

***STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
JUNE 21, 2006***

The work session of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, June 21, 2006, was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chamber of the County Administrative Center.

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Harvey, Roberts, Stepowany, Zuraf, and DeBord

Declarations of Disqualification

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. RC2501263; Reclassification – Westlake - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions of Assessor's Parcels 35-20, 20A, 21, 23, 24, 27(portion), 27A, 27B, 28, 28B, 30A, 31, 32A and 43-55 (portion), 59, 59A, 59B, 59C, 59D and 59E, zoned R-2, Urban Residential-Medium Density, R-1, Suburban Residential, M-1, Light Industrial, A-1, Agricultural and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts, consisting of 1,116.52 acres located on the south side of Warrenton Road, west of Holly Corner Road and along Cedar Grove Road within the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Light Industrial, Suburban Residential, Urban Commercial, Agricultural and Institutional uses. The Light Industrial designation would allow light industrial, light manufacturing and office uses. The Suburban Residential designation would allow residential development at a maximum density of three dwelling units per acre. The Agricultural designation would allow development at a density of one dwelling unit per three acres. The Institutional designation would allow hospitals, schools and public buildings. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses. **(Deferred to June 21, 2006 Work Session) (Time Limit: July 4, 2006)**

Clark Leming, representing the applicant, stated the issue was relocating the school site and getting approval from the School Board staff. He stated an additional proffer which references a pedestrian path includes an overpass or underpass.

Mr. Cook stated the underpass needed to be removed from the proffers.

Mr. Cook asked Scott Horan to speak on behalf of Stafford County Schools.

Scott Horan, representing Stafford County Schools, stated they look for flexibility with the size of the site because the School Board does not know what type or size school would be needed in the future. He stated the traffic issue was always a concern no matter where the site was located.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

June 21, 2006

Mrs. Carlone stated the property was zoned M1 and B2, and there was heavy truck traffic on the road. She stated the issue was whether to have a school site near the industrial location, the overpass would not eliminate the truck traffic. She stated in her opinion this was not an appropriate school site.

Mrs. Kirby stated her concern was Stafford County schools being built on major thorough fares.

Mr. Di Peppe stated there were stream issues with the new site.

Mr. Leming stated there was an existing farm pond on the new school site.

Mr. Di Peppe stated there should be some kind of dedicated lane with a buffer to separate the buses from the trucks.

Mr. Leming stated they would need Virginia Department of Transportation approval, as well as county approval. He stated the applicant was willing to say dedicate a bus lane.

Mrs. Carlone stated there was nothing concrete to say it was going to be a 2 lane or 4 lane road, or if it was going to be divided to keep trucks in their lane. She stated any school official who was not aware of traffic should not have voted on this.

Mr. Leming stated the applicant proffered to bring water and sewer to the site.

Mrs. Kirby said water and sewer would be at the site before the first Occupancy Permit was granted.

Mr. Cook stated the traffic would be there anyway and he finds it hard to go against the School Board.

Mr. Rhodes made a motion to approve the modification to the proffer amendment. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 5-2 (Mrs. Kirby and Mrs. Carlone voted no).

2. RC2501275; Reclassification – Staffordshire - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions of portions of Assessor's Parcels 36-66 and 37-5, 6, 9 and 10, zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, consisting of 260 acres located on Hulls Chapel Road approximately 1,200 feet north of Lakebreeze Way within the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Rural Residential use. Rural Residential use permits single family residential development at a density of one dwelling unit per three acres. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses. **(Deferred to June 21, 2006 Work Session) (Time Limit: July 4, 2006)**

Clark Leming, representing the applicant, stated the plan was to improve Moorwood Lane from Hulls Chapel Road to the Centreport properties and build a new road across Centreport to Mountain View Road. He stated the right of way was currently available and the road was a separate tax map parcel. He stated Mr. Ward, the applicant, was willing to reconstruct

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

June 21, 2006

Moorwood Lane and the road across Centreport contingent on two items. He stated a great deal of the right of way along Moorwood was controlled by Stafford County; he would want assurances the right of way would be made available to the applicant. He stated the second issue with Centreport was the right of way on the county plan was dedicated and the applicant would need an agreement that the access way would be added to the Stafford County master road plan. He stated the County would have to make available the land it controls so Moorwood could be widened and the counties master road plan would need to be amended to show the route across the Centreport.

Mrs. Kirby asked the width of Moorewood Lane.

Mr. Leming stated the road was fifty-feet wide but narrows near the reservoir. He stated the road would diagonally cross parcel 31F.

Mrs. Carlone asked what would happen to the two homes near the location of the proposed road.

Mr. Leming stated the two homes would not be impacted, we would use the existing right of way. He stated the right of way was sufficient so they would not need to take any land. He stated the applicant was trying to improve the access issue, to make the development more attractive and reduce environmental impacts on Abel Lake.

Mrs. Carlone stated the golf course could be leased out for someone to construct.

Mrs. Kirby asked about the cash proffers.

Mr. Leming stated the County was saving by not having the golf course and preserving the open space around Abel Lake.

Mr. Ward stated the environment was preserved by deleting the golf course.

Mrs. Carlone stated the second access point at Fire Trail Lane would need a lot of work. She asked the applicant if he spoke with the owners on Fire Trail Lane.

Mr. Ward stated he spoke with three or four owners.

Mr. Leming stated the interest in Fire Trail Lane was for use as an emergency access.

Mr. Rhodes asked about the situation with Truslow Road.

Larry Cruthers, Engineer for the project, stated the Truslow Road connection would have impacts on the community, streams, and environment. He stated he was concerned about acquisitioning the right of way.

Mr. Cook stated there was a right of way dedicated for a by-pass but he was told the project was cost prohibited.

Planning Commission Minutes

Work Session

June 21, 2006

Mr. Ward stated there was too much traffic on Truslow.

Mr. Rhodes stated Moorwood Lane would be a single entrance if there was no access from Wateredge. He stated he was concerned if Hulls Chapel Road and Moorwood Lane were blocked, there would be no alternative route into the development.

Mr. Leming stated in the current proffer the first one hundred and sixty homes would be accessed by Hulls Chapel Road. He stated the proffers addressed the golf course and now more issues were brought up. He stated the applicant was trying to focus on the golf course.

Mrs. Carlone stated the properties would be three-tenths to eight-tenths of an acre based on the golf course being built. She stated the county will not benefit, at least not monetarily.

Mr. Cook stated the time limit for Staffordshire was July 4, 2006.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to deny the proffer amendment request. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mr. Pitzel voted no).

Mr. Pitzel stated the connection to Wateredge stays.

Mr. Zuraf stated the preliminary plan does not show a connection to Wateredge, if that connection was to be added the preliminary plan would need to be amended.

Mr. Ward asked if they could move forward with the approved Preliminary Plan from 2004.

Mr. Harvey stated assuming the Preliminary Plan was vested the applicant could move forward as approved in 2004.

PRESENTATION – The Friends of Stafford Civil War Sites

Glen Trimmer gave a presentation on behalf of The Friends of Stafford Civil War Sites (FSCWS). He stated timely information was needed to preserve sites before development. He stated the focus of FSCWS was on recognizable physical features. He stated no one knew about Redoubt 3 and the developer would have preserved the site if they had known the site existed. He stated there are twenty-one sites not located on county maps and there were four significant civil war fortifications in the area. He stated the county owns the property but did not know the fortifications were there. He stated there was a recent surveying taking place at the site. He stated one of the three sites in the county database was misidentified and was added to the National Register of Historical Sites. He stated the county needs an official index on electronic files. He stated the GPS coordinates for any site should be on file. He stated the issue with the Phase 1 Ordinance was accuracy and in his opinion requires more study.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Planning Commission Minutes
Work Session
June 21, 2006

William Cook
Chairman

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JUNE 21, 2006

The regular meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, June 21, 2006, was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman William Cook in the Board of Supervisors Chamber of the Stafford County Administration Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Roberts, Stepowany, Sehl, and DeBord

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. CUP2600310; Conditional Use Permit – Den Rich Road Telecommunication Tower – A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Communication Facility within an existing Dominion Virginia Power transmission tower in an A-2, Rural Residential Zoning District on a portion of Assessor's Parcel 22-19L, consisting of 1.319 acres, located on the east side of Den Rich Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of Telegraph Road within the Widewater Election District.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report and stated the Comprehensive Plan recommends co-locating on existing towers. He stated there was an existing access road off of Den Rich Road and there was adequate screening from nearby residences. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if the county would derive any revenue from a telecommunication tower.

Mr. Stepowany stated the land was private property.

After a discussion between the Commission and Mr. Stepowany concerning the height of the tower, the number of antennas, maintenance of the site and the distance to existing dwellings, the applicant came forward to speak.

Greg Tulley, representing the applicant, stated the design of the antenna offers the most structural support.

Mr. Pitzel stated the propagation chart does not show much service to the east.

Mr. Tulley stated Nextel was required to use existing structures for co-location.

Mr. Pitzel asked if Nextel would be willing to provide space on the ground for Stafford County.

Mr. Tulley stated Nextel currently has two leases, a tower lease with VEPCO and a parcel lease with the property owner.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006***

After a discussion between the Commission and Mr. Tulley concerning ground space for the County, lightening rods, birds perching on the equipment, tax revenue, and the design on an existing VEPCO tower, the Public Hearing was opened.

With no one coming forward to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion for approval. Mr. Pitzel seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

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

<u>Location</u>	<u>Current Road name</u>	<u>New Road Name</u>
North side of Montague Loop 1800 feet east of westernmost intersection with Eskimo Hill Road	No Name	Millers Crossing Lane

Mr. Sehl presented the staff report. He stated the staff recommends approval for emergency purposes.

Mr. Pitzel asked if apostrophes were allowed in addresses.

Mr. Harvey stated apostrophes were not permitted in street addressing.

The Public Hearing was opened.

With no one coming forward to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

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

3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-273, Nonconforming structures, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O06-58. The amendment authorizes the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant a special exception to enlarge or alter a nonconforming residential building.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He gave a brief description of the proposed ordinance and stated the staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if older homes would have a buffer if there was an existing Resource Protection Area.

Mr. Stepowany stated the buffer requirements were for new lots.

Mr. Harvey stated expanding a structure could not encroach into a restricted area.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006***

The Public Hearing was opened.

Douglas Gross stated he was affected by this Ordinance. He stated the Ordinance was well intended but he was penalized by paying three-hundred dollars and delayed for two months while waiting for approval. He stated if he was doing new construction the approval would not be need.

Reesa Schindel stated she was turned down by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). She suggested those turned down should be exempted from having to reapply with the BZA.

With no one else to speak the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if there was a way to waive the fee.

Mr. Harvey stated the Board of Supervisors (BOS) would need to take action for a refund to be granted.

Mr. Mitchell asked what if a citizen wanted to add another level to a structure.

Mr. Harvey stated the BZA would determine if the design was within the character of the neighborhood and appropriate for the site.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the citizen would need to present a hardship to receive approval.

Mr. Harvey stated no.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion for approval. Mrs. Carlone seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mr. Mitchell voted no).

4. Amendments to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-25, Definition of Specific Terms, and Section 28-39, Special Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to O06-59. The amendment defines amateur radio service and allows an amateur radio service to be permitted by-right at any location licensed by the federal government, whether stationary or mobile. Permanent structures associated with an amateur radio service shall be in compliance with all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for an accessory structure for the zoning district in which the structure is located.

Mr. Stepowany presented the staff report. He stated Amateur Radio Towers would be by-right in any zoning district. He stated the tower would be regulated by any setbacks for accessory structures in the designated zone. He stated towers would be exempt from height control and they would need a building permit. He stated staff recommends approval.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if there was an average height for towers.

Mrs. Kirby stated most towers do not exceed one hundred feet.

Mr. Mitchell stated an amateur radio tower would have to comply with the same zoning requirements zoning as a telecommunication tower.

Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006

Mr. Stepowany stated the Zoning Ordinance does not define amateur radio service and therefore does not determine compliance.

Mrs. Kirby stated this was not a telecommunication tower.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was concerned about height requirement not being enforced.

Mr. Stepowany stated the setback requirements are based on the size of the lot.

Mr. Pitzel stated the applicant would have to get an FCC license to operate an amateur radio.

The Public Hearing was opened.

George Marsloff, representing the Stafford Amateur Radio Association, stated the FCC does not permit towers above two hundred feet. He stated his amateur radio license stated the location of the tower was at his residence, but what if someone had a vacation home. He stated the tower would have to meet setback requirements but the Ordinance stated the tower would have to meet all requirements. He stated the screening requirements would affect amateur radio towers.

Kurt Bartholomew, representing the Volunteer Emergency Communicators for Stafford County, stated the organization supports the amendment.

Tom Gregory stated in his opinion the language needed to be revised. He stated when he applied to have a tower he was told no permit was required. He stated he had back up power to communicate with other towers during emergencies. He stated he was the State Emergency Coordinator and he supports passing the ordinance.

John Humphrey, President of Fredericksburg Amateur Radio Club, stated he was concerned about the language in the amendment. He stated there was no commercial interest for amateur radio operators. He stated he provided support to the county during the hurricane.

With no one else to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Di Peppe stated he would be willing to sit down with the amateur radio operators and the county attorney to revise the language.

Mrs. Kirby stated she was concerned about putting the amendment off even longer. She stated if the Planning Commission passed the amendment tonight the language could be revised at a later date.

Mr. Cook stated the amendments to the language would be discussed at the July 19, 2006 Work Session.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion approve. Mr. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

*Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006*

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

5. RC2501259; Reclassification – Widewater Heights - A proposed reclassification from R-4, Manufactured Home Zoning District to B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Assessor's Parcel 13-37 consisting of 12.18 acres, located on the south side of Telegraph Road approximately 1,000 feet east of Jefferson Davis Highway within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Urban Commercial and Light Industrial uses. The Urban Commercial designation would allow development of commercial retail and office uses and the Light Industrial designation would allow light industrial, light manufacturing and office uses. **(Deferred to July 19, 2006 Regular Meeting at applicant's request)**

Mr. Cook stated item 5 was deferred to July 19, 2006.

6. SUB2501328; Ellison Estates Section 2, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 7 single family residential lots, zoned A-2, consisting of 9.97 acres, located at the north end of proposed Ellison Court and approximately 1,100 feet west of Jefferson Davis Highway and 1,300 feet north of American Legion Road on Assessor's Parcel 38-45H, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: May 24, 2006) (Deferred to June 21, 2006 Regular Meeting at applicant's request)**

Mr. Cook stated the Planning Commission received a letter requesting an additional thirty day on Item 6. He stated Ellison Estates would be heard at the July 19, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting.

7. RC2501489; Reclassification – Stafford Lakes, Parcel 44-56 - A request for a Reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Assessor's Parcel 44-56, consisting of 0.33 acres, located on the south side of Warrenton Road approximately 200 feet east of Village Parkway in the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Urban Commercial Use. The Urban Commercial designation would allow development of commercial, retail and office uses. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses. **(Deferred to July 19, 2006 at applicant's request) (Time Limit: July 4, 2006)**

Mr. Cook stated item was deferred to July 19, 2006 at the applicant's request.

8. RC2501263; Reclassification – Westlake - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions of Assessor's Parcels 35-20, 20A, 21, 23, 24, 27(portion), 27A, 27B, 28, 28B, 30A, 31, 32A and 43-55 (portion), 59, 59A, 59B, 59C, 59D and 59E, zoned R-2, Urban Residential-Medium Density, R-1, Suburban Residential, M-1, Light Industrial, A-1, Agricultural and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts, consisting of 1,116.52 acres located on the south side of Warrenton Road, west of Holly Corner Road and along Cedar Grove Road within the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Light Industrial, Suburban Residential, Urban Commercial, Agricultural and Institutional uses. The Light Industrial designation would allow light

Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006

industrial, light manufacturing and office uses. The Suburban Residential designation would allow residential development at a maximum density of three dwelling units per acre. The Agricultural designation would allow development at a density of one dwelling unit per three acres. The Institutional designation would allow hospitals, schools and public buildings. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses. **(Deferred to June 21, 2006 Work Session) (Time Limit: July 4, 2006)**

Mr. Harvey stated the applicant removed the word underpass from the proffers.

Mrs. Carlone asked if they addressed the wire fencing with the overpass.

Mr. Harvey stated the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) requirements would determine the design of the overpass.

Clark Leming, representing the applicant, stated they were bound by the standards of VDOT and Stafford County. He stated if the Planning Commission would like the wire fencing proffered he could act on it and provide the revised proffer to the Planning Department staff the following day.

Mr. Cook stated the overpass would be constructed according to VDOT standards and county requirements.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to accept the proffers. Mr. Rhodes second. The motion passed 6-1 (Mrs. Kirby voted no).

Mr. Harvey stated the Planning Commission still needed to vote on approval of the application.

Mrs. Carlone made a motion for approval. Mr. Rhodes seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mrs. Kirby voted no).

9. RC2501275; Reclassification – Staffordshire - A proposed amendment to proffered conditions of portions of Assessor's Parcels 36-66 and 37-5, 6, 9 and 10, zoned R-1, Suburban Residential, consisting of 260 acres located on Hulls Chapel Road approximately 1,200 feet north of Lakebreeze Way within the Hartwood Election District. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Rural Residential use. Rural Residential use permits single family residential development at a density of one dwelling unit per three acres. See Section 28-35 of the Zoning Ordinance for a full listing of permitted uses. **(Deferred to June 21, 2006 Work Session) (Time Limit: July 4, 2006)**

Mrs. Carlone made a motion to deny. Mrs. Kirby seconded. The motion passed 6-1 (Mr. Pitzel voted no).

10. SUB 2501169; River Creek, Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 41 single family residential lots, zoned A-1, consisting of 261.91 acres, located on the south side of Kings Highway approximately 1,000 feet east of Hollywood Farm

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006***

Road on Assessor's Parcels 60-90 and 60-91, within the George Washington Election District.) **(Deferred to June 21, 2006 Regular Meeting) (Time Limit: June 30, 2006)**

Mr. Sehl stated the homes were moved one hundred feet from the Resource Protection Area (RPA).

Mrs. Kirby stated there was an agreement to do a Phase II survey on the site.

Clark Leming, representing the applicant, stated the Phase II was offered beyond the requirements of the Ordinance contingent on the Planning Commission acting at the last meeting.

Mrs. Kirby stated the Planning Commission asked the applicant to do a Phase II on the sites.

Mr. Leming stated his assumption was the Planning Commission would act at the last meeting.

Mrs. Kirby stated Mr. Johnson agreed to do a Phase II.

Mr. Leming stated the applicant amended the plans to address the 35 foot setback.

Mr. Johnson, applicant, stated anything agreed to at the previous Planning Commission meeting was based on an action being taken for approval. He stated the subdivision was planned for 41 lots on 260 acres, providing a lot of green areas.

Mr. Cook stated the cultural resources of Stafford County should be protected.

Mr. Johnson stated he has owned property since 1947 and willing to do whatever to help the Planning Commission but in his opinion it was not necessary to do a Phase II and it would be very expensive.

Mr. Di Peppe asked if a compromise could be reached.

Mrs. Kirby stated there was Indian, colonial, and civil war sites on the property. She stated metal detectors could not pick up stones and arrow heads.

Mr. Leming stated the Phase II would be conducted in areas that would be disturbed.

Mr. Pitzel stated his concern about denying the plan on the basis of a Phase II without an Ordinance in place.

Mrs. Roberts stated the plan could not be denied on the basis of a Phase II.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the applicant should invite the Friends of Stafford Civil War Sites to provide a thorough delineation of the property.

Mr. Leming stated the applicant would agree to that.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the RPA setbacks would protect the cultural resources along the river.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006***

Mr. Cook stated the proposal by Mr. Di Peppe was a good idea.

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

NEW BUSINESS

None

MINUTES

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated the Utilities Commission requested a joint Public Hearing for August 2, 2006 concerning the Drainfield Ordinance. He stated there would be two public hearings on provisions for drainfields and the subdivision ordinances for drainfields. He stated the Board of Supervisors passed 12 of the 14 Ordinances presented. He stated action was deferred on the Cemetery Ordinance and the Phase I Ordinance. He stated the Board sent Forbes Landing rezoning back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the Board was putting together some committees and he would like to be on.

Mrs. Kirby asked why the Board did not pass the Cemetery Ordinance.

Mr. Harvey stated there were concerns about the depth of the buffer and maintenance. He stated Mr. Cook sent a letter to the Board recommending Mr. Di Peppe for the committee.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

No Report

SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

No Report

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Pitzel stated the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for June 26, 2006 at 6 p.m. in the Activities Room. He stated on July 17, 2006 at 5:30 there would be a Visioning Session for the Planning Commission. He stated there would be a Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting a 7:30 on July 17, 2006. He stated the survey was due back on July 16, 2006 and they have received 128 of 660 sent to the citizens of Stafford County. He stated the focus groups would be meeting in July.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the Ordinance Committee was waiting on information for the Reservoir Overlay District. He stated the Utilities Commission was working on the wording of the Reservoir Overlay District.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 21, 2006***

Mr. Pitzel stated the three focus groups were Business and Economic Development, Circulation and Transportation, and Environmental and Recreational.

CONSENT AGENDA

11. Authorize a Public Hearing for the Following:

- ❖ Sec. 22-106. Vacation of boundary lines - The boundary lines of any lot or parcel of land platted under the requirements of this chapter may be relocated or otherwise altered as provided under section 22-44. Such action, however, shall not involve the vacation, relocation or alteration of streets, alleys, easements for public passage or other public areas, nor the creation of additional building lots. No such areas shall be relocated or altered without the express consent of all persons holding any interest therein, as stipulated in sections ~~15.1-481~~ 15.2-2271 and ~~15.1-482~~ 15.2-2272 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended).

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to authorize a Public Hearing. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

- ❖ Sec. 28-351. Grant of special exceptions - (c) No special exception shall be granted, except after notice and hearings provided in section ~~15.1-431~~ 15.2-2204 of the Code of Virginia.

Mrs. Kirby made a motion to authorize a Public Hearing. Mr. Di Peppe seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Cook said he was forming a special committee concerning adult businesses. He asked Mr. Mitchell and Mrs. Kirby to serve on the committee. He stated Captain Moyer would be on the committee as well as the Deputy Commonwealth Attorney. He stated Mrs. Roberts would be the legal advisor. He stated the first meeting of the committee would be at the July 19, 2006 Work Session.

Mr. Pitzel stated he would like to be notified of all meetings concerning adult businesses.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey asked Mr. Cook to consider the Utilities Commission request for a joint public hearing on August 2, 2006.

Mr. Cook stated a joint Public Hearing would take place on August 2, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

William Cook
Chairman