

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
February 24, 2021

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, February 24, 2021, was called to order at 4:30 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center and at remote locations throughout the County.

Mr. Apicella: I have a statement to read, before we get started, today's meeting will be held using a video conferencing service, even though a quorum of the Planning Commission is present in the Board Chambers today. At this time, the County's closure has been extended through the end of February, and the Government Center will reopen on March 1st. Residents can still access all County services by phone, online, and in some cases by appointment during this closure. Unfortunately, this means that the public cannot attend today's meeting in person. I want you to know that we take this situation very seriously. For that reason, we have decided to defer any public hearings that may be deemed as controversial and do not intend to take up those items until in-person comments can begin again. Residents are able to submit comments online, up to the close of business on the day prior to our meetings. I assure you, that the Commission reads all of these comments and they will be read aloud during the meeting and added to the public record. For anyone who wishes to submit written comments, please send them to the email address listed on the Planning Commission's website, PC-PublicComments@staffordcountyva.gov. You may also call the Department of Planning and Zoning with any questions. My fellow Commissioners, I request that Mr. McPherson, Mr. Cummings and I be authorized to participate today from a remote location here in Stafford, and would ask for the Commission to approve our electronic participation by a motion.

Mr. Randall: So moved.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you gentlemen. Just do a quick voice vote. Everybody in favor say aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. Randall: Aye.

Mr. Bain: Aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. McPherson: Aye.

Mr. Cummings: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Two more points to make, a vote on motions will be conducted by voice votes and if we have any technical issues Mr. Randall will take over as Chairman.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella (virtual), Barton Randall, Fillmore McPherson (virtual), Albert Bain, Kristen Barnes, Dexter Cummings (virtual), Darrell English

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Brian Geouge (virtual), Joseph Valotta (virtual), Kathy Baker (virtual)

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualification on any agenda item? Alright, any changes to the agenda? Alright, seeing none, I'll open the Public Presentations portion of today's meeting. The purpose of Public Presentations is to allow members of the community to comment on any item except those scheduled for a public hearing today. There will be a separate comment period for each of those public hearing items as they are considered. Mr. Harvey, did we receive any written comments?

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Harvey: No sir, we did not.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. I do believe we have a presentation tonight Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: That's correct Mr. Chairman. We have a presentation on Projected Growth and Anticipated Stafford County Public School Seats Needs. And tonight we have with us Lionel White and John Anderson from the School Board staff, and also attending remotely will be Holly Hazard, School Board Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Great, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And I'll turn it over to Mr. White.

Projected Growth and Anticipated SCPC Seats Needs

Mr. White: Good afternoon Chairman Apicella, Chairman Hazard, members of the County Planning Commission. I'm Lionel White, Supervisor of Planning and GIS with Stafford County Public Schools. Also in attendance is Mr. John Anderson; he's our Executive Director for Facilities and Maintenance. Tonight we are going to share with you a presentation where we are going to shed light on projected growth and its impact on future seat needs of the School Division. And I'd like to start by looking at the past. So, this slide here which we're looking at K-12 enrollment over the last decade. One thing to note is that from 2010 through 2019, there was a 10% increase in student enrollment, and that comes up to approximately 2,700 students over that 9 year period. Also, you'll note in the slide that in 2020, due to COVID-19, we saw a 1.9% decrease in enrollment. One thing that's also important to note here is that I had conversations with school planners here in Virginia, and as well across the country, and we're all sort of in agreement that this COVID year is an anomaly year and that things will change in the long term. Next slide please. Okay, so now, this slide, we're looking at the present. This is enrollment data as of September 30, 2020, and an important column on this slide is the enrollment difference. And in that column, we compare what was enrollment in 2019 pre-COVID versus enrollment in 2020? And sort of big picture we see at the division level, we lost 569 students year over year. However, if we look a little deeper, you'll notice that at the elementary level, there was a loss of 718 students, which is significant. At the middle school level, we lost 56 students. And at the high school level, we actually gained 199 students. So, it's important to note that enrollment varied depending on the age of the child and the student. Next slide please. So, now we're looking into the future. This is our projected K-12 enrollment over the next decade. The fall 2020 projections suggest an increase of 5,800+ students over the next 10 years. And the projection clearly shows that the housing market and all of those factors are still in a... in a growth mode. Next slide please. Speaking of housing market, I have some statistics to share with you. Um, there are some housing indicators that we look at; housing starts, home sales, and then the average days on the market. If you look at that last column difference, what we've done is

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

we've looked at housing data from March to September 2019, which I like to call before COVID, and then the same data for March to September 2020, after COVID. And with that difference, we see that there were 8 more home starts and 318 more homes sales after COVID. Which is interesting, because one might think things would slow down. It's been the exact opposite and many of you know this that live in the County. If a home comes on the market, it's gone quick and it's selling at the asking price or higher. Also, notice that average days on the market; 16 less days on the market. That's pretty significant. So, we're in a really hot market right now. Next slide please. So, that combined with the fact that we work with, of course, the County, Jeff Harvey's team, to acquire residential housing data. And what we have here is a map that shows residential development projects as of February 1, 2020, and we see that there were 88 active residential projects in the County totaling 6,526 vacant lots. And, just to give you a little more detail about those lots, 88% of them were single-family detached homes, 10% were townhomes, and 2% were multi-family units. It's important to note that if you look at this map, it's not just in one place. It's scattered all over the County. So, when people say, oh, well you're growing, we're growing everywhere! Another thing I'd like to point out, this data shows us that 98% of these units, if you add that 88 single-family and 10% townhomes, those are single-family homes. And we know from our data, single-family homes give us the highest student yields. So, this is very important to note and this sort of plays into why our projections are that we're growing in the future. Next slide please. So, here we're going to take a look at current and projected seating capacity. And so, we have this information broken out by school level. So, the current school year, fall 2020, the elementary level is at 85% capacity, and of course, that includes that 700 less students that showed up.

Mr. Bain: Excuse me one second. There's somebody virtual that has their microphone on. Please check and make sure you're microphone is off.

Mr. White: Thank you. That's okay, thank you very much. Okay, so I want to point out the significance of these capacity utilization numbers. When we're above 90% capacity in aggregate at a school level, then per County policy or regulation, that's when we look at planning for a new school. Also, when we reach 100% utilization in aggregate, that's when we look at opening a new school. So, I want to just give you that context. So, you see that this year, at elementary and middle school levels, we're fine. High school, we're still 93.2% which justifies that need for that new high school we've been talking about; obviously we're still above that 90% number. If you look 5 years into the future in the mid-term, we see that elementary, middle, and high school... that high school, we need a new one. And at elementary and middle, we better start... we should be planning for schools. And then, if we go long term, I mean, clearly we need 3 new schools, you know, an elementary, a middle, and a high school. And again, all of this is caused by that growth we're anticipating from the hot housing market and just the desirability of Stafford County and the, of course, the great education that families get in Stafford County Public Schools.

Mr. English: Can I ask you a question?

Mr. White: Yes sir.

Mr. English: In 2008, I think that's when the bottom kind of dropped out of the economy with the housing boom, okay, do you... and then I see where it kind of went flat for the last 4 years, 5 years after that and then it just started picking up till about 2014. Do you maybe, have y'all considered this might happen again because of the way that things are going? It seems like we're repeating... you know, history always repeats itself, but it seems like the same thing's happening right now. Everybody's buying, they're paying over, and then the bottom drops out. Then, do you take that into consideration that that could happen? Or I'm sure you probably can't put those in your figures, right?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. White: Quite honestly, we don't; however, we do use very conservative estimates in our formulas.

Mr. English: Mm-hmm.

Mr. White: You know, we never know exactly when the bottom's going to fall.

Mr. English: Sure, I understand that.

Mr. White: No one can.

Mr. English: I wish we did have a crystal ball and knew that.

Mr. White: The best that we can do is we can... we look at 3-year averages and assume that that trend will continue. Another thing that's important to note – we update our enrollment projections annually. So, as soon as there's a change in the market, that projection the following year will have those adjustments. So, we're not promising that this will ring true, but what I can tell you is based on the best information that we know now, this is what we're expecting. And as things change in the future, so will our enrollment projections.

Mr. English: Thank you.

Mr. White: Thank you.

Mr. Bain: There's something here that's not equating in my mind though.

Mr. White: Okay.

Mr. Bain: We had the downturn because of COVID, and yet more houses are being sold as soon as they're on the market. What's the discrepancy there that, uh, why did enrollment drop as a result of COVID and why was it not compensated for by the rush to buy houses?

Mr. White: Got it. Well, in the slide where... and let me just go back, if I could go back to slide number 3... so, enrollment, it dropped. But it didn't drop evenly across school levels. And we see that at the elementary level is where we really lost students. But, when we look at middle and high school, we didn't really lose that many students, so it wasn't sort of evenly distributed. And it sort of to me it makes sense that small children, that parents of small children, they probably would hold their students back more than middle-age or high school students because typically the younger kids they're learning how to... well, for various reasons, I don't want to just point out just one, but because of their age.

Ms. Barnes: I have a question, too, if you don't mind.

Mr. White: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: If we could go back to that last... to the current projected city capacity slide, the last one that you were on. And you said that that 85.5% of the elementary school capacity, that includes the 700 less?

Mr. White: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: So, I don't know if anybody did the math, all of the things being equal, if we weren't 700 down, what would the capacity then be at that elementary level? Would it be over 90? I mean, would we currently be in an over 90% state?

Mr. White: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. White: Let me just...

Ms. Barnes: Because that's a little deceptive there. I mean, you even said it includes the 700, so I'd like to see what it is without those 700 because that's not going to be the case for very long.

Mr. White: Right. And so, I understand and you're right.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah.

Mr. White: And I just want to make clear that this data is just purely a snapshot for 2020 only. And so, as we look into the future, we're looking into the mid-term and we see that it accounts for those students coming back and that's why the elementary level is above 90%.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so we would... 85 is kind of deceptive. We would say that right now, without COVID, we'd really be over 90%.

Mr. White: Correct, that is true. But, right now we do have COVID and I'm just sort of giving you a snapshot.

Ms. Barnes: We could be back over 90 next year, I mean, in the next school year.

Mr. White: We could. It very well could. And we're anticipating that it will. But, I can't make any promises. This COVID thing is... it's interesting, you know. It's really thrown a monkey wrench in how we do projections and forecasting.

Ms. Barnes: It just makes it look like there's a lot more capacity in the elementary school than it really is on that.

Mr. White: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Randall: I guess a question then to that point. Do you know what the percentage was for this school year 2019 to 2020? The capacity number?

Mr. White: I do.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And then we... we'll at least see an elementary. I expect elementary to be a little higher because of what you said the drop was of 700 students. So I expect it to be probably in the 88 to 89 range.

Mr. White: So, to give you an answer, so in 2019 the elementary level was 90.7%.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Ninety percent. So, that answers your question. I've also noted through several avenues, that there are some that have taken their kids to private school. Do we think that that's not sufficient significant enough to impact these numbers? Or do you think that when school's back in session that those private... those families who have gone private, do you think they'll come back or do you think they'll be just the permanent section that'll stay private?

Mr. White: You know, we think and this is just speculation...

Mr. Randall: It all is at that point.

Mr. White: ... yeah, we think the majority of those students will come back.

Mr. Randall: Will come back.

Mr. White: Because they were public school students first.

Mr. Randall: Sure, sure, absolutely. Okay, so one other question concerning this, or one other comment concerning this. This does not... this is only an indication of comparison of actual students in the County to seats in the County.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. We could conceivably have schools that are over 100% right now.

Mr. White: Of course.

Mr. Randall: Okay, that don't... okay. So, there are certain areas in the County where the schools that service those areas are currently already full and have no available seats. Would that be a fair statement to make?

Mr. White: Well, at the elementary level, because we lost 700...

Mr. Randall: No, no, we're talking about... I'm not talking about currently, I'm talking about next year when everything's back to normal...

Mr. White: When things are back to normal, yes.

Mr. Randall: ... and assuming that the 700 students are, you know, we find them in the basement...

Mr. White: Right.

Mr. Randall: ... right, that we will then have them back and we could conceivably be at a level above 100% with several schools in particular areas. Is that fair to say?

Mr. White: That is very much fair to say. And I just want to point out again, in this slide, I wanted to give you the school level...

Mr. Randall: Sure.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. White: ... because of the trigger in the... in the County resolution that 90%...

Mr. Randall: Of 90% to 100%.

Mr. White: Yes, yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright. And do we figure that we're on track to have the schools necessary to keep it under 100?

Mr. White: When you say under 100, at a particular level or?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, these percentages that I'm looking at here, you know. At 2025-26, elementary is at 99.5, assuming that your projections are correct. That could be over 100 theoretically.

Mr. White: Right, and...

Mr. Randall: Would we be ready by that time to have an elementary school to minimize that, to reduce that percentage?

Mr. White: Yes. And, if I could, can we go to slide number...

Mr. Randall: I'm trying to help you here to segue into the next slide.

Mr. White: Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Is that going to help?

Mr. White: You did a great job, thank you. If we could go to slide number 10. Well, actually 8 please. So, slide 8, what you just asked, you read my mind.

Mr. Randall: I don't know how it came that way.

Mr. White: This is the wisdom of our School Board and their CIP priorities. Let's look at the top three priorities that they have. Number one, high school number six. And number two, elementary school number 18. And then number three is a Drew Middle School renovation. And since I gave you the top three, I might as well finish out the list. Number four, we want to add additional early childhood special education classrooms, 10 of them. Number five, we're looking at an additional middle school. And number six would be North Stafford High School renovations, the fine arts wing. So, these capacity numbers, they clue us into the School Board's priorities because you'll notice the priorities for the high school that ties in with the capacity utilization at the high school level saying we need a high school now. Secondly, that elementary school 18, that capacity utilization is telling us we need that elementary school, and so on. So, you'll see the tie between School Board priorities and capacity utilization. Next slide please.

Mr. Apicella: Sir, I've got to chime in for just a second here. This is Steven Apicella. So, a couple of points and a couple questions.

Mr. White: Yes.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021***

Mr. Apicella: Back to Ms. Barnes point, I think Mr. Randall sort of spring boarded off of that. So, we dropped in population at the elementary school level, I'm just going to say 720 students, just rounding. We had last year about 620, if I have the number right, I don't have that slide in front of me... let's say 625 new starts, new construction. That would probably be constant for this year, too. So, if we get back those 720 at the elementary level, and then we add another 625, that's going to put you again way over the 90% for the elementary school across the board; not at specific schools, but across the board. Is that an accurate statement? Again, just kind of spring boarding off of previous comments.

Mr. White: Yes, that's correct, and we would definitely need to look at planning elementary school 18 once it hits that 90% again.

Mr. Apicella: And can you help us understand what the difference is between program capacity and design capacity.

Mr. White: Okay, at the elementary level, schools are a little different. The elementary schools, kids stay in the classroom pretty much all day. And so, depending on the program, they're impacted differently than middle and high school students which they switch classrooms. So, I mean, that's one simple answer. I mean, I don't want to get too far in the weeds, but there are other things like we have K-3 class size reduction grants where we get funds from the state to reduce class sizes at grades K-3 in an attempt to get more kids reading and up to speed. And, of course, when we reduce class size in a class that would normally maybe fit 20+ kids gets reduced so now we're getting less seats in that classroom. So, there are a multitude of reasons why we use program capacity, but those are two of the simplest ways I can explain for elementary school.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just going to explain, and you probably know this already, but why that's important to us is because when staff... when somebody comes in with a rezoning application let's just say for 500 single-family homes, and they look at what the impacts are, determining what the right proffer contribution would be to mitigate those impacts is based on one of those two, design or program capacity. And I just want to make sure that we're using the right methodology, whichever of the two those should be, in determining or doing that analysis so that we don't come up short. Because if there are available seats, we're going to get proffers for it. If there are not enough available seats, and I think you're using 90% – again, I don't know whether it's design or program capacity – but once you go over that amount, any additional seats needed that's at the point when we will be asking the applicant to help offset the costs or mitigate the costs of their housing project. So, I'm just kind of throwing that out there. The second thing is, with regard to costs, can you go back to the previous slide? So, just look at these cost figures. So, the high school is projected to cost \$141, I don't know if that's the fully burdened cost including site work, but that seems to be much greater than say the last high school cost. I just want to make sure that both the County side and the School side are using the best available again when we try to figure out what the right proffer amount should be when we look to the developer to mitigate their impacts. So, that's more of a comment than I guess a question, but clearly you guys are talking to each other both on the projection side and on the... *inaudible*... side. And as these numbers change, I would just ask that we keep having that conversation and then go back to the developers... or when we engage with the developers to give them the best and right amount to use going forward. Not that we're not doing that now, but you understand where I'm coming from hopefully.

Mr. White: Yes, I do.

Mr. Randall: Steven, can I add to that just a little?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Stay on the same slide. Priority number two. You talk about elementary school number 18.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: And then you also have in there a program design... I'm sorry, a program level and a design level.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright, program being more restrictive, correct?

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright, and just so we're clear, so if I have a design capacity at an elementary school of let's say 950, with all of the things that you just mentioned, the smaller reducing class sizes, reducing all of these things, grants that we have, so although that the design capacity maybe 950, the program capacity may be 850.

Mr. White: That's correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And so, when we're talking about these percentages, we are using program numbers or we're using design numbers?

Mr. White: Okay, so, to be clear, for the elementary level, we use program capacity.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. White: For middle and high school, we use design capacity. For the purposes of this slide, I gave you both so that you could see the difference only at elementary what year the trigger would be.

Mr. Randall: Right. So, based on that, if we use program capacity for the development of a new elementary school, by your calculation we would need that elementary school in 2026, not 2030.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. And, so I just, again, just to the point that's made, we just need to make sure that when we're getting from staff the right numbers that we're talking about for elementary school, at least we're talking about program numbers and not design numbers. Because that's what you're using then to present... to paint a realistic picture of where we're moving forward. Because the intent is not to go back to 25 kindergarteners in a classroom as the school may have been designed, correct?

Mr. White: That's correct.

Mr. Randall: It's to keep the smaller classrooms and to keep us at a program level based on the situations that we have. Alright, do we expect that there will be, to my question before, do we expect that there

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

will be some mitigation steps taken to help alleviate, to help level out some of the schools at higher capacity versus other schools?

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. White: So, if you're talking about things like boundary changes and redistricting...

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. White: ... every year we look at that as part of our enrollment accommodation plan.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. White: And so, when we see that there's a need to do a shift to get that balance, we'll do it.

Mr. Randall: Okay, and so, based on what Mr. Apicella just said, Chairman Apicella, sorry, that the elementary, you know, if we jump up to you know 90% based on everybody coming back, the assumption that's been made, and then the new additions, that we could be at a 92 or 93% at this time next year, do we expect that that would trigger some type of a mitigation strategy?

Mr. White: It very well could. And the key thing, you're right on you're in a good place. The key thing is that 90%...

Mr. Randall: I hope so, I hope so.

Mr. White: The key thing is that 90% we're looking at is at an aggregate level for the school. So, all elementary schools, when they... when all of our elementary schools come to 92%, we're saying... come above 90%, we're saying we need to plan. And to your point, if we have a school that is 98% that's next to a school that's 80%, it makes sense for us to do a boundary change to balance the enrollment between those two schools.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. White: But, keep in mind, in aggregate we're still looking at a need for...

Mr. Randall: Right. The aggregate drives the school... a new school...

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: ... the work, the land, the development into a new school, but it's the individual school capacity numbers that could potentially drive mitigation steps to minimize that.

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Is that fair to say?

Mr. White: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. And so, that also needs to be taken I guess into consideration as we move forward whether or not that effort's going to be undertaken, because that drives our decisions and our requirements as far as mitigation steps for design or program deficiencies. Deficits, not deficiencies, deficits. Alright, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. English: I've got one question. I hear in the news there's some scuttlebutt about they wanting to make the schools go year round. Would that make a big difference if they made it year round? I'm sure it's going to be hard on the schools, but is there anything on that aspect?

Mr. White: Well, I can't speak for Stafford County Public Schools, but I can tell you in previous school systems that I've worked they did look at the possibility of year round school. Sometimes that's used as a tool to lower the capacity, because essentially if you have students in shifts and ¼ of the student body is not in school for a given set of time, then that frees up capacity for your buildings.

Mr. English: Right.

Mr. White: So, that's sort of the how that year round works when people implement it.

Mr. English: Yeah. But let me ask you this question, too. With the people staying at home... I mean the kids staying at home now doing hybrid and that sort of stuff, is that going to be the wave of the future? Is that something that the school is going to be taking in count of now? I mean, hey, I don't want to go to school, I want to be able to do... So, are they taking that into consideration? Or right after this is over with, this is it. The only time we're going to do the hybrid maybe is if it's a snow day. Is that something that I don't know if you've calculated that in or is it something that is like the future thing that's going to come about, or what?

Mr. White: I mean, it could be. What I could tell you is that it appears that students... a lot of students learn better with instruction...

Mr. English: Absolutely.

Mr. White: ... in the classroom. And so, we will continue to do that. But there are some students that thrive working remotely and I believe we do have programs for students that would like to take online classes. So, we are sort of integrating online education opportunities for those students. And these students are typically, you know, secondary kids, not elementary kids.

Mr. English: Right.

Mr. White: You know, high school, maybe middle school kids that can take advantage of some of those opportunities. So, I think we will offer both and we will to meet the needs of all students because every kid's different.

Mr. English: Understood.

Mr. Anderson: I'm John Anderson with the school system, Executive Director for Facilities and Maintenance. And I can just tell you, there's a big push to get the kids back in school. We're doing everything we can. And personally, I believe this is gonna be over. I mean, you look at history and this pandemic is a really unusual event that's occurring. So, I think we're talking about it the right way that we need to be anticipating the growth and we're planning on getting past this. There's no doubt that

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

face to fact instruction has huge advantages for the schools. We have parents coming to the School Board meetings now requesting that we try to increase the days, increase the hours that the kids can be in school, and that's just going to allow them to thrive. So, we are really working on that and I think it's a good question, but we expect this to be over. And I know everybody's in the same boat. We are just hoping and praying that this will be over soon.

Mr. English: Me too.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

Ms. Hazard: Chairman Apicella, this is Holly Hazard, is there any way I can make a comment at this point or are you all pick a time just to wrap up or to comment on a couple items that were raised that I could at least give the Board perspective because I know Mr. White and Mr. Anderson want to tread carefully there.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah please chime in as you feel you need to.

Ms. Hazard: With regards to either year-round school, to be honest we know that it's being talked about at you know the state level, we aren't really sure what that's going to look like, how that's going to look going forward but as what everybody is saying there may be a percentage of students that we will continue to offer a virtual option. That does make more sense from, at the secondary level but one thing I would say is I don't know how much you know in the news we are talking a lot about our CTE classes. Those kinds of classes that perhaps don't require going on for a college education. Our wonderful fire fighting program that's in partnership with the County has been a great success. Our drafting, our health services and there's a lot more push for us to be doing internships, things like that that are hands on and those are going to be building intensive programs, and I'm not trying to, please know that I am not talking program design I'm saying the auto body shop you know those are really great skill programs that we offer in our high schools and those are space intensive that I actually hope we maybe ramping up as opposed to you know going in the other direction. So, I just wanted to make that point in general. With regard to the elementary school, sort of the little joke among most of the Board members is wow we can't wait to see what our kindergarten and first grade class next year will be. We think they will be what we used to call a bubble class because they are going to be huge, because I think a lot of people who perhaps have children that maybe have birthdays that they are, promise them sometimes anyway of sending a young child to kindergarten, probably last year maybe said wow this isn't the year, but we may have a huge kindergarten and even potentially first grade class next year at least that's what I'm anticipating. I think it was Mr. Randall who came up with the lovely term mitigation strategies instead of the other word which I really like better about boundary line changes. Not sure I can get away with not using the other word. We are always looking at that and our superintendent has a certain amount of authority to move a small amount of students to make sense. The challenge for us when we look at large, I have to say redistricting efforts, you can work for the next two to three years and then if a large housing complex is about to come in but you moved everybody there you're back in the same problem. So...

Mr. English: Holly, Ms. Hazard, you talking about that bubble, I feel like you're gonna have some people looking to hold their kids back another year because they don't think they got educated this year so is that something that you, and if that's the case you're really gonna have an issue if you've got, if you've got kindergarteners and first graders, second graders say look my child didn't learn anything this year, I want them held back for another year and then you've got that on top of that I think you're gonna have some major issues if that happens.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Ms. Hazard: I don't disagree and so that's why I'm saying I think it was Ms. Barnes who noted, it's not really deceptive but it is the blip on the radar but I appreciate certainly Mr. White's work on this, he has been a delight to work with and I really appreciate him coming over and you all inviting us to come over and share this data to show you what we're seeing because I don't disagree I think many of the parents who have children in, I had almost called, some call it private school some it's a mix of things that people are doing. Most of the people I've talked to two or three who said we probably won't come back but every other person I talked to said no my child wants to go to school with you their you know the kids in the neighborhood or the people on their soccer team or all of that. I think we will have a lot of kids in elementary next year, I think that 90% is gonna be beaten rather quickly because as we spoke about last night at the Board meeting we are planning and our budget is based upon going back four or five days a week whatever we are allowed to when we open school in the fall we do believe we still be needing to offer a virtual alternative at least that's the indications we're getting.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Hazard.

Mr. White: Next slide please. Okay so some key takeaways. Long term student enrollment is definitely projected to continue. We're seeing growth and we believe very strong that we will see strong growth in the future. Next Covid-19 has not slowed down residential housing growth and it'll be interesting to see when we actually slow down on the residential side, I don't, I wish I had a crystal ball because then the projections would be better than they might be now but we'll have to wait and see. But what I can tell you is that we will continue working with the County to look at things like housing starts and occupancy permits to see if there are any changes in the trend and once we get that information we'll be sure to make sure we include that in our thinking for projections and lastly more funding is needed for more seats to accommodate all these future students that we have coming. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So additional questions-, thank you sir very much I think this has been very helpful to us. Any more questions for Mr. White and/or Mr. Anderson?

Mr. Randall: Not a question, just a quick comment. Just so we're all on the same page that most of most, probably the vast majority of those approved projects have been approved for a while. They have been out there for some, many, five, six, seven, ten, fifteen, twenty years and are now only deciding now that they want to build so I just want to make sure everybody's clear that it's not us that are just being the pump to all of these, they've already been previously approved and are now deciding to build at their leisure. Thanks.

Mr. Apicella: So, I've got a couple of points. Obviously, our equity here is that we want to make sure when developers come in with rezoning projects that they do their best to mitigate the impacts. Across the board on all of the infrastructure requirements that are driven by their projects and the biggest cost driver of course being schools. So, a couple of additional points to bring up. How often do you review and update the capacity information school by school and County wide?

Mr. White: So, we look at that annually and that information is shared in our enrollment accommodation plan.

Mr. Apicella: Okay and so just again for some context we're in the throes of updating our Comprehensive Plan, we're on a fairly short fuse to deliver something that the Board could chop on in the fall. Is that something you can provide, Mr. Randall is the Chairman of that subcommittee honchoing that effort I think potentially that information might be helpful to his effort if not to the whole Planning Commission, again is that something you'd be willing to share with us?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: The other important piece for all of us again as we review these projects when they come in front of us is the student generation factors. We had a meeting with your previous colleagues back almost two years ago and we had a pretty robust conversation about those generation factors. Some of us were still, and I don't mean to use this word pejoratively, skeptical about the numbers, meaning that we still I felt and they felt that the numbers were still a little low, especially as it relates to new starts, in some cases the new starts were lower generation factors than I call them county wide which in my opinion is, what's the right terminology... it's not quite accurate because it mixes old and new and I'm not quite sure that's the best information but nonetheless how often do you revisit the generation factors?

Mr. White: We look at that every year and we use a traditional approach well when I say we I typically use a traditional approach which is the County wide factor and also I want to say that it's important for ICPS to continue working together with the County to make sure that we have the best housing data possible in creating these student generation factors so I will be reaching out to Mr. Harvey and his team each year and gonna continue to reach out to his team to get that information.

Mr. Apicella: So again, for Mr. Randall' efforts and his subcommittee, I think it would probably be helpful to have the latest factors that you are using. And maybe this is dealt with in the countywide approach, but my concern that arose, again, about two years ago was, when we look at new apartments, and again those seem to have the lowest generation, but no less, new apartments when they first get built, those that are two and three bedrooms, they have fairly low student generation factors. And as time goes on, I think those generation factors might grow, but certainly over the life cycle of those apartments, you know, year one they may have none. Year five they may have one, year seven they may have half and so on and so forth. But my perspective is, and the reason why I am raising this point again, is that we don't get to capture the proffer up front. And in my humble opinion, we should identify what the maximum student generation should be... could be from that apartment, two or three bedroom apartment where ever it might be along, say that 30- or 50-year lifecycle. Because whenever that gets triggered, we are going to need a seat for that person. And we may not have gotten it via the proffer. I not sure if I am making sense, but if you use a .1 as the generation factor and at some point, in the future it's a .5 or a 07 and we've only gotten a proffer for a .1. then we shortchange ourselves and the tax payers. Do you understand where I am going with that?

Mr. White: I do, I understand what you are saying and one thing I would like to add is that, I guess we use the term long term, it may mean different things to the school system, long term means 10 years, because that's the horizon for our enrollment projections. And with County Planning long term is typically a lot longer. So, I understand exactly what you are saying when you mean long term in the context of 20-30 years down the line.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, well maybe we can have some additional conversations that I think from both our vantage points, the County and the School System, we want to make sure that we are using the best information that tells us what the student generation factors are for each type of housing unit. I thank you very much, this information has been very helpful to us. I would just ask when you go back to the School Central Office, if there is anything else that you can think of that would be helpful to our subcommittee that is updating the Comp Plan, if you could send that through staff, again, we all want to make sure that we get it right and we have the best available information to project where Stafford County is headed in the next five, ten, twenty years.

Mr. White: Will do.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Anderson: Will do, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: (Inaudible). Mr. Harvey, moving on the to the next agenda item, I believe we have three public hearings, the first one, Tree Haven.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC19152902; Reclassification – Tree Haven Rezoning - A proposed zoning reclassification from the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District to the A-2, Rural Residential Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 18-78, consisting of 3.67 acres (Property), to allow for the development of 3 single-family dwellings. The Property is located at the southwest intersection of Mountain View Road and Tree Haven Lane, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: February 26, 2021) (History: November 18, 2020 Public Hearing Continued to February 10, 2021) (Public Hearing Continued to February 24, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman, Mr. Geouge will give an update for staff.

Mr. Geouge: Good evening Mr. Chairman, member of the Commission, I am Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. The Tree Haven rezoning request was presented at the February 10th Planning Commission meeting. At that time there were still numerous comments and concerns from the Commission and the public. There are a couple of major comments that came out of that meeting. One was for the applicant to consider reducing the scope of their proposal from three proposed homes to one proposed home. And also, to do a little work on reaching out to the neighbors to try to address issues. So, the applicant has submitted some revised materials in response to those concerns. They've revised their proffer statement to limit development on their property to one home. They have also provided some architectural renderings which, I don't believe were in the report, but we do have those and they will be included in future reports. So, with the changes to the proffer statements, due to the scope of the changes, this application has to be re-advertised. So, the applicant has waived their 100 day... the 100-day time limit for Planning Commission action and extended it to March 24th. Which would provide time for that re-advertisement. So, in light of that we are recommending that the Planning Commission defer this to March 24th at this time. I am not sure if one of the call-in people on WebEx meeting, if that's the applicant. But, if so they may be available to answer some questions also.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Geouge. Any questions for staff? Okay, I... just to piggy back off of Mr. Geouge comment, is the applicant online? Okay, it doesn't appear so. So, you are asking for a motion to defer the item to March 24th for the re-advertisement of the matter and I assume that would also mean that the public hearing would stay open as well. Is that correct Mr. Geouge?

Mr. Geouge: That is correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Ms. Barnes, this is in your district.

Ms. Barnes: Yes, it is. Thank you, I will go ahead and make a motion to defer this reclassification to the, what is it? Is it the March 24th, thank you. RC19152902, to March 24th.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I caught Mr. Bain being the seconder, there is probably somebody who did first, but I am going to let Mr. Bain be second on that one. Any further comments Ms. Barnes?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: Not this time.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay, there is a motion to defer this item to the March 24 meeting, giving staff an opportunity to re-advertise the changes and hold the public hearing open. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye, so the motion to defer passes unanimously. Thank you everybody. On to item 2, Mr. Harvey, Celebrate VA – Sam’s Xpress Car Wash Conditional Use Permit.

2. CUP20153483; Conditional Use Permit – Celebrate VA-Sam’s Xpress Car Wash - A proposed conditional use permit to allow a car wash within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 44Y-15C (Property). The Property is also within the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District. The Property consists of 1.7280 acres and is located on the south side of Warrenton Road and west side of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: June 4, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mike Zuraf will be making the presentation for staff.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. If I could have the computer, thanks. So, yeah this is a Conditional Use Permit for a project known as Sam’s Xpress Car Wash. Next slide please, okay, let’s see if I can, yeah, I can. So, this is a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a car wash within the Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on property that is zoned B-2, Urban Commercial. It’s 1.37-acre parcel

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

in the Hartwood District. With Sami Nafisi, as the applicant and Clark Leming is the agent representing the applicant for this case. So, this site is located on the Southwest corner of the intersection of Warrenton Road and Banks Ford Parkway. So, looking at the existing conditions, the site consists of a cleared and graded pad site, it's generally level. There are no environmentally sensitive features or resources present. The site does include, in the upper corner, an emergency vehicle turnaround that was required of the adjacent auto service/tire center and then also there is a shopping center sign for the overall Celebrate Virginia on the other front corner of the parcel. Surrounding parcels include an auto service facility, NTB, to the west; automobile is located across Warrenton Road to the north, there's a place of worship to the east; and undeveloped property to the south. So, the property was rezoned in 2008 from A-1 to B-2, included proffers. The rezoning action covered the larger surrounding area and that resulted in the development of the surrounding pad sites and also the surrounding road network improvements, including widening of Warrenton Road. At the same time, there's a Conditional Use Permit approved for several drive-through uses, including one on this site. These approvals did not limit the development of the site to any other use including drive-through uses. When the surrounding roads were developed, this parcel was created, and has remained undeveloped since that time. So, the General Development Plan shows the overall layout of the car wash and so the car wash does consist of a 4,200 square-foot building that's oriented kind of parallel with Warrenton Road. There is a single automated wash bay. The vehicle access into and out of the site is via separate one-way in and one-way out entrances located on Watson Way, that's an internal private kind of travel way serving the different uses within this part of Celebrate Virginia. There is no access proposed or to be provided at all along Warrenton Road or Banks Ford Parkway. The site does include two stacking lanes with automated pay stations. Leading into the site, the drive aisle for exiting vehicles includes several rows of vacuum stations. The applicant will construct new sidewalk along Watson Way, that will connect to existing sidewalk that is located along Warrenton Road and Banks Ford Parkway. The site basically is designed for one-way traffic flow through the site. There's several... click to the next view, there's arrows showing the traffic circulation through the site. This is the kind of stacking area as cars enter in and pay and go into the carwash bay. Here is running through the carwash and then the last is the kind of... how cars will circulate through the vacuum station area, through the remainder of the site and exit back out onto Watson Way. So, the existing emergency-vehicle turn-around located on the car wash site is for the benefit of the adjacent NTB tire and auto store site to the west. They have... only have a single drive aisle without adequate space for emergency vehicles to turn around. So, the new site configuration will retain the inter-parcel connection, that's shown in red, and also provides a paved travel way along the western property line, with stripping and signage to call out that the accessway as for emergency-vehicle only. So, emergency vehicles going to the NTB would be able to utilize this travel lane to exit out... back out to Watson Way, without having to back out on to or reverse back to Watson Way.

Mr. Randall: So, quick question for you Mr. Zuraf. So, that, that... you just said there will be marks on... there will be painted lines on the ground, there will be no gate, no anything there. What will stop people from coming through there, not paying for the car wash and going to the vacuums?

Mr. Zuraf: So, yeah, initially the general development plan has some bollards to block traffic from connecting through. Fire and Rescue did request those be removed and that be open to free access through, so they could get out if they needed to in short order. The applicant... this was discussed with the applicant, they intend on placing traffic cones, basically in that general area to discourage people from driving through the area and trying to use the vacuums without paying. So, that is their plan.

Mr. Randall: Right, because the vacuums are part of the the...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Randall: ... payment for the car wash. It's the carwash and then the vacuums, right? So, those are free vacuums?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And just another point, you know, the CUP for a car wash use is generally... you know, the purpose of it is to insure that traffic management issues are addressed, with the main concern being the excessive vehicle stacking that occurs at certain times of the year. So, to address this the applicant did, you know, they have limited the access points, only to off of Watson Way and then also they did move that entrance point as far to the west as possible, away from Banks Ford Parkway. Plus having the dual stacking lanes, that should do a lot to minimize and avoid, altogether, stacking backout on to the main travel ways around this site.

Mr. Bain: Will there be an employee on site at all times while it's open.

Mr. Zuraf: My understanding is yes, but I will defer to the applicant to confirm that.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And I understand also, to kind of assist at the pay stations as well.

Mr. Bain: To sort of follow up on what Mr. Randall was saying, there would be nothing that would stop somebody from entering the exit area off of Watson Way and going to the vacuums, either.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, that could happen at any... there's nothing at all that we could do about that.

Mr. Bain: Yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: So, I am pretty certain there ... and I think they could speak to their operations, I think they will probably have staffing to make sure that that's... I am pretty certain this is not just fully automated where nobody is around to monitor things like that.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So, these are renderings of the building design the applicant is committing to. Many of the features of the proposed building conform with our Neighborhood Design Standards Plan. Some of the features mentions in our plan, that they have are brick and glass as a primary façade material. The use of neutral colors on the majority of the façade. There are breaks and fluctuations in roof lines and façade plains, wall plains and also, yeah, that's the highlights of the main features. So, several proposed conditions that the development... developed as shown on the GDP. There will be limits... it would limit the car wash to a single automated wash stall, within the building, as proposed on the GDP. Also limit access to the Property via Watson Way, in the location shown. Limit the hours of operation to 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. This is, I believe, consistent with all their other stores. Requires utilization of a water recycling system. It requires the buildings be constructed in conformance with renderings, that you just saw. It would prohibit temporary signage from being located along the frontage of the site, along the main roads. Basically, along Warrenton Road and Banks Ford Parkway. Require the inter-parcel connection and emergency fire access lane as we went over and then requiring a repair and completion

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

of the damaged segment of sidewalk. That's basically located at the intersection of Warrenton and Banks Ford Parkway, just a small little fix there that they are committing to as well. So, there are several positive aspects, it's consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comp Plan. The use is consistent with the established auto-oriented commercial uses in the vicinity of the site. And the conditions will help ensure that any negative impacts are mitigated. And staff does not see any apparent negative aspects, and would recommend approval of the application pursuant to R21-91.

Mr. Bain: Just a comment, I think we ought to very carefully consider this application because based on the presentation a few minutes ago, the School Board is going to be doing a whole lot of car washes to get money for the new schools that they are going to need. So, this is competition for them.

Mr. Apicella: Alright Mr. Bain, thank you. Any further comments of staff? Alright, seeing none, would the applicant like to come forward and make a presentation?

Mr. Morgan: My name is Chris Morgan at Sam's Express Car Wash. I believe Mr. Leming is online to make a presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Leming, are you on the line, by chance? I am not hearing anybody else. Sir, I did not catch your name. Are you willing to answer some questions, if not make a presentation?

Mr. Morgan: I am. Again, my name is Chris Morgan, I am the Project Manager for Sam's Express Car Wash. I am here to answer any questions that you may have and even some of the questions that were raised just a few minutes ago. Just a little bit about our operation. We do have a minimum of at least two employees on the site at all times. We do... during busy times we have as many as six different employees on the site. So, there will not be a time when the store is open that somebody is not on site during (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you. Questions for the applicant?

Mr. English: Mr. Morgan, this is Commissioner English. Is there a... is this a chain of car washes?

Mr. Morgan: Yes sir. We are located in Matthews North Carolina, which is right outside of Charlotte. Right now, we have 30 locations that are in operation in South Carolina, North Carolina and actually two that have recently opened in Virginia. One right outside of Richmond in Midlothian and one opened about two weeks ago in Williamsburg. So, we are a growing company. We actually have five in the field right now, about to open, I guess, sometime this year. So, I hope this will continue growing, especially in the Virginia area.

Mr. English: Thank you.

Mr. Morgan: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Are there other questions? I will just ask a quick question, in lieu of traffic cones as a barrier, and I appreciate the public safety community, does not want bollards. Did you all discuss or consider, maybe a gate as a barrier instead?

Mr. Morgan: Well, originally when we developed the GDP, we had the flexible bollards. The ones that you see on the highway, where if a car hits it, it basically just bends over and flops back into place. Those are the ones that we would prefer to put in to control traffic. I do want to say this also, we really

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

do not want people coming into that entrance from National Tire and Battery because it would sort of interfere with the flow of traffic coming out of our carwash. It is an automated car wash, once you go through the process it takes about three minutes, so it's really a short amount of time that cars are going to be in the tunnel. So, they are going to be exiting pretty quickly and they are on an automated conveyor. Now there are safety precautions in place where if somebody stops at the end of the conveyor, it shuts down the conveyor. So, that way people are not running into each other. So, we would prefer that people not come in that way from National Tire and Battery and also exit from our car wash. We want them to continue with the flow. We would, we would be okay with a gate, that is going to be completely up to, I guess, Fire and Rescue. I can't imagine that they are gonna want a gate up. But, we would be okay with a gate.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, other questions? Alright, thank you sir. So, I am going to open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on this particular item. Mr. Harvey, did we get any written comments submitted to the County on this?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we did not.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I am going to close the public hearing on this item and bring it back to the Commission. I am going to ask Mr. Zuraf to come up for a second. So, given Mr. Morgan's comments, are there any other options that could be considered as a barrier short of the traffic cones? I am not quite sure that's going to be a sufficient mechanism for keeping people from going one way or the other.

Mr. Zuraf: I am going to apologize, but I was not necessarily involved with the back and forth with the Fire Marshall, so I couldn't speak to what options might have been discussed. Or what options they would be amenable to.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I guess I will just throw it out there. I mean, if traffic cones are the only solution, that perhaps the applicant could continue to work with the staff and our Public Safety folks, to see if something beyond the traffic cones would work for all parties. Again, not as an additional CUP condition but just on the good graces of perhaps pursuing it downstream. Anybody else have anything else that they want to bring up? Or a motion on this item?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I do see that the applicant's representative is now online.

Mr. English: Clark Leming.

Mr. Apicella: So, I am going to ask Mr. Leming, can you give us a brief presentation, if need be?

Mr. Morgan: It looks like he is possibly on mute.

Mr. English: Well that ain't good. He's on mute.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, I will give it a last call for the applicant's agent and if not again bring it back to the Commission for dissuasion add possible a motion. It looks like he is off mute. Mr. Leming, are you there? I am still not, still not hearing anything. Mr. English, this is in your district. Are you comfortable proceeding?

Mr. English: Yes sir, I am. I make a motion that we approve CUP20153483.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Okay...

Mr. Randall: And I will second that.

Mr. Apicella: Was that Mr. Bain?

Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. English: Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: (Inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: I am sorry, I got to work on my hearing in picking out people's voices. I apologize. Alright, anything further Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Only that, to your point, I hope they can work something out on that, so we can put something in there more than just the cones. I think it would be right for the applicant to have something more sufficient there. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Randall. Anybody else? Okay, there is a motion to recommend approval of CUP20153483, Conditional Use Permit, Celebrate Virginia, Sam's Xpress Car Wash. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Motion carries unanimously. Thank you everybody, moving on to item number 3, South Ridge Church CUP.

3. CUP20153586; Conditional Use Permit – South Ridge Church - A proposed conditional use permit to allow a place of worship within the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 44-119L (Property). The Property consists of a total of 2.45 acres and is located on the north side of International Parkway, approximately 500 feet east of Brandywine Court, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: June 4, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Joseph Valotta will be making the presentation for staff.

Mr. Apicella: Good.

Mr. Valotta: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners. I am Joseph Valotta, Planning and Zoning, presenting the South Ridge Church project. I am going to share my screen so we can see the PowerPoint. Before I begin, can everyone see the PowerPoint?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Yes, I see it.

Mr. Valotta: Perfect, thank you. So, again this project is called South Ridge Church, it is a Conditional Use Permit request to allow a place of worship in the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District. The subject site is Tax Map Parcel No. 44-119L, 2.45 Acres, located in the George Washington Election District. The applicant is Jeff Geyer with South Ridge Church, Inc. He is here tonight remotely, with some associates. The Property is located on the north side of International Parkway, zoned M-1, Light Industrial without proffers. The R-1 Zoning District abuts the property to the north, and on the three remaining sides, the M-1 Zoning District abuts the property. Also, in terms of Zoning, a concurrent site plan for this project is currently under review in the Planning office. The Property is sparsely wooded, with topography sloping down from south to north. All abutting properties are currently undeveloped. The England Run North subdivision is located north of the subject site, across an open space parcel. And the proposed building would be located approximately 500 feet away from the nearest residence in that subdivision. Also, there's a 100-foot Resource Protection Area buffer on the property, a 100-foot RPA buffer. It's located on the north side of the property. No development is proposed within the RPA. Also, in conjunction with the site plan, the applicant is going to have to submit a Chesapeake Bay Compliance Plan, to ensure that the RPA location has not changed and that development will not impact the RPA. This is the GDP of the proposed place of worship. It shows a church, approximately 11,000 square-foot in size. Parking areas are located on the north, south and east sides of the building. In this situation, based on the proposed seating capacity, the Zoning Ordinance would require 36 parking spaces, however the applicant has shown 45 parking spaces both here and on the site plan that is under review. The loading zone is located on the east side of the building, and the dumpster enclosure on the east side... excuse me, the east perimeter of the development area. There are two full-movement entrances proposed on International Parkway. And a one-way travel lane is proposed on the north and west sides of the building, to help traffic circulation within the site. No conceptual architectural renderings were submitted with this application. However, the applicant has submitted their building plans to the County for review. This is a representative image from the building plans. Some features that conform to our Neighborhood Design Standards Plan include breaks and fluctuations in the roof line. Avoidance of extended unadorned features, excuse me, avoidance of extended unadorned building façades. The use of awnings and projecting features from the façades and also a well-defined customer

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

entrance facing the primary road. Some of the conditions that staff is proposing would require conformance with the GDP. Limit capacity of the structure in terms of size and in terms of seats and the conditions would also limit structure height. Looking at the Comprehensive Plan the comp plan identifies the property within the Business and Industry and Resource Protection designations. Staff believes that this project is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations. No development is proposed within the Resource Protection Area. On the other hand, the Business and Industry areas are areas in the County that are intended to accommodate larger scale developments that would serve broad markets inside and outside of the County. A place of worship is not fully consistent with that recommendation. However, with this parcel, this specific parcel is relatively small in size compared to some of the other parcels which limits the potential for any sort of large-scale industrial development. Also, peak traffic hours for a place of worship and typical industrial development are offset from one another, so this should minimize the potential for land use conflicts. And taking a look at the staff evaluations, staff notes positively that the project is consistent... generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comp Plan. It won't change the established development pattern within the vicinity and conditions will help mitigate potential impacts. No apparent negative aspects are noted and staff recommends approval of this CUP with conditions pursuant to Resolution R21-93. And that concludes the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Valotta. Questions for staff?

Mr. Bain: Mr. Valotta, could you go back to the GDP, please. There we go. Can you, maybe with your markers show again, which direction run off flows on this site.

Mr. Valotta: Sure, yes. So, their... I don't know if I can draw it from here remotely, but run off... in the applicant's engineer should be able to speak to this too. I believe it's going to flow to the east, there is a stormwater management pond east of the site. So, if you can see my cursor it will be going this way, towards the right-hand side of the screen, over here.

Mr. Bain: Okay, I see your cursor. And where is the pond? Is right where your cursor was is the pond?

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, it's approximately right here.

Mr. Bain: And is that a shared pond that this site would be able to utilize then?

Mr. Valotta: I do not know off hand. I would need to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Bain: Okay, alright. That's all I have.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Alright, thank you Mr. Valotta. Is there anyone here representing the applicant, who would like to provide a presentation and answer questions? Mr. Valotta, do you know of anybody online?

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, I believe he is about to speak, it looked like he was on mute for a second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Freeland: I am sorry, this is Ray Freeland, with Freeland Engineering. We are the engineers for the site. To answer your question about the storm pond, it is a regional facility that was designed to

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

accommodate all those parcels in the development. So, there is a capacity that is required there and the water quality has been addressed. So, all stormwater will be sent to that regional pond.

Mr. Bain: Okay, thank you. That's very good.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, anybody on the applicant side who wants to provide a presentation or answer questions?

Mr. Geyer: I am here, it's Jeff Geyer to answer any questions. But I thought Joe and Ray have done a great job, so thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you sir. Any questions for the applicants? Alright, I am not hearing any, so I am going to open the public hearing on this matter. And this is an opportunity for the public to comment on this particular item. Mr. Harvey, did we receive any written comments?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we did not.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I am going to close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission for further discussion. Mr. Bain, this is in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Bain: I would like to recommend or make a motion to approve CUP20153458, South Ridge Church.

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

Ms. Barnes: I will second that.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Barnes. Any further comments Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay, so there is a motion to recommend approval on CUP20153586, Conditional Use Permit, South Ridge Church. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Motion carries unanimously. Thank you, Mr. Valotta and the applicants. Moving on to our next agenda item, unfinished business, item 4. A small item of course, Downtown Stafford. Before we get started, I just want to remind everybody, this is our last opportunity to make changes before we decide what we are going to put forward on the Comp Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment for public hearing in later March. Mr. Harvey.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. Downtown Stafford - Authorize public hearings for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Zoning Ordinance Text amendment regarding the UD-5, Urban Development, Zoning District, and a zoning reclassification application for approximately 29 acres to the UD-5 Zoning District, in the Courthouse Planning Area. **(Time Limit: March 29, 2021) (History: PC Work Session December 2, 2020) (Deferred to January 13, 2021) (Deferred to January 27, 2021) (Deferred to February 10, 2021) (Deferred to February 24, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Zuraf will be giving the staff update.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, good evening again. We have a brief presentation to kind of bring us to speed on this. So, again this is the Downtown Stafford proposed related to Comprehensive Plan amendment and Zoning Ordinance amendment portion of the project. Thanks. And the separate item, of course, it the reclassification that is the next item on the agenda. So, this has been discussed at several work sessions up to this point with the last discussion at your last meeting on February 10th and at the last meeting, it's kind of come down to one issue that's seems to be remaining on this. The Planning Commission discussed in detail further... requesting further refinement of the Comp Plan language recommending developers of the new project provide a pro rata contributions for community amenities where it isn't feasible to construct and there were some concerns raised. The Commission requested, you know, additional language to further solidify the desire that amenities should be provided consistent with the location and size recommended in the plan and also wanted to seek some assurances that amenities will be provided, properly designed and constructed with appropriate features and landscaping, stressing the quality of life and environmental benefits that these amenities would bring to the community. So, we've proved two versions of proposed amendments to language. Initially staff, in your staff report, there was kind of staff proposed language and let me go to the next slide, sorry if it's so bright. But this is highlighting the changed area in this, we further modified the language too that basically with these amendments they propose to expand on the current standards that were located right before the pro rata discussion. And then also we added a new standard, the new language is of course highlighted in red and bold on this slide and so, in addition though you did receive some new modified language proposed by Commissioner Apicella. That was email out to everybody this morning, and I believe you received a paper copy of this proposed amendment. Generally, the kind of intent of Commissioner Apicella's language was to do several things. Allow developers to partner with each other where... partner with

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

each other not just only provide a contribution to the County as an option where no one fully owns that parcels necessary to construct the specific amenities. Also allow developers to provide an alternate location and partner as may be necessary to construct an amenity. And also that all developers have to provide a portion of the amenities associated with the size, scope and their project in relation to the entire Downtown Stafford area or contribute towards some type of amenities on a pro rata proportions basis. The version that we... that was vetted through staff, in doing so, we removed the term pro rata, there was some concern that that might conflict with State Code, as it relates to mitigation of impacts. And also, we did add a clarification that the contributions should be consistent with the State Code because there are specific limitations in what the County could legally accept when we get into proffers as these projects are coming through. So, this... then the next step, of course, would be authorize the public hearing, as mentioned. This is the last meeting to schedule a public hearing for the item and meet the deadline imposed. And that ends my brief summary.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Zuraf. Questions for staff and any thought about how we can proceed... how we should proceed on this last piece... open piece...

Mr. Zuraf: Hopefully it will move forward.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions. So, did you have a chance to send Chairman Apicella's comments and proposed language to Lauren or to who ever needed to look at it, to see if that met the legal standard?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Yes, so it does.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so my question then to your... to what I see in here, you know, we all have one purpose in mind and that is to assure that if it shows that it's going to be a... I think you guys talked to us at one of our meetings that there was going to be, what, eight... I can't remember... eight or nine acres of recreational... maybe it wasn't, maybe its five or six acres. I can't remember.

Mr. Zuraf: Eight separate parks.

Mr. Randall: Eight separate parks.

Mr. Zuraf: The acreage is less, lower.

Mr. Randall: Okay maybe lower. So, I want... the only thing I am concerned about in making sure that the language that we have in there drives us to that end goal, right? And if I say based on what you wrote in the new standard, and you can put that back up if you are interested. Developments within the Downtown area will construct community amenities in a manner generally consistent... So, if they buy the property that has the parks on it, then they would be then required to build it, generally consistent with the size and location provided on the concept plan. Go back one. Right? The question is, who is going to buy that prop... that piece or property that has nothing but a park on it? There is one area in there that's got a two-acre park on it and it looks like it's the entire city block. Right?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So, how do I ensure that I get a two-acre park and that particular... let me rephrase that. How do I assure that I get a two-acre park somewhere in that Downtown, it may not be in that location, right? Because it's an entire... now maybe there is a developer out there that will buy Lot A and Lot B, will develop Lot A and then also put a park on Lot B. I don't know if that is feas... I don't know if that is realistic, right? So, what do I need to do to ensure that that park of two acres and the half acre park here and the one-acre park over there, all get built?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, again this is all conceptual.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Zuraf: And the big thing is, you know, those park locations, those do not follow current parcel boundaries and I think likely you are going to have parcel areas that... and maybe that is something that we can provide as we, as an element of the staff report is an overlay of the parcel lines with these parks to kind of make... visualize it a little better. So, it's likely going to be where these park features recommended in the plan are just portions of larger parcels that are coming in for development. And also, just as a reminder, these are all just elements of the Comp Plan, they are all guidelines and so, none of this, you know, is fully enforceable where we say you have to, you know. It's going to be contingent on the applicant to come in and provide a good plan and a good proposal that meets the overall intent.

Mr. Randall: So...

Mr. Zuraf: There is likely going to be some adjustments and a little variations so... but it's providing the framework to make sure that we get as close as that as possible.

Mr. Randall: Right. And we have talked about. We've talked about the fact that this is a Comp Plan only and the Comp Plan is a guideline. But, I think there also is some validity to the point that there needs to be some... there needs to be some teeth somewhere, right? And if we put it in the Comp Plan, such that it gives us an ability to say no, if they are not, if they don't, right? Then we can... because everything we do, right... compared to the Comp Plan, compared to Comp Plan, check on the Comp Plan, how does it relate to the Comp Plan, right? If we don't have the ability to say no to a developer that says I don't get any money building a park, I get all my money building such and such and such, you know, I don't have the ability to say, alright, that's not what is in the best interest of Stafford County, the answer is no. You know, how do I put that in the Comp Plan that gives me the teeth to say, you have to do what is best for Stafford County, not necessarily what's just best for you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall, I tried t address that in the language that I came up with, which maybe I am overselling it, but I think what I tried to do is address your concerns as best I could within the context of what we are allowed to do and say. If you look at the third paragraph, it says, you know, either you own the whole property or you abut a property where a park is partially supposed to be constructed, they you are going to have to help make that happen. Either with the other developers around you or by providing some contribution or identifying an alternate location. And you know, as we look at that, we don't have it in front of us now, but if we look... if we had that chart in front of us or that diagram in front of us, when reality sets in and somebody starts building, there may be good reasons why a park is identified on the layout, but it may not be feasible in that location. So, I tried to come up with some alternatives that kind of address all the different scenarios, again as best we could, and also for those folks who choose not to develop the park that you are talking about, maybe they are a hundred feet away or a thousand feet away, and there is no park associated with their project, well they would still be expected, and that's the word in that last paragraph, to pony up some kind of amenity. Either directly or indirectly

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

or as part of a contribution, which is not part of the language that staff came up with. So, I understand your frustration, I hear where you are coming from, I think the problem is legally there's only so far, we can go to kind of push the envelope. At the end of the day projects will come in and staff will give us their report and tell us whether or not they have met the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan. And like anything else, if it doesn't meet those objectives, they would say so and as a Planning Commissioner and the Board can choose not to go along with the proposed project, because it doesn't meet the expectations and the desirability in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Randall: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I know that your language gets a lot closer to where I think we need to be, so I am all for adding your language into the Comp Plan amendment.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else want to chime in with their thoughts or comments?

Mr. Cummings: I will put it on the record again, I guess. I think that what we want to accomplish and what... I think its achievable, I think it's achievable in the Comp Plan, by just including some language possibly, and I will leave it to the Committee... the Commission and to Counsel to determine whether smart climate... *inaudible*... see language added into what we have thus far gives us some guidepost and since everything is going to be... is based on form based code and hopefully form based code, that we get to, will be data driven as we move towards smart city. That envelope for the Downtown Stafford, whether it's plot by plot and/or the overall mix of green space and/or more importantly the goals, right, to be accomplished by the aggregate amount of green space and air and light density, or air and light on each envelope, will allow us to accomplish the goals that we want. So, I am hoping that we will get this sooner rather than later as far as the Comp Plan amendment, I just submit and recommend that we include some climate smart and... *inaudible*... language into the amendments to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Apicella: So, Mr. Cummings, I would... the first thing I would say is, again we really at the midnight hour here. This is very specific to urban development and specifically Downtown Stafford. I think your thoughts about climate issues at the last sub-committee meeting of the Comp Plan Committee, they were talking about it. I think that would be a more generalized place to have that discussion in the absence of having very specific language and further discussion on what that means at this point in time, given where we are. I am not trying to say no, I mean if you have some specific language and you can tell us where it should go and what it means, I think that would be helpful. But again, we have reach... literally reached our deadline here to make final adjustments and put something forward for a public hearing in about a month.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: Is there a specific location you would like your proposed wording added to the Comp Plan for the Downtown Stafford area?

Mr. Apicella: It would replace what Mike had provided and so it would go into that specific space.

Mr. Bain: Okay...

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible*... give staff some leeway to figure out whether it is in the right place or they need to put it somewhere else, but generally it would just replace in total the yellow/red marked...

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Yeah, I know.

Mr. Apicella: ... verbiage that Mike had provided, in that particular portion of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Bain: Alright then, I would like to make a motion to...

Mr. Zuraf: Can... excuse me, sorry.

Mr. Bain: Oh, sorry Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah Mr. Chairman, sorry. Yeah, if I could... if you would go back to the PowerPoint please. I could just propose that the Chairman's language replace the second and third bullet points and may we retain that first one, which was a previous criteria that I just expanded on to address some of the issue that Mr. Cummings raised at the last meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I am good with that.

Mr. Bain: I am too. So, I would like to make a motion to that that be done and that the Downtown Stafford proposal be advertised for public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so...

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Bain and Ms. Lucian, do we need to take these up separately? The Comp Plan amendment first? Or the Zoning Ordinance text amendment first? Or can we do it together?

Ms. Lucian: I think it is helpful to do it separate, since you are making a change to the Comp Plan, just to make it clear.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so Mr. Bain, your motion is just to revise the Comp Plan amendment with the language that I proposed and, in the place, that Mike just mentioned.

Mr. Bain: Yes, that's exactly what I was thinking. Yes, I would like to change my motion...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson, you agree to that?

Mr. McPherson: Yes, that was me.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Okay, any other comments on the Comp Plan piece, Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: No additional comments, it all looks good, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, anybody else? Okay, so there's a motion to put to a public hearing the amended Comp Plan amendment language for the March 24th meeting. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Thank you everybody for the Comp Plan piece. Is there someone who wants to make a motion on the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment? Anybody?

Mr. Bain: I can... I will do that again, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Mr. McPherson you are seconding that one as well, I hear?

Mr. McPherson: Yes, second again.

Mr. Apicella: Alright thank you. Any further comments Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? I am just going to say kudos to staff for the months that we have been working on this. I appreciate all their efforts, Ms. Baker, Mr. Geouge, Mr. Zuraf, Mr. Valotta, Mr. Harvey. We have noodled this for quite a while, I think we are as far as we can go and I think it's as good as we can get up to this point. So, I look forward to the public hearing and getting comments from stakeholders on this. Alright, Mr. Bain how do you vote on the motion?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. That motion carries unanimously. Mr. Harvey, on to the next item, item 5. Is there actually something to talk about here? I didn't see anything in the agenda package.

5. RC21153698; Reclassification – Stafford County Board of Supervisors, Courthouse Road Property - A proposed zoning reclassification from the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the UD-5, Urban Development 5 Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 30-43, 30-43A, 30-43B, 30-43C, 30-43D, 30-43E, 30-43F, 30-43G, 30-44, 30-45, and 30-46, consisting of approximately 16.11 acres; and from B-3, Office, to UD-5, Urban Development 5 on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 30-50 and 30-53, consisting of approximately 13.08 acres, in the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: 100 days from Public Hearing)**
(Potential Public Hearing Date: March 24, 2021)

Mr. Harvey: No sir, there's nothing to talk about right now.

Mr. Apicella: Okay...

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, do we need to set the public hearing for that?

Mr. Apicella: Well, that's driven by when the reclassification package is ready. So, staff are indicating that they hope it will be ready for the March 24 meeting. Do you feel comfortable at this point Mr. Harvey that that seems about right, or could it be moved down, down the road even further?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman we are still aiming for that date.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Item 6, anything to say about that Mr. Harvey?

6. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance - Discuss proposed Resolution R20-81 and proposed Ordinance O20-20 to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the Implementation of the Board of Supervisors Healthy Growth Strategic

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Plan Priority. **(History: PC Work Session October 7, 2020) (BOS-PC Joint Public Hearing October 29, 2020)
(BOS Deferred)**

Mr. Harvey: No sir, other than the Board of Supervisors has it on their agenda for next Tuesday, to consider the Healthy Growth priority.

Mr. Apicella: And will that be at the evening portion of the meeting or the earlier portion of the meeting?

Mr. Harvey: It's considered as unfinished business, so it will be at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Item 7, I see that we got a potential public hearing date for May 26 and authorizing that for April 28th. So, is there anything that we need to do in the short term on that?

7. Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance - Amend Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms," Sec. 28-35, "Table of uses and standards," and Sec. 28-39, "Special regulations" in regards to cluster development regulations. **(Time Limit: May 30, 2021)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: April 28, 2021)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: May 26, 2021)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman we are sort of in a holding pattern to see what happens with Healthy Growth, because some of the code amendments dealing with the Cluster coincide with the same sections of the Code that Healthy Growth pertains to.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, so I know we are going to talk about this later on in the meeting. We are cancelling our March 10 meeting. I am just wondering whether the Committee just needs to have its antenna up and maybe start working soon after the March 2nd meeting, based on whatever happens then. Does that sound fair? I just don't want to wait until March 24th, that's only a month away from the April 28th date. Anybody... somebody?

Mr. Bain: Sounds good.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall, I think you are Chairing that?

Mr. Randall: Yes, I am.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so again I am just going to ask to follow what's going on with the Board and work with staff if you need to proceed forward soon after their March 2nd decision.

Mr. Randall: If I could, we are fairly close. We had some push back and so it was based somewhat on the Boards efforts. And so, once we have that, or get some further guidance we'll probably have to convene at least one or maybe two follow on meetings to assure we have the right language.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Randall. No new business, Planning Directors report.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wanted to report that the County Administration building will be open back up to the public next week. So, on your March 24th public hearing, we may have citizens in attendance here in the Board Chambers. We intend on operating very similar to what we did prior to the building closure, where staff will work with the applicants to maintain social distancing as well as the public to maintain social distancing within the chamber, we may utilize the ABC Conference Room for certain aspects of the meeting. We will still allow people to participate remotely as far as applicants are concerned and we will still work with the Commission to ensure that Commissioners who need to can participate remotely.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Is there an update on the joint public hearing? Is that still on or has it been moved out to a different timeframe?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, the joint public hearing is still on track for March 16th.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so that would be here in the chambers at what time Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Correct Mr. Chairman, the hearing will be here in the chambers at 7:00 pm, and we are still working on some of the logistical aspects of where everyone is going to be seated in order to maintain social distancing.

Mr. Apicella: And for those of us who still want to participate remotely, is that going to be an option?

Mr. Harvey: As far as I know, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Anything else Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: That concludes my report.

Mr. Apicella: thank you sire. County Attorney's report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: I have no report, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Lucian. Moving on to committee reports, A-2 Zoning Subcommittee, Mr. Cummings, do you have an update?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

8. Uses in A-2 Zoning Subcommittee
Next Meeting – TBD

Mr. Cummings: A brief update. We considered to get some more work on the comparison between the A-1 and A-2 and the by-right opportunities. And so, we also moved ahead to deal with some of the Boards concern about animals in the A-2. So, and we do have a follow up meeting to finalize the meeting is on the 3rd of March at 3:00 pm.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021***

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Cummings. I appreciate your work on this. Mr. Randall, Comp Plan Update Committee.

9. Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update Subcommittee
Next Meeting – March 4, 2021 @ 3:00 PM; TBD

Mr. Randall: Yes, we had a meeting on the 18th of February. We talked... we were gathering information, trying to narrow the scope of what changes we foresee to the plan. All three of us on the committee are making changes to... we are going through the Comp Plan and making changes as we see fit. We are sending those to Mr. Zuraf and hopefully all the Committee members... or the Commission members have been in discussion with your Supervisors so we have some input from Supervisors as well. And then starting on the 4th, which is our next meeting, we will be going through Chapter 1 and moving forward Chapter 2 all the way through in order to be done... in order to have some progress for some community involvement here probably the end of March into May... into April and then with sending something to the Board, as well, the end of March. Over.

10. Healthy Growth Subcommittee
Next Meeting – TBD

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Randall. Okay on to Chairman's report. Just as I kind of prefaced earlier, since we have no public hearings or over due business for the March 10 meeting, that Commission meeting is cancelled. I know it is going to create great angst for everybody on the Commission and staff not to show up that day. But I hope you will bear with us. Pursuant to our bylaws, I hereby authorizing the Vice Chairman to sign any documents in my absence. On to other business, TRC. It looks like there is something for the Aquia District. So, that has been or will be provided to Mr. McPherson. Approval of minutes. It looks like we have the January 13 minutes to approve. Is there a motion to that effect?

OTHER BUSINESS

11. New TRC Submissions
* 21153710 The Hills at Big Springs – Aquia Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

12. January 13, 2021

Ms. Barnes: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you Ms. Barnes and Mr. Bain. I will just do a quick voice vote. All those in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Mr. Bain: Aye.

*Planning Commission Minutes
February 24, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Cummings: Aye.

Mr. English: Aye.

Mr. McPherson: Aye.

Mr. Randall: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Motion carries. So, with no further business before the Commission, we are hereby adjourned. Thank you everybody. Have a good month.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:23 PM.