

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
December 14, 2016

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, December 14, 2016, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Steven Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Stinnette, Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

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

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the Board of Supervisors took action yesterday on two items that are currently on your agenda for public hearing tonight. Staff believes that those proposed changes with new referrals by the Board would essentially make the public hearings tonight ineffective and suggest they be postponed... or cancelled.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, without objection, we're going to, did you say cancel those or postpone those?

Mr. Harvey: Cancel.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, without objection we're going to cancel those.

Mr. Rhodes: Items 2 and 3?

Mr. Apicella: Items 2 and 3.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. It's now the public presentations portion of tonight's meeting. This is an opportunity for the public to speak on any matter except tonight's scheduled now one public hearing item. There'll be a separate comment period during that public hearing item when it comes up. Please state your name and address before you start your comments and address the Commission as a whole. You have 3 minutes to speak when the green light comes on. The yellow light indicates you have 1 minute left. And when you see the red light, please wrap up your comments. So, if anyone's interested, please come forward. Okay, must be the Christmas holidays; no one's coming forward. I'm going to close the public presentation portion of the meeting. Mr. Harvey, item number 1.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP16151474; Conditional Use Permit - Clearview - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a special event venue for weddings and other events on Tax Map Parcel No. 53-121A, which is a use not listed in the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District. The property consists

Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016

of 8 acres located on the east side of Forbes Street, approximately 100 feet south of Clearview Avenue, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: March 24, 2017)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Please recognize Mike Zuraf for the presentation.

Mr. Zuraf: Could I have the presentation please? Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission; Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. This item is a Conditional Use Permit for a project known as Clearview. The request is for a special event venue for weddings and other events which is a use that's not listed in the Zoning Ordinance. And there's a provision in the Zoning Ordinance that allows uses not listed to obtain a Conditional Use Permit for them to gain approval. The site is Assessor's Parcel 53-121A. The site itself is zoned R-1, Suburban Residential; it covers 8 acres. The applicant is Elizabeth Sale. The location of the site is on the east side of Forbes Street, approximately 100 feet south of Clearview Avenue. Surrounding the site on most sides are single-family dwellings, including the Clearview Heights subdivision to the east, and to the south is a parking lot for the Falmouth Baptist Church property. The site sits on a ridge overlooking Falmouth and the Rappahannock river. A driveway follows the ridgeline to the historic Clearview home. Several outbuildings are located around the property as well. The site slopes downward to the east, south, and west from the access drive and home site. The perimeter of the site is generally wooded, and there are no wetlands, floodplain, or Resource Protection Areas that would limit the development or use of the property. Clearview is a significant historical resource in the County. Clearview was originally built as a plantation house around 1740. The home was utilized during the Civil War due to its strategic location overlooking Fredericksburg. The house is one of five 18th century homes which overlook Fredericksburg and Falmouth. Clearview is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Virginia Landmarks Register. It was included in the County's Historic Overlay District in 1985. Any modifications to the existing structures... additional structures or features such as signage would require approval by the Architectural Review Board separate from this Conditional Use Permit. The General Development Plan identifies that the event venue is proposed in the location of an existing 4-car garage which is proposed to be converted, and it's in the area that's circled on the map. It's located in a central location on the property and to the east of the main house. The main house is circled in yellow, and it's not proposed to be modified as part of this request. Access to the site would be from the current entrance point off of Forbes Street. The access consists of a gravel driveway. There are two pillars that frame the entrance drive and those would likely need to be removed to accommodate entrance improvements that would be required for this type of use on this property. The existing driveway would be used as the access and parking is proposed along the driveway closer to the event facility. Commercial development standards would require paved surfaces, although the applicant may be able to seek a paving waiver at a later date. At the end of the driveway, a turnaround is proposed to optimize traffic flow in and out of the site. In combination with the existing trees that serve as transitional buffers from adjacent uses, a row of evergreen trees or fencing is proposed along a portion of the access drive that's closest to the Clearview Heights residential neighborhood to enhance screening in this location.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, can I take you back just to the discussion about the driveway. What's the width of that driveway?

Mr. Zuraf: I believe it's somewhere in the range of 14 or 15 feet.

Mr. Apicella: And would that accommodate traffic coming in two different directions?

Mr. Zuraf: There's likely going to be a need to widen the driveway a little bit to I think either 18 or 20 feet.

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: That would be something they would have to do, not something we'd have to specify in the conditions?

Mr. Zuraf: They would have to do that as they go through the site plan approval process.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: This view highlights the location of the existing structure that would be modified for the venue, the current 4-stall garage. The yellow shading denotes the area of building expansion. And then the outdoor patio space is proposed as well on the front and back of the expansion. Also, an outdoor area for weddings is shown on the GDP that the applicant may utilize as part of the overall use. The applicant also notes that there may be temporary tents or canopies that may be utilized. Staff is recommending a condition that no tents or canopies be located within 100 feet of any of the property line on the site. These are these initial renovation plans for the garage structure that would house the event venue. Again, these plans would require approval from the ARB, the Architectural Review Board. These two images show distance proximity; the image on the right shows the closest residential structures to the property, and these are to the east in Clearview Heights. They range from 25 to 45 feet from the structure, the closest point of the structure to the property line. And then the image on the left illustrates the closest structures to the venue, which are 300 and 350 feet away. A traffic study was not required for this use. The most comparable use in the ITE trip generation manual that we could identify was a church use. And we applied an estimate of should a venue have up to possibly 300 people, the seats would generate up to 555 vehicle trips on a Sunday, and so those vehicle trips could be experienced potentially on the days of these events. VDOT staff did review the application and noted that their concerns could be addressed at time of site plan. This specifically includes the site access design and site distance for people exiting out of the site looking south onto Forbes Street. Site distance issues might be addressed by removal of overgrowth along the bank that leads up to the property along Forbes Street. So, I've also included some... several Google street-view images of the current site access conditions along Forbes Street. So this is a view that you'd see traveling north on Forbes Street, and you can see the overgrowth on the right-hand side of the screen. Removal of that overgrowth could help with site distance issues. And then this is the view traveling south from Clearview Avenue towards the site access. And then this is the view from the site entrance looking south down the hill on Forbes Street. And then this is the view from the site entrance looking north along Forbes Street.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, can you go back one slide? Actually two slides, I apologize. So, there's a house sort of, not immediately across the street but in close proximity. Does staff have any concerns or VDOT have any concerns about ingress or egress, especially when there might be a large event and there are cars that are gonna want to be turning left back onto Forbes Street and its impact on the immediate neighbors?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I talked to VDOT about this and they did not have too much of a concern with left turns out of the site as long as site distance is provided. They said the usually access restrictions are in situations where you have higher volume roads where there's going to be a lot more traffic approaching and in conflict. And also, site... access limitations could cause other problems if somebody can't turn left into the property, then they have to pass the site and then somehow turn around; they may end up, you know, doing a U-turn further down the road or turning into somebody's driveway or somehow having trouble getting themselves turned back around. So that could be a problem. And then also, VDOT mentioned that if it's a lower volume road and there's no traffic, people may just generally just illegally just go ahead and do a sharp left turn where they're not supposed to. You know, VDOT's concern here they feel is the site distance and then the design of the entrance to make sure it's wide enough so you have two lanes of traffic coming in and out. That was their feeling on that.

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: So, I appreciate VDOT's perspective. I'm trying to put myself in the place of one of the immediate neighbors. I don't know how many houses there are, maybe 5, 6, 7, down that road. And I'm coming I guess it's west on Forbes Street; is that right?

Mr. Zuraf: This would be north or south.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So north...

Mr. Zuraf: Going up the hill?

Mr. Apicella: ... if I'm going towards Route 1?

Mr. Zuraf: Going south.

Mr. Apicella: South. I just do not have my directions. Why don't we try east. And I'm trying to get to my house and there are a hundred cars that are turning left onto Forbes Street and I'm just waiting to get to my house. Is that not an issue or concern and how might that be dealt with or mitigated?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, they... I guess the people exiting the site, if it's an event that's in the evening... well, more likely it's going to be during off-peak times when maybe people aren't going to be coming and going from their home. That may be less likely. Otherwise, people exiting, they're going to have to yield and wait for the... the traffic on Forbes Street has the right-of-way so they'd be pulling out in front of traffic if they were going to be, you know, doing that. And there's a pretty good distance before you get down to any stop sign which is all the way down to Route 1. So, people exiting the site, if they're all doing it at once, there's not like another stop sign immediately where there's going to be a backlog of traffic on Forbes Street I don't envision.

Mr. Apicella: Well, I just was wondering, and I don't know whether it would help or make the situation worse, if it was a right out only, as one option. And maybe Mr. English has some other suggestions as someone who works for the Sheriff's Department on a way to mitigate traffic flow right at that one point.

Mr. English: Would it be possible, Mike, if they could put a second entrance down there? You see where that little sign is? Would it be possible that they could put a right-in right there? And I don't think from the traffic coming north could to right-in and then traffic that's coming south could go left-in. Is that possible? It's high but maybe I think you could come up a little bit further.

Mr. Zuraf: There's a grade issue farther down. We'd have to look into it.

Mrs. Vanuch: Any idea, Mike, based on the expansion of the building, the occupancy numbers they're going to be getting?

Mr. Zuraf: They have mentioned in their application and through discussions that generally 100 to 200 people, but potentially up to 300.

Mrs. Vanuch: So up to 300, okay.

Mrs. Bailey: Mike, I do have a question in regards to the number of parking spaces. On this plan it's indicating 67 spaces. Is that adequate enough for an event place that would potentially hold up to 300?

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Zuraf: That amount... one moment. I believe that... I have to look back in my notes, but I believe that was the number we provided them based on the zoning requirements for the closest use in the parking tabulations was a conference facility. And I have to check to see if I based that number on 300 attendees.

Mrs. Bailey: And will these parking pads be graveled or will they be paved? Any indication what that would be?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the ordinance requirement generally is paved, but there is a potential that it could be another surface, possibly gravel. And the applicant would have to seek a waiver to have some other type of surface. And I think it is their goal, and I defer to them to confirm, but I think they would prefer some other surface other than a hard asphalt surface on this site.

Mr. Apicella: And who does that waiver request go to?

Mr. Zuraf: That waiver would be made to... is it to you? Okay, to Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Apicella: I'm still not feeling like we addressed that one issue about I'll call it the egress outside during a large event. So, I've heard in other circumstances that people who represent the venue have put folks out to help direct traffic. Is that an option? And I'm going to ask Mr. English how that might work.

Mr. English: Yeah, that would be an option. When we do for school traffic, we have the safety guards. They would probably have to come through the Sheriff's Office to do a quick class for the employees to do that and I think that would be... that would work.

Mr. Zuraf: Traffic management?

Mr. English: Yeah.

Mrs. Vanuch: Yeah, Roy and I were talking about that a second ago and he had the same recommendation.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. English: That wouldn't cost them anything, just get the employees.

Mrs. Vanuch: That might be the least costly mitigation.

Mr. Zuraf: I will defer...

Mrs. Vanuch: Is it in our power to add that type of requirement?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, you may want to I guess talk to the applicant as well just to see what their thoughts are on it. But I think you could.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Mr. Zuraf, and I was curious when I first was reading all the material, I was thinking of Belmont and that type of... because they don't have paved parking, it's a historical thing, they have

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

events. My concern was sort of the lack of lighting there when you go at night and try to find your car and try to drive out of there. But the difference sort of between Belmont and this is that this is sort of you're parking along the side where those of us who are not great at parallel parking would have sort of difficulty. Was there any discussion about trying to do something like the parking at Belmont so that it's a little bit more conducive to actually that type of things rather than people trying to squeeze in?

Mr. Zuraf: And those are perpendicular parking spaces that are shown; it's just not all striped out. But, yeah, I think the applicant wanted to try to limit the overall impact onto the site. And I guess utilizing the existing access drive is a way to kind of do that.

Mrs. Vanuch: I have a couple more questions if that's okay?

Mr. Apicella: Well, it's my fault for stopping Mike midstream. Do we want to give him a chance to... I just wanted to take the opportunity since he was talking about you know the entrance to kind of jump in and ask some questions about it.

Mrs. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And there are several conditions that are being proposed. With parking, there are conditions to ensure adequate parking in designated spaces to avoid parking on Forbes Street and not obstructing travelways. And access should be limited to the current location with entrance improvements. With screening, properties to the east of the travelway would be screened with existing vegetation, new vegetation, or privacy fence. And then with outdoor uses, the outdoor activities and canopies and tents would be set back 100 feet from any adjacent residential properties. With building design, the design of the building expansion shall be generally consistent with the elevations subject to modifications that might be necessary for ARB approval. And with food service, that food service is limited to guests of events scheduled for the property to avoid this turning into a full-service restaurant. With signage, the signage should be lower intensity and exclude electronic signs and internally illuminated signs. And limiting the hours of operation to no later than 10:00 p.m. for outdoor activities and midnight for all other events. With the Future Land Use Plan, it identifies the property within the Suburban Area land use designation. The proposed use is compatible with the Suburban Area recommendations in that the conditions intend to make the use unobtrusive to and compatible with the community around. And the proposal includes preservation of significant features and natural vegetation. And also, staff notes the use of the site as an entertainment venue should help toward the maintenance of this historic resource as opposed to the use sitting vacant. With positive aspects, the conditions would minimize negative impacts on adjacent properties and transportation network. The use meets the standards of issuance for a conditional use permit and the proposal is in conformance with the Comp Plan. And staff doesn't see any negative impacts and would recommend approval pursuant to Resolution R17-14 with the proposed conditions. And I'll take any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Zuraf. I've got a couple questions. So, I see that there were some ARB recommendations. Do we or does the ARB adjudicate its recommendations? What is the ARB's role here?

Mr. Zuraf: The ARB is going to... the applicant would have to get approval from the ARB for any modifications or expansions to any structures on the property since it's in the Historic Resource Overlay District. So, the ARB is going to evaluate the details of any building plans; also for any plans that might be even signage, they will look through those details to make sure that the work that's being done is maintaining the historic character of the property regarding materials, also the scale of the expansion as well. So, they're going to get the application and look at all those details and can approve what's being

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

proposed or they may ask for the applicant to make modifications to their plans and come back. Or they might approve the request with some... if it's just a few conditions.

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm looking at the ARB's comments, page 9 of 11, and the first one that's mentioned here is have an archaeologist present during ground disturbance. Is this one that the ARB could enforce? Since you mentioned buildings, I just want to be clear about...

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I don't think they can enforce that so that's a suggestion on the overall site.

Mr. Apicella: But it is a condition that we could, something along these lines, to have an archaeologist take a look at the site before any ground disturbance? I think it's a little... having one present might be a little too much.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I talked to the applicant about some of these points and they agree with kind of the thought of going through the, you know, typically we'll request a Phase 1 archaeological study and that can be done on the areas where any disturbance is going to be proposed. And then we have an idea of what's there before the work occurs.

Mr. Apicella: And remind me about number 2. Did we... is it in the conditions that the driveway maintain its existing alignment?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that's a recommendation in our conditions.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Now the parking on the grassed area, that would be in contrast to our Zoning Ordinance, and that would have to be through special approval.

Mr. Apicella: Right, I don't think we can set a condition that's outside the current requirements.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Apicella: Can you help me understand the 10 to 12 hours of operation for non-outdoor uses during the weekday.

Mr. Zuraf: So, we went with 10 p.m. for outdoor uses; that's in line with the noise ordinance in the County code. The noise ordinance maximum decibel levels change at 10 p.m. and so we kind of thought that was...

Mr. Apicella: To what level?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the nighttime noise level for a residential zone is 55 decibels; that's the maximum level. It drops from 60 is the daytime, 55 is the nighttime.

Mr. Apicella: And... I'm just thinking out loud here. If there was a band playing in the garage, and I realize it's about a football field away to the nearest house -- I don't know how sound travels per se, I'm not a technical expert -- but if they're hitting 60 decibels with the band, what happens?

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Zuraf: Well, that would be a potential noise violation at the property line, if at the property line they're exceeding that maximum decibel... permitted decibel level, it would be a violation of the County code.

Mr. Apicella: So we don't need to establish any conditions about noise; that's automatically going to be taken care of by itself from 10 to 12, is that kind of what I'm hearing?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, the noise ordinance is handled through the Sheriff's Department. So, typically what happens is the Sheriff's Office receives a complaint and they send a deputy out there to check out the situation to see if there are violations. If there are, then the deputy would normally advise the property owner or occupant of the property that there is a violation. And usually that resolves it.

Mr. Apicella: And is there a certain number that, you know, it becomes a problem and some action can be taken? I'm not suggesting the applicants will do that; I'm just asking hypothetically and for my own knowledge. It's the fifth time the Sheriff's Office has been called out. What happens?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not certain how that...

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman?

Ms. McClendon: Chairman Apicella, in condition 15 we have a provision that if there's a violation of county, state or federal law, the CUP may be revoked. Violation of the County code would be a violation of a County ordinance and the Board and the Planning Commission could consider revoking the CUP if it becomes a continued problem.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. So, Mrs. Bailey asked this question about the parking areas and I must have zoned out, I'm sorry. You said there were 67 on the GDP. So, no matter what number they are trying to get to, they're going to have to match the number of parking spaces with the maximum number of people they can have at any given time, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So, if 67 is not enough and they're going to have 300 visitors, or 150 cars, they're going to need 150 spaces, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman? I did look in the code while the presentation was going on and Mr. Zuraf is correct. The ordinance standard for a conference facility has 4.5 persons per parking space. So that's the minimum required. They would have to at least provide 67. They could provide more. Often times property owners provide more parking than our ordinance requires because they want it to be convenient for the patrons of the business. If the patron can't find parking, they're not going to want to go there. So, more than likely the owners will probably have more parking provided than the County code requires.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Harvey. Other questions? Mrs. Bailey?

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mrs. Bailey: The conditional use permit is for the wedding event venue. The existing property -- is that in current use for anything do you know?

Mr. Zuraf: It's currently vacant.

Mrs. Bailey: Okay. What is the possibility of that, for whatever reason, being used as a bed and breakfast, or ancillary use to a wedding? For instance, you may have the bride come in the night before with her entourage. So what would the possibility of additional use without that being addressed in this conditional use permit application?

Mr. Zuraf: They would likely, and it's not in the Zoning Ordinance, but I think the bed and breakfast type of use would require a separate conditional use permit approval. So, they'd have to go through that separately.

Mrs. Bailey: Okay. And then, as far as meal planning, usually with a wedding you're going to have... I mean, are we talking about catered events? Will there be onsite cooking? Do you have any information on that?

Mr. Zuraf: My understanding is it's basically like a warming kitchen. So, the food is brought in and then there's a kitchen for food preparation for the events.

Mrs. Bailey: And then one last question. When you have service vendors come to do weddings, will they need to have designated parking? I don't see that on the GDP, if in fact that might be required.

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check on that to see if...

Mr. Harvey: Mrs. Bailey, they would be required to have a loading space.

Mrs. Bailey: So, when they go through the site plan, that would be a part of that...?

Mr. Zuraf: Captured during that review.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: A couple quick questions. Since you mentioned bringing stuff to it, trash, you know, a trash receptacle or something I'm assuming there'll have to be one there but I don't see it on anything. Is that something that we promise that in the future we'll look into?

Mr. Zuraf: My understanding from the applicant is that they are going to be requiring the people operating the venue that they'd have to remove the trash after each event each day.

Mr. Coen: Okay. And then refresh my memory -- are there any plans relating to Forbes Street as when we're looking at the Falmouth Historic District, as far as widening, fixing, doing anything, or is this outside of what we generally think of as the Historic Falmouth area?

Mr. Zuraf: It's just outside of our designated kind of historic area for Falmouth and I'm not aware of any near term plans to make improvements to Forbes Street (inaudible).

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Coen: And the reason why I'm thinking that, if we were trying to make the Historic Falmouth Area walkable and people wanted to go up to this historic site, even just to look at the house if there's nothing in it, to see it, maybe see a plaque, do that little thing everybody does now that looks like little black and white bubbly things but I don't remember the name of it.

Mrs. Bailey: Little bubbly things?

Mr. Coen: You know, the little square things that you go and you get historical information from. QR Code, right. Well, they were really big... I know on the Historical Commission we were big on that. There's no way for anybody to really do that or know about that. So, I'm just sort of thinking ahead that if we have envisioned this idea of a historic area where we are cherishing property like this. You can walk to Belmont if you're in downtown Falmouth. So, we would like to tie it in but there's no way to get there. Because I know driving to and from work, it's not really user friendly with school buses and other things and it just wouldn't be safe to try to walk up that hill to go up there.

Mr. English: It looks like it would be through Falmouth parking lot, through that area in the backside of Falmouth Baptist Church.

Mr. Coen: Right. I mean, you could well do that. And that would be a nice way... and also, you could wrap your wedding or your other event into hey, why don't we take part and enjoy the downtown Falmouth and that could help the whole community.

Mr. Apicella: Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: I have a couple questions. The first is alcohol -- allowed to be served on the premises?

Mr. Zuraf: They would have to get an ABC license. There's no prohibition of that in our use permit.

Mrs. Vanuch: Okay. And have any neighbors been notified as part of this process? Have we gotten any feedback from any of the adjoining pieces of land?

Mr. Zuraf: All abutting property owners have been notified and I've not received any inquiries from any of the abutting property owners.

Mrs. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Does that include the church?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mrs. Vanuch: That's all my questions.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Okay, thank you. Will the applicant like to come forward?

Ms. Sale: Hi. Did you all have some questions?

Mr. Apicella: Did you have anything you wanted to state in advance?

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Ms. Sale: We're excited about embarking on this endeavor of turning our family's property into an event facility. And we've tried to be thoughtful about the history of the property. And when you guys were talking about things like parking and paving the driveway, widening the driveway, we want to be able to, certainly when people rent the facility, be able to know that if there's emergency vehicles that need to come that they have easy access. That was part of the reason for the turnaround in front of the house. And when Mike talked about exploring the possibility of alternate surfaces for the driveway, our thought was to, if it was possible down the road when we get there, consider tar and chip which would be kind of a mix of gravel and pavement. One of you all brought up loading areas. If you look at the area right in front of the garage, there is... that was our thought of where loading would take place, loading and unloading, and there would also be ample handicap parking. And that would be ramped down to a small patio in front of the structure.

Mr. Apicella: Just one second Mr. English. Could we just get your name and address for the record?

Ms. Sale: My name's Elizabeth Sale.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. I'm sorry Mr. English, go ahead.

Mr. English: Ms. Sale, are you going to do anything with the house? Is the house going to be used for anything?

Ms. Sale: The house is presently getting a little tender loving care and part of what we... why we want to do this is to be able to create some income to keep the property up.

Mr. English: Understood.

Ms. Sale: And we don't want to have any bed and breakfast sort of thing going on in that house. I know one of you all brought that up. We have no interest in having renters ever spend the night. We'd like to be able to offer the house to be used for brides to come and go for services and that sort of thing, but the house was built in the 1700s and we just don't feel it's safe really for people to be in there, you know, for events.

Mr. English: Is it going to be kind of like the one in Spotsylvania? I don't know if you're familiar with the one in Spotsylvania on 208 on the right.

Ms. Sale: I haven't been there.

Mr. English: It's a farm, you've got the older houses and they use the houses for the brides and stuff and that's it.

Ms. Sale: The house will in essence be more of a backdrop and that's why the structure that's now a 4-car garage, that if we're allowed to move forward, would be more than doubled in size. That would house the event venue. And again, the first floor of the house I can see being used for pictures and, you know, the bridal party perhaps getting dressed downstairs, not upstairs. So it would be used some but more as a backdrop.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? So, what you heard Mr. Zuraf talking about in terms of the ARB was potentially doing a Phase 1 study. Are you okay with that?

Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016

Ms. Sale: Yes. In fact, when Mike and I spoke yesterday, he brought up some of the ARB's points and I made a phone call to a friend of ours who works for Dovetail and just asked how they tend to work with people who are doing this sort of thing. And he said that what, as far as needing someone to be there from his firm for every time a shovel would be put in the ground is overkill and would be very expensive for us. But what he would want to do would want to take a look at where we're proposing to make changes on the grounds, being additions or adding to the driveway or whatever, and in those places go in and do archaeological studies. And then if there's something there that's of interest, then explore it further and kind of move as they find things.

Mr. Apicella: So, my only other question is, again, about ingress and egress and do you have any thoughts or ideas about how to mitigate the impacts on your neighbors, if you have a large event and a lot of people are trying to leave at the same time?

Ms. Sale: Yes. Again, we want people to use our venue and we want them to be able to use it safely, both coming and going. And in so doing I feel like we need to change the entrance as well. And I want VDOT to help us with that. It's narrow right now; it's at the top of the hill. We feel like if we were to move the pillars that are there now further in the driveway and widen that entrance so that a car can kind of pull out in different directions depending whether they're going to go north towards Clearview subdivision or south towards Falmouth Bottom. And generally, in events I feel like people are arriving more at the same time and leaving in a staggered nature. I'm sure that's not going to be the case a hundred percent of the time, but I feel like if you're worried about lights shining in neighbors windows as people are pulling out, I don't feel like it's going to be an impact really. I don't think it's going to be 200 cars at once on a regular basis at all. Because people generally leave, like wedding receptions and those sorts of things, over an hour or two, not all at once.

Mr. Apicella: I appreciate that. I still have some concern having been to some events, because, at the end of the day, you might choose to do things beyond weddings, right? It's possible. And people are all... you've got 30 cars wanting to leave at the same time and the person right across the street wants to get to their house and they're blocked from getting there unless and until just because the nature of some people leaving a venue sometimes, they're all pulling out at the same time and they're not being cordial to the person who's waiting to travel down Forbes Street. So I'm just thinking of one of the things we talked about is potentially training some staff, not all the time, but if there's a big event and everybody's leaving at the same time, to help do some traffic management. Is that something you'd be amenable to?

Ms. Sale: That's a good point. We would urge public transportation buses, that sort of thing, when it's appropriate so more people are able to leave in one vehicle at the same time. Also, in our journey with looking at this property, we have found, if we get this conditional use permit awarded to us, one of the next things that we would do would have the property lines marked by a surveyor because it hasn't been surveyed since the 80s. And it looks like the church has built one of their parking lots partially on our property, and so we would like to explore being able to use for some of the events as valet parking, that church parking lot. And that's down the road but it does look like a good quarter of that upper parking deck was allowed to be built on our property. And until we took a look at all this when we were exploring doing the venue, we never knew that. So we would like to be able to have, you know, the safe parking, safe entrance, safe exit, and certainly wouldn't want to upset any of the neighbors.

Mr. Apicella: So, again, just in thinking in terms of a potential additional conditional use... additional condition, would you be willing to provide traffic management when and if needed during certain events? Again, that's having people standing out there directing traffic.

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Ms. Sale: When and if needed during certain events. Yeah, if it looked like we were going to have a large event and if it was going to be for instance a funeral service or memorial service where people would be leaving all at once, I would think that it would be very appropriate to have some sort of, you know, whether it's hiring an external party to halt traffic or whatever, I would think that that would be something we'd be willing to explore.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Anyone else? Alright, thank you so much.

Ms. Sale: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Apicella: I'll now open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on this particular item. Please direct your comments to the Planning Commission as a whole, not to any specific member. You have up to 3 minutes to speak. Please state your name and address when the green light comes on. The yellow light indicates you have 1 minute left. When the red light comes on, please quickly wrap up your comments. Yes ma'am.

Ms. Holbert: Hi, I'm Jenny Holbert and have the property that you saw in the photographs; it's Lavender Heights Bed and Breakfast. It's right across the street. And I just want to first start out by saying I really welcome the opportunity to have them... have this as a wedding and event conference meeting site. I think it would be a really great opportunity and it's talking about the highest and best use of that property, I think that would be a really smart thing for this to have. So I would recommend your favorable consideration. I do have some of the same questions that you would have about traffic ability because having lived there now for 6 years there have been rollovers going down the hill. People are traveling way too fast going up and down the hill and when you're coming up the hill to the top, if there was a car stopped right at the top you may not see it and you're going to have to stop suddenly. So, I appreciate the conversations you were having earlier about really working closely to make sure that you don't have a backup. You know, say maybe an hour before a wedding were to start you could have everybody coming in pretty much in a pretty concentrated timeframe. Their egress probably they straddle out but, you know, like Ms. Sale was saying, there are certain times when ingress or egress would be very concentrated. And my property sits up a lot higher so I wouldn't worry about headlights at night because I sit about 10-12 feet higher than the surface of the road. Forbes Street does take bailout traffic also, from 95 and Route 1. Friday afternoons I should be out there with a lemonade stand with my business cards because it's going so slow, and it's usually going downhill, it's not coming uphill. So that's just something I wanted to point out to you from my experience. And I think there's a way we can work it out with the proper signage. I am restricted to a 4 square-foot sign that cannot be backlit and I am zoned R-1. With a conditional use permit it would probably be similar. And I can tell you that my guests... no one sees the sign. No one knows there's a B&B there; they have no clue what's going on up at Lavender Heights because they can't see the sign, it's not lit. So, actually I would make a recommendation that a waiver be given so that we could have some kind of tasteful appropriate lighting for both properties because we would both have guests coming and going and it would maybe help the whole situation as far as trafficability. You don't want people going up, missing the turn, and turning around; that would create a safety hazard because they would go up to Clearview or Clearview Avenue and it just... it would be a problem I think. And then just recognize that I would think most events would be on the weekends and evenings. So, except on Friday night when you have bailout traffic it probably would be off-peak, just not Friday night. I appreciate the comment about the driveway further on down the line going from gravel. My concern would be dust mitigation; not noise, but dust mitigation for the driveway, especially on a hot... you know, on a hot summer day when you're in the middle of a drought. I think that's about it. I really welcome them to come and have this event. And I might get some spill-over lodging from the events.

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mr. Apicella: Sounds like a good opportunity for a partnership.

Ms. Holbert: So I'm not offended by that at all. Thank you very much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Clifton: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I'm Irma Clifton and I live in beautiful historic downtown Falmouth. I'm here tonight to support the Clearview property conditional use permit. This is a lovely site and would lend itself to such a use as is being proposed. I do foresee a few issues which you all have covered tonight, by the way, such as traffic control, overflow parking, lighting, noise, and paving. But, I believe these can be resolved before the time of the site plan approval. With oversight by the County's ARB and restrictions placed on properties in a National Register Historic District, the integrity and sense of place should be protected and ensure that one of the gems of Falmouth -- I think they said there were five -- from that era is preserved for the next generation to learn from and enjoy. Belmont has a similar operation that has proved to be an asset and adds to their revenue stream which is especially important in maintaining historic properties, I can tell you that. Also, Belmont is located on a narrow 2-lane road and I have not seen or experienced any adverse impact on traffic. It's on the, as you all know, on the north side of... west side of Washington Street and traffic comes barreling down there from 17, but there has not been any issue with that as far as I know. I believe this property to be a creative and worthwhile use for a historic property, and that staff recommended conditions will contribute to the successful operation and that this project will be a welcome part of Historic Falmouth's community. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Anyone else? Seeing no one else, I'll close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. This just happens to be in the Falmouth District. I'd like to talk about and have us consider a couple of additional conditions based on the conversation and some of the concerns raised by the two public commenters. The first one, and actually I think the second one as well, might be that we need to tweak the language that I'm proposing here. But I'd like to add a condition that a Phase 1 archaeological study be conducted prior to any land disturbance. I see a head nod from the applicant. And the second one would be sufficient traffic management commensurate with the size and scope of specific events.

(Inaudible from audience.)

Mr. Apicella: Sufficient traffic management commensurate with the size and scope of events.

Mr. Boswell: What does that mean?

Mr. Apicella: I mean, I'm open to any language that further clarifies it, but I'm struggling with trying to define when traffic management might be required. I don't know whether it's a hundred cars leaving at the same time, 200 cars; I think it's just kind of something that would have to be worked out. But if anyone has any other language, I'm certainly open to it.

Ms. Sale: Do you mean that you want VDOT to get involved in directing us in how...?

Mr. Apicella: No, what I'm saying is for specific events, you may need to have some kind of traffic management. And as one public commenter mentioned, it might also be in terms of ingress as well as egress. So I didn't want to limit it to just egress; there might be times when you have a lot of vehicles entering into the property because, you know, you've got chairs and food and whatever being delivered at a certain time and you've got traffic that's also wanting to go one way or the other. So, I'm leaving it

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

pretty broad and also a little bit vague. I don't know how to further define it. I know conceptually what I mean but, and I'm not sure if I'm adequately saying...

Mr. English: I get what you're saying. I don't know if you want to put a car limit or not on it either. Just somebody that's going to be managing your traffic if you've got, like Mr. Apicella said, if you've got a hundred cars and you know that's going to be coming out at one time, like you said you had a funeral, you're going to have somebody, employees or something like that, sees that the traffic moves flow and stop it if need be and have some sort of traffic training is I think where he wants to go with this.

Ms. Sale: Okay, that sounds good.

Mr. English: Am I right?

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. English: So I don't know if that's a good time to put a limit on the cars because 25 cars can mess up the whole thing, so I don't know if I would (inaudible).

Mr. Apicella: That's why I'm saying commensurate with the size and scope of the event, because it might vary. One event might have a hundred cars and it might not be a problem. Another event might have 25 cars and it could be problematic. Is that...?

Ms. Sale: Yeah, I would agree to that.

Mr. English: And then you might, just a suggestion Ms. Sale, you may want to talk to one of our traffic guys at the Sheriff's Office, maybe get some guidance from them. They may be able to give you some insight too.

Ms. Sale: Perfect, we'll do that.

Mr. English: I'm always open to whatever you need, contacts, I can help you on that end of it.

Ms. Sale: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Any other comments before I pass the gavel to Mr. Coen?

Mrs. Vanuch: There was one other comment that I had about the sign. Is it within our scope to provide some type of a waiver to allow them to put a larger backlit sign?

Mr. Apicella: I think that goes back to the other discussion about the change in the surface of the parking. We don't have the ability to on our own wave; it would have to follow whatever the normal and customary process is for the County.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the sign ordinance stipulates the size of signs. Currently, in the R-1 zone it is 4 square feet as was provided in the previous testimony.

Mrs. Bailey: And the ARB may have some input in that as well.

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

Mrs. Vanuch: Well let me encourage you to come to our sign public hearing maybe with the Board of Supervisors in January where they're redoing the sign ordinance.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you. And if memory serves me, we need to vote on the... nope, we can... okay. So, we have the issue, I'll turn to Mr. Apicella and see if he has a motion for us.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move for approval of CUP 16151474, the Conditional Use Permit for Clearview, with the addition of two conditions which I'll restate, if I can find them. Adding conditions to include Phase 1... the applicant will conduct or provide a Phase 1 archaeological study prior to any land disturbance. And then an additional condition, that sufficient traffic management will be provided commensurate with the size and scope of events.

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Coen: Okay, we have a motion by Mr. Apicella, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. Any further comment Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I would just actually echo the comments of both our two public commenters that this is a great opportunity for the area, that I think it will spur economic development. It's a great site. I think it's something that is probably well needed in the area and in the long term I think it will help preserve that site for the future. So, I appreciate what you're doing and I look forward to when it gets built out and you start having some customers. Thank you.

Mr. Coen: Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Alright, anyone else?

Mrs. Vanuch: I just wanted to commend the applicant that what you're doing to preserve the property is very positive for the community and wanted to echo Mr. Apicella's comments. And it obviously shows that you're trying to be a great neighbor and that they were willing to come out and speak on your behalf, so that shows that you've really put a lot of thought into this.

Mr. Coen: Alright, and I'll just echo everyone else. I think it's a great way to preserve a historic area and to make Falmouth what we've envisioned it to be. So, good job. Alright, so if we will now take a vote; everyone gets to play with their device. And the motion passes 7 to 0. And I hand the gavel back to you and I wish the applicant great success.

Ms. Sale: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Again, items 2 and 3 have been cancelled, so we're moving onto Unfinished Business, item number 4, now item number 2, the reclassification of Courtyards of Colonial Forge.

2. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O16-40 would amend Stafford County Code Sec. 28-33, "Districts Generally;" Sec. 28-34, "Purpose of Districts;" Sec. 28-35, "Table of Uses and Standards;" Sec. 28-39, "Special Regulations," and Sec. 28-102, "Off Street Parking" to create the ICTP, Integrated Corporate and Technology Park Overlay Zoning District. The ICTP district would promote the integration of uses such as Class A office space, hotel space for corporate clientele, supporting retail services, data centers, and child care—to facilitate

the growth and development of large scale corporate office and technology parks. The proposed Ordinance would established by right, conditional, and special exception uses; development requirements; and special regulations. **(Time Limit: December 27, 2016)**

3. Amendment to Subdivision Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O16-42 would amend Sec. 22-118, "Water and sewer" to modify standards for on-site sewage disposal systems by removing the minimum size of 4,000 square feet in area for a primary unfiltered, and establishing a uniform minimum size of 2,500 square feet in area and a capacity mandate at least 400 gallons per day per dwelling unit on a peak flow basis. The proposed Ordinance would also eliminate the minimum size requirements for on-site sewage disposal systems located on existing improved parcels where an existing on-site sewage disposal system has failed, is to be upgraded, or is subject to a boundary line adjustment. **(Time Limit: December 17, 2016)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. RC16151294; Reclassification - The Courtyards of Colonial Forge - A proposed zoning reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-3, Urban Residential—High Density Zoning District, to allow for the development of 39 multi-family dwelling units on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 28-94B and 28-94C. The property consists of 7.701 acres, located on the east side of Woodcutters Road and north side of Kellogg Mill Road and Accokeek Furnace Road, within the Hartwood Election District. (The development as a whole would include a total of 49 multi-family dwelling units, including Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-84, 28-100, and 28-94A which were previously rezoned to the R-3 Zoning District.) **(Time Limit: February 17, 2017)**
(History: Deferred on November 9, 2016 to December 14, 2016)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mike Zuraf will give the staff update.

Mr. Zuraf: Hello again. This is a request for a reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-3, Urban Residential-High Density Zoning District, to allow for the development of 39 townhouse residential units. On this site, the development includes a total of 49 residential units. The public hearing on the application was conducted on November 9th and the related discussion was deferred to this meeting. There were two issues of concern raised at the time. First was the Commission raised concerns about the proffered noise mitigation measures not including measurable standards. The applicant has proposed changed to proffer number 7 to specify that materials would reduce noise levels within each residential unit to a 45 decibel level or less. And there was a question from one of the Commissioners -- if you can go to the presentation please -- of what 45 decibels mean. And so we have this handy chart that is used occasionally. And this shows typical sounds that are associated with different decibel levels. So, you can see in the 40 to 50 decibel range, that corresponds with a typical suburban area background or library. And doing some other research, that 45 decibel level also can correspond with the noise generated from a computer, a refrigerator, babbling brook, or light traffic.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, this is a great chart. Can you send it to us?

Mr. Zuraf: Sure. Okay, and then the next issue was due to the project being located within the Airport Overlay Zone of the Comp Plan, the Commission requested input from the Stafford Regional Airport Authority. And subsequent to the meeting, you received comments from the Stafford Regional Airport Authority. A summary of those comments include that although they recognize that the incompatibilities with higher density housing in this location, the Regional Airport Authority is not opposed to the project due to the scale of the project, the existing conditions, and prior approvals and proffered mitigation efforts that they're offering. And the memorandum was included in your

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

attachment. The time limit for the Planning Commission to act on this is February 17th. And I'll turn it back for any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Any questions for staff? Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission, my name is Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler Fleischer and we represent the applicant. Thank you for your time this evening. Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays to you all. This is your last meeting of the year; I'm sure you're excited about that, as are we. I think I would just simply just reiterate just a few quick comments and thanks to staff for its presentation. I don't have a very fancy chart but I appreciate the analogy that was presented by staff. I thought the bottom one was snake at first when I first looked at it, so it would have been a very quiet snake. But anyways, just a reminder, this is a very small infill project. It's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The uses that surround us are very similar as well. We also are preserving about close to 50% open space, which exceeds the requirement under the underlying zoning district. As staff had noted, Mr. Rhodes had asked us to take a look at sound mitigation, which we did, consistent with what a prior project had also presented. We went right to that project and basically utilized similar language to that. And then also obviously the airport's input that they do not oppose this project; we appreciate those comments as well and respectfully happy to answer any other questions you may have regarding this initiative.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Payne. Any questions for the applicant? Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: I'll bring it back to the Commission. Mr. English, this is in your district.

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, I think it looks good. He's got good proffers and everything like that and I'm happy with the reaching out to the airport and the airport's comments. So, with that, I'd like to make... to go ahead and approve RC16151294.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Apicella: And, just for clarification, we're looking at and improving the amended proffers dated November 10, is that correct? With the change in the... or the clarification on the decibel levels?

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Okay, there's been a motion and it's been seconded. Any further comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Boswell? Anyone else? Alright, cast your votes. Okay, the motion carries 6-1 (*Mr. Coen opposed*). Thank you very much. No New Business. Planning Director's Report, Mr. Harvey.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

✧ Yearly Expenditures

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wanted to start off the report by wishing the Planning Commission a Happy Holidays. Staff is very appreciative of our opportunity to work with you throughout the year. We feel we've had a very productive year and have accomplished a lot. Looking at some of the items for the end of the year, I've provided the expenditure report. And that shows that the Commission is well within its expenditure limitations in the budget. That's essentially a mid-year review from a fiscal year standpoint, but it happens that it coincides with the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Apicella: So we have about two weeks to go crazy? Christmas party! Sorry Mr. Harvey.

✧ Subdivision Plans

✧ 2017 Meeting Calendar

Mr. Harvey: And the Planning Commission previously asked staff to give the Commission periodic updates about constructions plans that have been approved for residential subdivisions. As you may recall, on July 1st of 2014 state law changed and we had to change the local ordinance regarding preliminary subdivision plans where the County could not require a preliminary subdivision plan for 50 or fewer lots. Since that time, we've had 9 subdivisions that have been approved and went directly to a construction plan and did not have a preliminary plan. So, that's 9 subdivisions for a year and a half. Also, staff has included the...

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, but do you mind? I think Mr. Coen has a question.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Coen: Just a quick question. Since many of us dove deeply into the numbers for developments for the Comp Plan, did these come in as expected, lower, higher, do we know?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Coen, these were all by-right subdivisions. As you can tell by the chart, almost all of them are A-1, Agricultural. There was one R-1 project, but that did not ask for any additional density bonuses, so it's all well within the by-right density allocations. Did that answer your question?

Mr. Coen: Yes sir. I just remembered all the discussions about where we're going to put it and how much was going outside the growth areas and how much in and all those ratios. And I was just curious if what was actually coming through was on target of what Mr. Zuraf was always using as his numbers, or was it coming in lower and we have to worry about it? So that's what I was just thinking, sort of going between the two Mikes' mentalities in numbers loving.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Coen, I think this is probably the trend we're going to see from the most part in the future is that most of our residential and higher density zones are going to be projects larger than 50 lots and have to come through the Commission, whereas projects that are smaller will probably choose to bypass the preliminary plan process. I would like to note that staff is observing that our supply of lots that have been platted but not built on is shrinking due to the pickup in the economy over the last few years. So, we're almost back to what I would refer to as normal operations where we have less than 2,000 platted lots that aren't built. This year we're looking at possibly building around... having a total of around 800 or more homes built this year, which is an uptick from last year. So, we're seeing the

*Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016*

trend continue to move upward, but no indication of any real spike in housing development. Also, I wanted to let the Commission know we've provided a draft calendar for next year. It's for you to think about, look at the calendar dates, and we'll talk about that at the first January meeting. Last night the Board of Supervisors had a very busy meeting and there was a number of things that they dealt with that may be of interest to the Commission. In the afternoon, they approved the Dollar General Store rezoning on Courthouse Road. They also referred the Integrated Corporate and Technology Park Overlay Zone back to the Planning Commission. That was one of the public hearings that was cancelled for tonight. The Board asked the Commission to hold a public hearing on the Overlay Ordinance as it was originally drafted with the minor modification in the overall description of the purpose of the district. The Board deferred Patriot's Crossing; they had some community concerns that they wanted to have looked at further dealing with the buffers between the proposed project and the existing Park Ridge neighborhood, as well as some questions that the School Board still had. The Sign Ordinance went to public hearing and was deferred. The Board has asked staff to amend some of the amendments that pertain the comments we received after the Planning Commission's public hearing. We had received comments from a couple different entities about ways to improve the ordinance, and the Board would like to see that incorporated into the draft.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Harvey, so as part of that effort, is there going to be any further reach out to potential stakeholders before a final draft is ready to go?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Board talked about having staff modify the ordinance, but also talked about possibly referring the issue back to the Planning Commission. It wasn't clear to me if they were intending on adopting the ordinance as modified and then ask the Commission to dive deeper into the ordinance for other... to address the concerns that the Commission had. I think that still has yet to be finally determined in January on the 24th. So there may be more opportunity for input. The Board also, thanks to Commissioner Vanuch's help, approved the Cemetery Ordinance. That was a unanimous approval. And they also approved the Telecommunication Tower Conditional Use Permit at Duff Green Park.

Mr. Rhodes: I think that was about the fastest ordinance writing, development, and approval we've ever had.

Mr. Apicella: Great work.

Mr. Harvey: And, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report, and again, Happy Holidays.

Mr. Apicella: Before we move on from Planning Director's Report, I just want to say the beard's looking really good and I'm wondering if you're auditioning for a Santa role somewhere. Okay, County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

Mr. Apicella: I'm shocked, just shocked!

Mr. Coen: You did a nice job last night.

Ms. McClendon: Thank you.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: There are no Committee Reports. Chairman's Report. Well, first of all, I just want to thank everyone for their hard work this past year and the tremendous efforts in particular of staff. We were just well served by what I think is the best staff in the entire Commonwealth. So, thank you so much to you, Jeff, and everyone who works in your office. I want to thank everyone for giving me the opportunity to be Chairman this year. It's been fun. It's also been an honor and a privilege, and again I thank everybody for giving me this opportunity. And I just want to wish everybody a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and I want to give folks an opportunity to say anything before we close out this year, if they would like to.

Mr. English: I just have one question. Mr. Harvey, are we going to have the opportunity to meet the new County Administrator? Is he going to come to one of our meetings? Is that appropriate?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. English, I don't know yet. From what I've been told, the new Administrator will start February 1st. So, we'll have to see once he gets on board and gets acclimated what his itinerary will be.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: I think it's a condition of his contract that he has to sit through our longest meeting.

Mr. Apicella: So, would anyone like to make any comments or press on?

Mrs. Vanuch: As the newest member of the Planning Commission this year, it's been an honor to serve with all of you. And staff, you've been very, very helpful. And I want to thank each and every one of you because when I first joined, I think everybody reached out to me, offered their help and assistance, specifically every one of you I could name at any different point in time kind of held my hand through learning curves and helping me identify opportunities to serve the community a little bit better. So I really appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Coen?

Mr. Coen: Real quickly. Just a humongous thank you to Jeff and the staff, Ms. McClendon, for a terrific job. Thank you Mr. Apicella, Mrs. Bailey, for everything you've done this year. I can't believe we've accomplished so much, and Mrs. Vanuch, the cemetery thing was just an amazing accomplishment for somebody who just started on the board. So, I think that is something to be very much... greatly appreciated. And thank you again.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Coen.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. Rhodes: While being a bit redundant, I don't think it's undeserved and certainly I think all are very appreciative of the great work of the staff and the super job that Jeff does leading them. I think we have, the last few years, provided some feedback, both to the County Administrator as well as the Chairman of

***Planning Commission Minutes
December 14, 2016***

the Board of Supervisors, for consideration as they're going through their performance evaluations. And I think that'd be, given our strong feelings towards the tremendous professionalism and support provided by the staff, not just for us but in their work with clients and customers and citizens of the County, I think it'd be appropriate for us to have a communication that goes forward again this year.

Mr. Apicella: Sounds good. I think that's a great idea. Anyone else? Alright, moving on, Other Business; TRC for the 28th cancelled. Darn, I'm sure everybody's upset about that. And then a TRC meeting in January; it looks like I have an item there and one for Hartwood and Garrisonville as well. So the last item for tonight is approval of minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

5. TRC Information - December 28, 2016 - Cancelled
6. TRC Information - January 11, 2017
 - * Telecommunications Tower at Smokehouse - Hartwood Election District
 - * Austin Ridge Commercial Center - Garrisonville Election District
 - * Heather Hills Section 5 - Falmouth Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 12, 2016

Mr. Rhodes: I make a motion for approval of the October 12th minutes.

Mrs. Bailey/Mrs. Vanuch: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, cast your vote. (*The minutes passed 7-0.*)

Mr. Rhodes: Darrel's always first; what does he do over there?

Mr. Apicella: Okay, with no further business being before the Commission, we are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.