feet.

Mrs. Kirby stated, in her opinion, there were still problems with Ordinance.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to put Item 9 in committee. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

10. CUP2600905; Conditional Use Permit - Holiday Inn Express - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a hotel within the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcels 45-18 and 45- 22, consisting of 2.86 acres, located on the east side of McLane Drive approximately 100 feet north of Warrenton Road within the Falmouth Election District. (**Time Limit: November 13, 2007**)

Mr. Schultis presented the staff report. He stated the site was a mix of wooded and open spaces. He stated a perennial stream exists along the back of the property. He stated the GDP proposed a 5-story, 114-room hotel occupying 72,655 square feet. He stated primary access would be through the extension of Jones Lane from Warrenton Road to the subject property. He stated the ITE Trip Generation Manual estimates traffic generation of 710 vehicles per day during a weekday. He stated there have been discussions of improving Route 17 from a six lane facility to an eight lane facility. The traffic study includes analysis for both scenarios and concludes that the proposed hotel use has minimal impact to the projected traffic operations in the study area. He stated the hotel was compatible with established commercial development pattern and zoning, meets the intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plans and the standards for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. He stated staff recommends approval of the application as submitted and staff recommends the conditions as specified in resolution R07-347.

Mrs. Kirby asked if there was an existing hotel located there now.

Mr. Schultis stated yes and the majority of the existing Holiday Inn would remain. He stated one of the buildings, which was part of the old Holiday Inn, would be raised to make room for the new hotel.

Mr. Pitzel stated there was no way the approval of this CUP could be tied to removing the parking area for the current Holiday Inn from the RPA.

Mr. Schultis stated the Commission could not require the removal of existing structures in the RPA.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about the three entrances onto Route 17. She asked if one of the entrances could be blocked off.

Clark Leming, Leming and Healy, stated the hotel was constructed in 1973 and there was not a 100 foot buffer requirement for the RPA at that time. He stated the parking lot was 15 feet into the RPA. He stated this would be an updated version of the Holiday Inn concept. He stated the new hotel would be Holiday Inn Express and the old hotel would change entities. He stated the right turn Mrs. Carlone was concerned about would actually be located on the old hotel site.

Mrs. Carlone stated she would like to see the connection removed.

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Mr. Leming stated the new hotel would primarily use the Jones Lane access point.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to see the inter-parcel connection remain.

Mrs. Kirby asked if the hotel was brick and stucco.

Mr. Leming stated yes.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the hotels would be connected in any way.

Mr. Leming stated no, the old hotel would become a Clarion Hotel.

Mr. Cook opened the public hearing. With no one coming forward, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

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

Mr. Cook stated he received a letter from the applicant requesting to withdraw the application.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to accept the request to withdraw the application. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

12. 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)(Deferred to the August 15, 2007 Work Session)**

13. 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

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses in the B-2 Zoning District. **(Time Limit: September 18, 2007) (Deferred to the August 15, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to out items 12 and 13 in committee. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

14. 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)(Deferred to September 5, 2007 Work Session)**

Mr. Cook stated Item 14 was deferred to September 5, 2007.

NEW BUSINESS:

15. 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 15 was deferred to September 5, 2007.

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

16. Woodstream Waiver Request – Request of waiver of Section 22-143, Shape, of the Subdivision Ordinance for Woodstream Subdivision on Assessor's 21-8F and 21N-1, consisting of 142 acres located on the east side of Staffordboro Boulevard approximately 1,900 feet north of Garrisonville Road within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: November 13, 2007)**
17. SUB2700288; Woodstream Subdivision, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A modification to a previously approved preliminary subdivision plan for 27 additional townhouse units for a total of 86 lots and relocation of the recreation center, zoned R-2 and R-4, consisting of 142 acres located on the east side of Staffordboro Boulevard approximately 1,900 feet north of Garrisonville Road on Assessor's Parcels 21-8F and 21N-1 within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: November 13, 2007)**

Mr. Schultis presented the staff report. He stated the request was for 32 proposed lots in Section 4. He stated the site was vested to the 1978 Zoning Ordinance which required 40 feet setbacks from public streets and the current setbacks were 8 feet in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated the Subdivision Ordinance was not vested to 1978 and they would have to meet the current setback which required a 25 feet setback from the rear property line. He stated when both setbacks were applied; they end up with a 6.2:1 lot depth ratio. He stated the waiver request would allow for 10

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

feet more in length. He stated the extra; length would allow for extra features such as bay windows, patios, and the 120 feet would allow for the 1978 zoning setbacks. He stated staff recommends approval of the waiver request. He stated the preliminary subdivision plan was for effected 86 lots in Section 4 and adding 27 lots. He stated the lots would be served by public water and sewer and the main access would be off of Woodstream Boulevard and Short Branch Road. He stated the amenities included a pool house, aquatic facility, and tot lot. He stated staff recommends approval of the preliminary plan.

Mr. Pitzel asked if this was the subdivision that had the road width problem.

Mr. Schultis stated he was not aware of any issue but he was new to the project.

Mrs. Kirby stated the applicant wanted all the good parts of being vested in 1978 but do not want to give up anything from the new Ordinance.

Mr. Mitchell stated he met with staff and the applicant. He made a motion for approval of Item 16. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mrs. Kirby was opposed).

Mr. Mitchell made a motion for approval of Item 17. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 5-2 (Mrs. Kirby and Mrs. Carlone were opposed).

18. SPR2700030; Celebrate Virginia Lowe's Shopping Center, Preliminary Site Plan – A preliminary site plan for the construction of two, one-story buildings with a total of 201,110 square feet, on Assessor's Parcel 44-76, 76C, 98A, 99, 101A, 101C, and 103A, zoned B-2 consisting of approximately 50 acres located on the south side of McWhirt Loop approximately 200 feet south of Warrenton Road within the Hartwood Election District.
(Time Limit: October 21, 2007)

Mrs. Baker stated the applicant requested to defer Item 18.

MINUTES

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mrs. Baker stated she would like to remind the Planning Commission about the August 20, 2007 Comprehensive Plan meeting and the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) Special Meeting on September 12, 2007.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

No report

SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

No report

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning Commission Minutes
August 15, 2007

Mr. Pitzel stated the Comprehensive Plan meeting was scheduled for August 20, 2007.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would be making a presentation on affordable housing at the Comprehensive Plan meeting. He made a motion for approval for a public hearing with the Planning Commission for an ordinance to amend Sections 28-33, 28-34, 28-35, 28-39, Table 7.1, and 28-127 of the Zoning Ordinance. He stated the amendment establishes a Life Car/Retirement Community Zoning District. He stated the Planning Commission finds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice requires the governing body to consider an ordinance to amend the regulations. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

No report

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

No report

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for adjournment. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:12 p.m.