

**JOINT MEETING OF THE  
STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
AND UTILITIES COMMISSION  
March 14, 2018**

The joint meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission and Utilities Commission of Wednesday, March 14, 2018, was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chairman Crystal Vanuch in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Crystal Vanuch, Steven Apicella, Albert Bain, Roy Boswell, Darrell English, Fillmore McPherson, Barton Randall

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Daniel Wisniewski, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Brian Geouge, Susan Blackburn, Andrea Hornung

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Now at this time we'll pause for any declarations of disqualification from the Commission on any of the agenda items tonight. Does anybody have any declarations of disqualification? Seeing none, we're going to move on to the public presentations portion of tonight's meeting.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Vanuch: So this is the time where anyone from the public can come down to the podium and speak for three minutes on any item, other than one of the items on tonight's agenda for public hearing. You'll have three minutes when the green light comes on, one minute when the yellow light comes on, and when the red light comes on, please commence with your comments. And when you come to the podium, please state your name, address and the district you reside. Would anyone like to come forward?

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, the Rock Hill district. I also own property in the Griffis-Widewater district, but I'm not giving the address. Tomorrow is the last day for any of you who have your land assessed to appeal. If you need any help, you can freely contact me at whyhavehoas@gmail.com, or quitsoliciting@yahoo.com. I've been out in the community and as Planning Commissioners you should see all the sidewalks to nowhere that are filling in. You can now walk from the post office to the landscaping business, get some gas and St. Patrick's Day is coming up for those of you who have Mc in your name. Then at St. Patty's on Saturday I love to get smirks. Remember there's 14 people up here. That's not a prime number. 7 is a prime number. Much better committee. We could have a stalemate here. Oh I'm sorry, there's 7 apiece. Let me continue to the auto part store, then you can either go to Wings to Go or Sam's or that Thai restaurant Nara. And if you get upset, you can go to Dan's pharmacy. Get yourself some pills for indigestion, because now you have a sidewalk. Just keeping on the sidewalk and you go to Arby's and they got good deals between 2 and 5 pm. I want to remind the public that five of the Planning Commissioners voted to repeal and did not replace. We'll see next Tuesday where we go. There was three attorneys before me who kind of told you broke it, we broke the law. At MIT we don't have lawyers, we have scientists. Finally, let me finish with, I've been working on a new flag. You know we have 50 stars there, but I was corrected by a boy scout, he used to say 46 states, we only have 45. So that'll work out in my flag that we have 4 Commonwealth where common sense is not common and the

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

republic of Texas will have a row all by itself. So we'll still have 50. And to finish, remember that the word American says I can, the word republican says I can, the last three letters in democrat says R-A-T.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Waldowski. Would anyone else like to come down and speak on the public presentation portion of tonight's meeting? Okay, seeing none, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of tonight's meeting and we'll move on to the first item on our agenda, which is actually a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission and the Stafford County Utilities Commission.

**JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan - Water and Sewer System Master Plan - A proposal to amend the Stafford County Virginia Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036 (Plan), to update and replace the Water and Sewer System Master Plan element of the Plan as identified in the document entitled *Draft* "Stafford County, Department of Utilities, Water and Sewer System Master Plan," dated January 9, 2018. **(Time Limit: April 15, 2018)**

Ms. Vanuch: So if you guys will just bear with me, I have just a few rules that will govern tonight's meeting. The first is that the Planning Commission Chair will chair the joint public hearing and meeting, except when the Planning Commission temporarily relinquishes chairmanship to the Utilities Commission Chairman. The next is, the Planning Commission by-laws shall govern the meeting, except during the Utilities Commission only portion of the joint public hearing and meeting. Presentations by staff and the applicant, public comments and the applicant's rebuttal will be given to the Planning Commission and Utilities Commission jointly. Members of both, the Planning Commission and Utilities Commission, may pose questions to staff or the applicant during their presentations. Members of the Planning Commission and Utilities Commission are not permitted to engage members of the other body in debate. After close of the public hearing by the Planning Commission chair, the meeting will be turned over to the Utilities Commission and the Utilities Commission chairman for the Utilities Commission's discussion, debate and recommendations upon the joint public hearing items. During the Utilities Commission portion of the meeting and until its business is concluded, no member of the Planning Commission is permitted to participate and/or engage the Utilities Commission members in discussion, as the Planning Commission members are not members of the Utilities Commission. After the Utilities Commission has voted on the item, the Utilities Commission chairman will adjourn the Utilities Commission meeting and the meeting will return to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission chair. At that time the Utilities Commission members will be excused from the dais and we'll probably take probably a five minutes recess at that time. The Planning Commission will be permitted to engage in discussion and debate. No member of the Utilities Commission is permitted to participate in or engage the Planning Commission members in discussion during the Planning Commission's deliberations as the Utilities Commission members are not members of the Planning Commission. So those are the rules that will govern this evening's joint public hearing and so at this time, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Makee, the chair of the Utilities Commission, to do his rollcall.

Mr. Makee: Alan Glazman.

Mr. Glazman: Here.

Mr. Makee: Joyce Arndt.

Ms. Arndt: Here.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Makee: Mike Makee. Present. Bill Tignor.

Mr. Tignor: Here.

Mr. Makee: Mo Bolden.

Mr. Bolden: Here.

Mr. Makee: Kent Carson.

Mr. Carson: Here.

Mr. Makee: Mickey Kwiatkowski.

Ms. Kwiatkowski: Here.

Mr. Makee: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Okay. So now at this time I'd like to recognize Bryon Counsell for the presentation.

Mr. Towery: Good evening. Jason Towery, Director of Utilities. Just wanted to say thank you for this opportunity tonight to present our master plan in this public form. I did want to take a moment and introduce a couple of other folks here who are with me tonight and I do not have all the answers to the questions that may come up, so I'll be calling on them periodically, I'm sure. Bryon Counsell, our Assistant Director of Construction and Engineering has overseen this master plan process over the past year from our department's end and then the two gentlemen immediately behind him. Mr. Tom Dumm and Mr. George Rest from O'Brien and Gere, our consultants, who have been invaluable to us throughout this process. So this is the 2008 water and sewer master plan, again, the master plan is a component of the Comprehensive Plan. The last time the master plan was updated was in 2006 and really what we've done in the Utilities Department over the past year is, reflect the changes that are shown in the Comprehensive Plan. So the first portion of this process actually started with working with the Planning Department staff very closely to ensure that all the data and projections and so forth, that go into the Comprehensive Plan, that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted, are properly reflected in the Utilities master plan. 2006 to 2018 is a long time. There are a number of changes that have occurred in this master plan, but overall we haven't seen anything that is significantly surprising. Perhaps the one thing that I would call your attention to, and we'll talk about it here in a moment, is some of the changes in customer usage and we'll talk about that in just a moment. Brief overview of what we'll talk about here tonight; changes in needs have driven changes in the master plan; investment priorities, what is it that we as Stafford County have said through the Comprehensive Plan is important. And then any operational enhancements, there are a number of things that we found, when we go through the master plan, that we can do better as a department. So it's an opportunity for a, if you will, a gut check, as a department to really sit down and think through, are we doing this the best way that we possibly can; are we doing the best way that our customers deserve and being the most fiscally responsible that we can. We'll also talk about the alignment with planned development, which is, of course, directly driven by the Comprehensive Plan and talk a little bit about some of the cost summary, and then of course at the end have some time for questions and answers. So what are the objectives when we do a master plan? This slide right here talks about it, what we're ensuring first and primary is, that we're providing for the growth and the development, the capacity needs that are outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. As I said before,

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

first thing we do is sit down with the Planning Department and we crunch numbers and we pull all that data together and then we turn it over to the consultants and the put that data into a model, and then they say, okay based on this, here is what needs to happen. We also look at regulatory requirements. A lot of what we do is very driven by Department of Environmental Quality, EPA, various federal and state organizations that we report to on a regular basis to ensure that the water we deliver and waste water that we treat is done so in an environmentally responsible way. Those regulatory requirements are constantly changing and the master plan looks to capture, as best as we can, what regulatory requirements we see coming, both near and short term. And then finally reliability. Water and sewer is a critical component, not only to our community's development, but also to the health, safety and welfare of our citizen. Ensuring that we're able to maintain reliability during large storm events. Maintain reliability throughout the system consistently, is something that we're always ensuring and looking to make sure that we do adequately. So some of that involves rehabilitation, replacement to critical water and sewer needs from time to time. So the master plan looks to capture some of that vital work as well. These are the guiding principles that we look at as a Utilities Department in our master plan process. Of course we're customer driven. Not every resident of Stafford County receives public water and sewer. So we have a certain customer base. We have about 36,000 nearly 37,000 accounts. We serve a little over 100,000 customers, so...well 37,000 customer and roughly a little over 100,000 residents in the County. So, we're always looking to make sure that we are very customer friendly. What can we do kind of approach. Proactive planning, of course looking forward, in this case, the master plan. As maybe evident in the name, we're looking 20, 30, 40 years out, system buildout needs and growth. Sustainability of course is what we build, is it going to last, are we making the wisest investment? And that ties directly to fiscal responsibility. Are we making the wisest investment with our dollars and will this truly work for the system long-term? But also environmental sustainability. We want to make sure that what we're doing is environmentally friendly. So the master plan, again, considers those regulatory requirements. And then finally adaptability. And this has been something key for us over this past year as we've looked over the master plan and some of the changes that we're looking at right now, we've really had to change some our outlook. This is directly reflected right now in the CIP process and the budget process that we're currently going through with the Board. A lot of what we thought in 2006 didn't pan out. Some things did. Some things changed. So we have to change and react to that. Since the last master plan we've completed 35 water and sewer projects that were recommended specifically in that plan. The most prominent of those was the Lake Mooney project. That was the largest project that this County ever conducted and thankfully it's done. But for a long time, that ate up a lot of time and dollars over the last 10 to 15 years since we've really been back looking at the master plan, but that's behind us now and we're of course thankful to have that out of the way, but we're turning towards a lot of other, very important, critical infrastructure at this point. One of the things that we're seeing, as we look ahead and that we've seen over the last 10 to 15 years since 2006 is a decrease in demand per household if you will. A lot of low flow fixtures are out there now, which is great. A lot of people are being very conservative with the water use, but as, I think I've shared this with this joint group before, one of the trends we've seen is, even though our customer growth continues to grow at a little over 2%, our water sales only trends at about 1% growth. And so as you can see there's a diverging portion there that will eventually create a larger gap. So that's something we really had to start looking at. How do we close that gap, fiscally. How do we close that gap? How do we reinvest money to make sure that what we do, ultimately so that we don't have to raise rates, as much as we can mitigate those things. Again, going back to fiscal responsibility, customer service. Ultimately it affects the build out demands and has allowed us, we believe, to look at creatively doing more reinvested within our infrastructure. We can, it looks, at this point, based on the master plan that we can push out some of our increased demands that we were looking at originally on our water and sewer plants. Not forever, but we get a little bit of a break, we hope. So, what that allows us to do is take some of those dollars and put them back into other critical infrastructure that previously we weren't able to do. Also, we have had some changes in the Comprehensive Plan and

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

the Land Use that this master plan of course reflects. Those were fairly minor in terms of their impact to the master plan, but they are captured. The previous master plan also showed water service projected outside of the Urban Service Area. We've pulled back on that. That's not to say that there can't potentially water service outside of the Urban Service Area, it's just to say that the last master plan showed the potential for that water service outside of the Urban Service Area much more extensively than what we would currently anticipate. So that, again, has changed some of the demand requirements that we're looking at for build out purposes. We talked a little bit about customer behavior, changes in low flow and then one of the other things that we're really looking at doing, this is an ongoing thing, but fighting our I&I. Every time rains, a lot of that rain water ends up down in our sewer treatment plants. And so that's something we're constantly looking to better at keeping out of the system, so that we can extend the capacity of our plants, and pumps, pipes, things of that nature. Talk for a minute here about economic development. And I do want to be careful to draw a distinct line here. First off, we talk about the master plan and we look at economic development. The master plan is not intended to either encourage or discourage growth. We're simply reflecting the growth projections that are shown in the Comprehensive Plan. So if the Comprehensive Plan says this certain portion of the county is anticipated to grow and develop at this type of rate and this density. And we look at that and say, how much water, how much sewer do we need to have ready to meet the projected demands in that portion of the county. However, from time to time, as many on these commissions are aware, the Board does make decisions through the CIP process to encourage economic development and may change through the CIP process the timing of certain projects that are shown on the master plan. That's what this is trying to depict here. The 2018 CIP has a number of those master plan projects that could potentially be build further out, projected in the near term to be ready and help to stimulate some of that economic development, economic growth. But again, that is distinct and separate from the master plan. The intent of the master plan, again, is not to encourage or discourage growth, but simply to meet the demands and needs. One of the other things that we've talked about of course is reliability and regulatory compliance. We have a number of permits that we regulate, both at our water and wastewater treatment plants. We've actually been very recently in discussion with DEQ about some of the changes, particularly in the Rappahannock, in terms of the amount pollutant loading that is allowed to be placed into the Rappahannock. So all of those things will affect how we ultimately develop and redevelop plants, how we...and what we do along the way. So a lot of, again, what we're looking at here with this particular aspect of the master plan is making sure that we have reliable, regulatory compliance systems. And then one of the other things that we look at with the master plan, are there any operational enhancements that we can do. Currently, you may or may not be aware, but we have multiple pressure zones throughout the county that each tank, not each tank, but each pressure zone operates at different pressures based on the elevation set in tanks. Well, if we can eliminate some of those pressure zones by combining, by eliminating some tanks, we can create less room for operations, or less operational needs. So that's one of the things we're looking at is eliminating two of our water pressure zones and going to 8 instead of the 10 we currently have and simplifying things. We are looking to decommission 4 water storage tanks to avoid unnecessary maintenance and then we have a number of changes on the sewer side. We have over 90 pump stations throughout the county. Some of them are small. Some of them are large. Some of them you smell going down the road. Some of them you don't. But we are looking to decommission 7 of those pumping stations. To, again, eliminate cost of fuel, electricity and staff time, parts, things of that nature. We put this slide in here just to, again, go back to and talk about...again the Department of Utilities is financially independent. We are an enterprise fund. We do not receive funds from the general fund, so the tax dollars that are paid through the assessments and so forth, real estate assessments that are done, do not come to the Utilities Department. We rely solely on user fees, folks who pay their water and sewer bills, and pro rata and availability fees. Pro rata and availability is really to help capture system growth and user fees to help capture ongoing system maintenance needs and requirements. So there is a bit of a distinction there. One of...we tried to outline that here, just briefly in this slide. And this is, again, a

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

breakdown of the CIP. This is not the master plan, but just so you know, where we, as a Department, over the next 10 years are currently projecting. The blue is effectively, it's listed as economic development, but essentially that's system growth, new developments that come on, anything from Embrey Mill to any of the commercial developments that come on to the system, as well as potential economic development stimulating projects that the Board has requested the Utilities Department to do. We have a couple of those currently going on. The red and the green are basically our ongoing system maintenance and regulatory compliance funds that we have split up. So over the next 10 years you can see it's not quite...it's about 50/50 in terms of growth expenditures and regulatory and maintenance expenditures. I'd like to go ahead and just stop at this point and see if there are any questions about anything we've talked about here. A lot of information there and what we tried to do here was give you a very general, high level overview of what the master plan process looks like. I know all of the various Commissioners have received copies of the master plan. It's very thick. I would suspect you maybe have not had a chance to go through all of it, but certainly, we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have about that. And at this point I'll be quiet.

Ms. Vanuch: Does anyone on the Utilities... Come on. Here you go.

Mr. Tignor: What is the provision for updating this plan and how often does that happen?

Mr. Towery: Great question. Again, it is updated when the Comprehensive Plan is updated. That is technically when...it has not historically always been updated when the Comprehensive Plan is updated. We would like to see that change, particularly large Comprehensive Plan changes should trigger on the Utilities Department and a look, a close look at the master plan to see if there's anything that might need to change to reflect that. Again, the last time that was done was 12 years ago. Our plan moving forward as a Utilities Department is to at least every 5 years, take a hard look at the master plan and see if any updates need to be done, to capture some of the smaller changes that come through the course of that time.

Ms. Kwiatkowski: What is the cost to do this analysis?

Mr. Towery: Do we know what the cost of the...about \$125,000 is what we've currently contracted with O'Brien and Gere in their fees, as well as staff time, which I couldn't answer right now but.

Mr. McPherson: Are there any, or do you anticipate in the future any joint projects with neighboring municipalities? City of Fredericksburg? Quantico? Things of that nature? Just at a high level.

Mr. Towery: Yes, actually in our CIP, and I'm not sure if this is captured in the master plan, but within the CIP we actually do have an interconnection proposed with Spotsylvania County. We do currently have two interconnections with Spotsylvania County, but they're small and they both also intel the City of Fredericksburg. As you may or may not know, the City of Fredericksburg receives its water services currently from Spotsylvania. So we have an agreement with them to ensure that we provide emergency backup services. What this would do would be to allow for a more effective emergency route. What we have right now is reliable and we've had to use it actually recently, but we'd like to see that beefed up. As far as Quantico goes, we do sell water to the west side of the base and we've worked with Quantico and tried to receive any projections that they may have for potential growth on that side of the base. At this point they have not indicated that they plan any significant changes on that portion of the base that would affect the master plan at this point, but we have assumed certain demands from them as a major user.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. McPherson: Okay thank you.

Mr. Bain: The decommissioning of the storage tanks and pump stations, I assume that implies that you're going to do additional pressure piping or gravity sewers in some way to replace those units. Is that in the CIP and what kind of time table do you have for that?

Mr. Towery: Sure. There is...let me break that down into two separate things. First off, the water tanks, there is most of the decommissioning of the water tanks is in the southern part of the county. There are 4 right now that are being looked at and before any of those would be taken off, a new water tank would be constructed. What we're looking at doing in the master plan, in the CIP it's reflected over the next 3 years, 3 to 5 years I should say, is building a new elevated storage tank on Enon Road. If you're familiar with our Enon Road, where Hulls Chapel comes in to Enon Road, we have a large 4 million gallon water storage tank there on the ground that would ultimately be replaced and removed with the construction of a new 2 million gallon elevated storage tank. Once that occurs then we look at eliminating a couple of other tanks for operational purposes that are no longer needed. And then the last tank is really related to one of our pressure zone changes. We're looking at Ferry Road tank potentially, would be decommissioned at a certain point. That's the one out by Ferry Road. If the choice is made to go ahead and put that area of the county, that pressure zone onto a new pressure zone. Did that make sense? Okay. There are some small pipe, water pipe connections that need to be done with that, but in terms of major infrastructure, I will caveat this with the Enon Road tank expects a large water line to come up from the Lake Mooney water treatment plant. That water line is about 50-75% already completed in the ground. A portion of that waterline would come up Truslow Road to the new tank. So that's a major construction project that needs to occur prior to the tank going in. On the sewer side, we actually have one that's actually getting ready to be decommissioned. The new Courthouse tank out here, if you all have seen it, if you drive out on a sunny day it looks great, the old stand pipe that's by the mobile home park just down the road will actually be decommissioned. On the sewer side there are a hand full, I believe it was 7 pump stations that we believe can be eliminated by simply adding a little bit of additional pipe and tying into a nearby gravity main that's now within vicinity and then eliminate that.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. English.

Mr. English: Well you answered, I was going to ask you a question about the Paradise Estate, was that going to be decommissioned, so you just answered that. My other question is. You're tearing, and I know, we've talked about this, but I want it on record, that right here on Courthouse Road, right there by the commuter lot, there is a...the water stops right there, it stops again up on Courthouse Road just past Kelsey Road maybe, and then there is Mine Road that comes in. What's your intentions of hooking that all up, since the road is being torn up? Wouldn't that be a good time to lay some pipes while they're doing the construction, because I don't want to say we're not going to do it now and then 10 years later you come back, well we're going to put the pipe down. Why not put the pipe down now, while you got all the road tore up? Sounds to me, it would make good sense on the dime part of it. And then the other question is, you said 7 sewer pump stations are going to be decommissioned. Where are they in the county? You can just say north or south and that's all. So those are the two questions I have.

Mr. Towery: Well let me answer the first question...if you want to take a quick look at the 7 pump stations, where they are generally. I know where a couple of them are, but...on Courthouse Road, we couldn't agree more and we actually worked very closely with Shirley Construction obtaining quotes in an attempt to construct that line at a benefit to the county. We felt the same way, that it's a great opportunity to get this line in there. Unfortunately the quotes for work did not come in very favorably. For whatever reason the contractor, we did not feel, came in with very competitive pricing, and again,

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

unfortunately because that contractor already had that project under...they were already selected by VDOT. There was no opportunity for the department to competitively bid that out, even though the road is currently, as you pointed out, being constructed. So at that point we made a decision. It kind of came back to a dollars decision in terms of the criticality of it. The portion of pipe specifically in those couple of areas that you were referring to, is really ultimately to move water along, actually from the Centreport area and then up through the future George Washington Village, and then once it gets to that point on Courthouse Road, move it west for redundancy purposes out in the western pressure zones. So while that pipe will also provide additional opportunities for interconnection and provide additional opportunities for water connections for residents along Courthouse Road, ultimately the purpose and intention of that piece of pipe is really to move water from Centreport for redundancy out in the western, Rock Hill portion of the County. And we do not currently have a pressing need for that redundancy. So it ended up just being a cost/benefit analysis at this point. And at this point, until the portion of the pipe comes up from Centerport Parkway, through the George Washington Village area, while those other portions of pipe could be constructed, they would really ultimately vastly overconstructed for what the current need is. So it also came down to a question of, do we want to build these pipes now in their ultimate condition, knowing that they really don't need to be anywhere close to that size right now. We did look at some smaller pipe sizes through there, but then again, once you put it in, you come back and you rip it back up again. It was a tough decision and I think we would have loved to have made it happen, but at the end of the day the decision was made to push that off and at this point, if or until the George Washington Village project moves, it may be unlikely that that would happen. That doesn't mean that some smaller projects couldn't happen in the interim to bring portions of that. We still do have a water and sewer extension policy, which we're currently, I know you know, we're currently in the process of working with the Board to revise, in an attempt to try to help some of those infill areas across the county. We do recognize, particularly that one is a bit of the hole in donut right now. We understand that and that's one of those ongoing items that we're working through. On the pump stations, I'll let Bryon take over a moment. Okay, so it looks like the vast majority are right in the central part of the county. A lot of these if I remember correctly are affected directly right now by the Lower Accokeek project and that's a project that the Board has pushed up on the CIP, that we're doing right now, that would not technically be needed, but it's being used to help stimulate some growth in the Courthouse area. So right in this portion of the county there are 5 of the 7, I'm sorry 6. Yes, the vast majority are here.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions from the Commission or Utilities? Go ahead.

Mr. Glazman: Jason, is the greatest uncertainty in the inputs that you use as you write the plan in terms...what negative event could cause the plan to have to change?

Mr. Towery: I would certainly think anything that would significantly affect the Comprehensive Plan if perhaps the limits of the Urban Service Area were to change, significantly, I wouldn't be so concerned about small extensions here or there, but a significant change to the Urban Service Area would likely require the overhaul of the master plan, or at least a close look at, perhaps, a certain pressure zone. And then really the other thing, although I think we probably, be careful to say this, I don't want to jinx us, but I hope we felt a lot of the effects of the changes in the user trends, although it is something that we've seen nationwide. Certainly any kind of changes there could affect, or have an impact, but those tend to be slower development. I wouldn't see any of those as being sudden. And then really the last thing would be if there were any large regulatory moves that might perhaps significantly push up the need for a plant enhancement, but again, most of those items tend to be longer moving, at least those last two.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions? Mr. Randall.



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Randall: I have a couple of questions. The model that was used by your consultants, is that an industry model, or is that their own proprietary model? It's an industry model? Okay, I thought that was the case. We did this last in 2006, is that correct? And the short term numbers we projected out 10 to 12 years up to 2018. How did those numbers compare to what you projected? How did the numbers today compare to the projected numbers in 2006?

Mr. Towery: Let me see if I can go back here just briefly. I think there were a couple that we noted here in terms of some of the changes. Again, the biggest change...and the master plan in 2006 did look out, again, that 20 to 40 year time frame. Again, the biggest change was...did I skip it...the biggest change was in the, ultimately, the water demands, which ultimately affect the sewer demands. As you can see here the 2006 master plan projected 30.8 million gallons a day with a 46 million gallon a day peak. And that moved down significantly on the water side. And then of course that affects the sewer, because for the most part, not always, but what you put in, you get back out on the other end. So does that answer...

Mr. Randall: Sure. Okay, and then the last thing is, your long term projections are out to 2060, is that correct? So outside the Comprehensive Plan, is that based on the model then for those extra 24 years? Is that based on your model of what you think will be projected?

(inaudible)

Mr. Towery: Yes and that's correct. The long term, although we kind of look at buildout potential in the 2060 timeframe, or at least what it kind of talks about in there. As Mr. Rest was saying, it is really a buildout condition that we're looking at. So we take the Comprehensive Plan with the buildouts that the Comprehensive Plan is going to demand and then we plug it into the model, and we say okay, you're going to have x amount of users in this area and it's going to create this type of demand, this pipe, this tank, this pump station needs to be upgraded. So the model is really, in terms of...you can look at intermittent periods of growth by working the model and inputting intermittent periods of growth, but really again, we're looking at the build out. Does that make sense?

Mr. Randall: Yes it does. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions? Okay. Nobody looking to ask any questions. Thank you very much. We can move on to the public comment portion of this public hearing. So at this time, if any members of the public would like to come down and provide comments on the water and sewer system master plan. You'll have 3 minutes to speak at the podium, again, say your name, address and the district you reside. You'll have 3 minutes when the green light comes on, 1 minute when the yellow light, and when the red light starts blinking, please end your comments. Anybody want to come down? Okay, I see somebody coming.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, Rock Hill District. I've not got a county water and sewer bill for 17 years. You just heard 12 years they're off. Look at his numbers. Projections of the model. You ought to go in to weather forecasting. Have you take into account 225 square miles are only in the county because Quantico uses 55 square miles. The Comprehensive Plan was updated on 8/16/2016, that was my 64<sup>th</sup> birthday, that's why I wasn't here, just so you know. Elvis died also on my 25<sup>th</sup> birthday. Now one of the key things that's really out of whack here, and I already have an appeal on my tax rate, and I'm tired of paying taxes and I do not get customer service. I do not get a water bill. I just sent the fabricated water bill, I'm dealing with the Virginia State Corporate Commission. I've notified other people in my fictitious HOA that's been robbed by 3 property management companies since I've owned the property in 2001. I love how you try to use projections of 2% and 1%. You know Centre-Pork is what it is. It's just

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

like the Rocky Pork Reservoir. I hear no demand. One of my key pet peeves is, you have someone on the project and there's no stakeholders from residential aspect. I don't care about the George Washington Village. I'm 65 years old. I own property. I don't get a county water and sewer bill and my estate will sew this county and it'll get it from my children. It's real easy. You have enough money to pay 125,000 for a draft of 186 pages. It's just ludicrous of what goes on, and you call this a master plan. I'm a master chess player, you're not even an expert playing here. These Comprehensive Plans are out of date and this water and sewer plan does not take care of people who've owned a property 35 years. There are 1983 townhouses in this county that don't get a water and sewer plan. It's ludicrous. He only has 37,000 customers and he's talking about 100,000, or there's 128,961 in the 2010 census. Hm. Guess I know the numbers. I didn't have to write that one down. And the census bureau projected there is 140,000. And the county has doubled every 20 years from 1960 to 80, 70 to 90, 80 to 2000, 90 to 2010 and of course in 2020 when I'm working on redistricting, proof to you numerically it has not grown. My property has not acreage in the county aspects and I'm being charged for taxes and I get no services.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Waldowski. Would anyone else like to come down and speak during this public comment time. Okay. Seeing no one else, we're going to bring it back to the Planning Commission if we have any additional questions for Mr. Counsell. Do we have any other questions from the Utilities Commission or the Planning Commission? No? Okay. So at this time we're going to close the public hearing portion. And so now I will ask all members of the Planning Commission to push back from the dais and we will turn it over to Mr. Makee, the Chair of the Utilities Commission for action.

Mr. Makee: Any other comments on the master plan? Yes, Mickey.

Ms. Kwiatkowski: I make a motion to approve.

Mr. Makee: Okay. We have a motion. Does anyone like to second the motion.

(inaudible)

Mr. Makee: Alright. Open it up for debate. Any debate?

Mr. Tignor: Does the plan, at all, contemplate rate changes?

Mr. Towery: I think what would be important to point out is, what we're looking at here tonight is master plan. The rates ultimately, we have a rate consultant that we work with very closely on a regular basis to ensure that what we're doing in the master plan and in the CIP on a yearly and a 10 year basis that our rates will be able to handle that. So I think it's important to remember that what we're talking about here tonight is, we're looking at the master plan itself. The master plan does not directly address the rates, but those would ultimately reflected from the master plan and the CIP and those things through our continual, if you will, work with the rate consultant. Does that answer...Okay.

Mr. Tignor: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. Makee: Okay, any other comments from the Utilities Commissioners? Yes Sir.

(inaudible)

Mr. Towery: Ultimately the rate increases that you're inquiring about are really, we're looking at user fees in terms of the rates that continue to grow on a more regular basis. And those user fees, again, I

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

would say if you were to shut off all development today, those user fees are what we would need to maintain, and the subsequent rate increases to continue with ongoing maintenance, regulatory compliance, capital replacement of our program...of our system rather. So, those rates are kind of one thing over here if you will. We have, as we've talked about, availability and pro rata. Availability and pro rata, we maintain a financial model that we use to project availability and pro rata needs, along with our regular user fee needs. Again, the master plan ultimately drives those rates that are needed. One of the subsequent things that will come as a result of this master plan is proposed, potential changes to the pro rata rates. Pro rata, and I want to, again, what we're talking about here tonight is the master plan, but pro rata is a separate funding program that's used to fund portions of this master plan and the growth. So that would be a separate item, assuming the acceptance of the master plan, that we'll go back and we've already been working with O'Brien and Gere and our rate consultant to look at those changes. But to be honest with you, the pro rata is a very small portion of our overall budget. It is impactful at times, but it's rather small in the overall picture. And the pro rata is not related to the specific rate increases that you were referring to earlier. There's a lot of information there. I think if I were to summarize it, I would say the master plan and the user fee rate increases are intended to be separate. Does that...

(inaudible)

Mr. Towery: Sure. Let me clarify sir. Yes. Let me clarify my statement. What I should say is that the growth related projects with the master plan are separate from the ongoing user fees and so yes, the master plan does talk about certain system reliability, rehabilitation, replacement projects that will need to be done. Those, yes, would affect ongoing user rates. But what the master plan is ultimately saying is, this is what we think needs to be done and those rates ultimately, yes, would need to reflect any capital changes, replacement, or rehabilitation work that may need to be done. The user fee rates that are currently projected for various increases are...we don't look at those on a 40 year basis necessarily. We look at those on a shorter term basis, and yes, any of the rehabilitation, reliability work, maintenance work, things of that nature, are reflected in those user fees increases. Does that...okay.

Mr. Carson: I have a question. It was stated earlier that no tax dollars are going to the operation and maintenance of the water distribution system, but our current residents who are not connected to the water or sewer distribution systems, they are, they have that option to connect to that if it's out to where they live, is that correct?

Mr. Towery: Within the Urban Service Area primarily there is the water and sewer extension program that allows for those kinds of connections to be made and there are various Ordinances in the County Code that require connections for, say, new development, or in the case of a well failure. So yes, there is the option for existing residents who wish to hook up to water and sewer for them to do that. Often times, if it's within a certain distance, they'll apply for the extension program and that would occur through that process. If it's a longer distance, a lot of times they may or may not be self-funded.

Mr. Makee: Okay. We have a motion to approve. It's been seconded. I'm going to close the discussion and now vote. So, Utilities Commission, all in favor of approving the...recommending approval of the master plan say aye.

Mr. Glazman: Aye.

Ms. Arndt: Aye.

Mr. Makee: Aye.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Tignor: Aye.

Mr. Bolden: Aye.

Mr. Carson: Aye.

Ms. Kwiatkowski: Aye.

Mr. Makee: All opposed say nay. Alright the motion passes. At this point I would like to adjourn the Utilities Commission meeting and return this to the Planning Commission Chairman. Thank you very much for hosting us.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you so much Mr. Makee. And at this point in time we will take a 5 minute recess. Let's say we'll come back 7 minutes at 7:05.

Meeting recessed at 6:58 p.m. and reconvened at 7:06 p.m.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we'd like to reconvene the meeting at 7:06 and we're going to bring everything back to the Planning Commission at this point. So I'd like to bring it to the Planning Commission for any discussion, debate, or any motions that we may have. Anybody have any discussion so far? Any questions? Alright. Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Yes, I have one additional question. In the wastewater treatment facility part you mentioned that there are several items that would be critical, as far as priority is concerned, some are critical in both the wastewater treatment facilities. By critical, does that mean they're on the current CIP, or does that mean that it's critical to you, but may or may not be on the CIP?

Mr. Towery: Let me actually...George, would you mind coming up? And I think the answer is we do have a number of items currently on the CIP within even the next 5 years to make some enhancements to our processes in the wastewater treatment plants, but in terms of...I would say some of those items are critically in nature, but I think probably, correct me if I'm wrong George, most of the critical improvements discussed under there would just be critical to the life of the facility per se.

Mr. Rest: Well, I guess as I was listening to the presentation, what went through my mind, I think the answer to your question sir is that there are some regulations that are evolving, that are coming out of DEQ. And those could be certainly critical, they could be very critical. They could be very significant. And that's what Mr. Towery was talking about. And so...but we don't yet know, because they haven't decided yet at DEQ exactly how those regulations are going to be promulgated, because they're still in development. And so what we did with the county was made a recommendation for some place holders, some of them in the 10 year window, some of them outside the 10 year window, that are our best guess, as to what might evolve, based on our discussions with DEQ here and in other places in the state.

Mr. Randall: Right, understand. So the message then from the master plan to the Comprehensive Plan, the message is that, although it's priority 1 or a priority 2, its priority to the ways to the master plan, not necessarily to the county.

Mr. Towery: Yeah, I think what you're pointing out is that...and we address with the CIP on an annual basis, when we go through our CIP process, that's where we capture and are able to adjust for those more

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

frequent changes that may come from DEQ or whoever, and anything that would become more critical may get moved ahead, although it may currently be shown as a need, right now, that we may project might only be needed 10 years from now. If DEQ were to move quickly, and make some changes, we might say, okay, this needs to move ahead on the CIP and then propose that to the Board for a change. Really, the CIP is the vehicle that kind of captures that on a regular basis.

Mr. Randall: Right, I have 4 things that are priority 1, and you don't think any of those are on the CIP currently?

Mr. Towery: I would have to look specifically at those items, but we do have, we do have a number of, within the next 5 years, we do have a number of enhancements at the Little Falls Run and Aquia wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Randall: That's fine. That's fine. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions on the Commission. Okay if nobody else has a question, I do have a question. First of all I want to take this opportunity and thank you guys for your time this evening. You did a wonderful job with the presentation. Obviously this is pretty good that we're having a lot of back and forth debate, and I want to take this opportunity while you guys are here, to ask a question. Mr. Waldowski has been to a number of Planning Commission and Board meetings and he's always had questions about his water bill and how it goes to the HOA. Can you just explain to me, or to the Commission, if you know, why it's going to the HOA and it's not going to him independently?

Mr. Towery: Sure. There are a number of systems within the county that are private and that are metered from the county's end through a master meter. Quantico is actually a good example for this. We sell water to Quantico. We send them one bill. We get one payment back every month. They internally determine how their billing process works among their customers if you will. And we have a number of other groups, such as Mr. Waldowski's, I think he is in a condominium that has water we sell to that entire condominium through a master meter, and then they internally are able to sub-meter and distribute bills to their customers specifically. We have talked with Mr. Waldowski in the past about, are there opportunities to potentially bring that private system into our public system and we're certainly willing to entertain that, but there are a number of, in that specific situation, a number of deficiencies in the system that would need to be corrected before the county would accept ownership and liability of that. So there would...the HOA or the entity through the homeowners, they would effectively come together, make a decision that we would like to request the County take this into the system and then from there we would do an evaluation of the system and say, ok here are the deficiencies and this is what would need to be corrected and then go through a process of those corrections being made, a final inspection and then acceptance.

Ms. Vanuch: And so when you say deficiencies within their system, could that potentially be miscalculating what resident's consumption of water is?

Mr. Towery: I, well, we, I'm not specifically familiar with how they sub-meter their system. I can speak to what we send them for a bill from our meter and there are no deficiencies up to and including our meter and so how they chose to then cut up that bill afterwards and distribute it could potentially be affected by anything that's going on within their system. I think that is absolutely possible, but again I'm not familiar with exactly how they sub-meter every single account.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: And I guess within the County that's just allowed, they're allowed to do that. There is nothing that we can do to require that. Because I completely understand, if I was living in a condominium of 100 houses and my water bill was more than I thought it was for just me independently, and then I was paying for my neighbor's water, not seeing that accountability, I can definitely see where there could be mass confusion and aggravation and contempt for that process. And they also could change the rate possibly. Couldn't they? I mean, who's to say they're charging the exact same rate for every gallon used, in and out?

Mr. Towery: Yes to the question, it is allowed. We actually just had one come of fairly recently within the past year, up near the Aquia Towne Center parcel. We do try to discourage it and so we do work with the engineers and developers during that process to attempt to get them to be a public entity, because ultimately there is a lot of maintenance that's needed, particularly if there's fire hydrants, things of that nature, on the private side that need to be regularly maintained and they do work, in that case, with the Fire Marshall to ensure compliance. In terms of how, or how they're able to charge, you know, I've looked at some of the bills that Mr. Waldowski has given and nothing has particularly stood out to me as being, you know, nefarious per se, on the bills. I would say they seem to have a way that they're distributing the base fee for the water sold among the customer and then what I would term a maintenance fee that they collect, I would suppose, to maintain their own private system.

Mr. Boswell: Madame Chair. Are they metering it or are they flat rating each individual homeowner in that complex? How are they divvying up this bill?

Mr. Towery: My understanding is that they sub-meter.

Mr. Boswell: So they have their own meters? You have a main meter. You know how many gallons are going through there.

Ms. Vanuch: I see Mr. Waldowski shaking his head, so...

Mr. Towery: So, I could be wrong. I don't know. I know in a number of places that sub-meters are done. And so it can be different from, in this case, this HOA may do it differently than another HOA, so...

Mr. Boswell: Right, so could they possibly be breaking it up for each, you know, charging each unit the same as Ms. Vanuch just pointed out, you know, if you got one person living in one and you got a family of four living in the other, and the one guy by himself is getting the same bill as the family of four. That could be...and they could quite possibly be making money on the water and sewer bill without...And you say we're still allowing this to go on? I would have thought that might have been something that would have happened maybe 20/30 years ago, but I would have thought all the new developments, the new condominiums would be a meter per unit or some way. That's not the case.

Mr. Towery: Right. There is nothing within our Code right now that prohibits it from occurring. Again, we do try to discourage it, because sometimes the systems can fall into disrepair and then ultimately the group would come along and ask the County to take it over and often times it's hard to get them into repair at that point.

Mr. Boswell: So standing there right now you don't know if his situation is that this condominium project has...they're taking water in from you and you're metering the overall thing and you don't know that they have a separate meter going to each condo? You can't answer that question?

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Towery: I do not know the specific situation. I do not know.

Mr. Boswell: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. English: Again, if you think this is a problem, why don't y'all set some type of ground rules, and say look, we want to stop doing that, because it isn't fair for somebody to be getting , like they both said, one lives there and somebody's getting hosed, and then somebody's making some money somewhere along, I would imagine. But can't you come up with something and say look, we're not going to do this anymore.

Mr. Towery: We certainly could...

Mr. English: ...draw an ordinance up.

Mr. Towery: Sure. We certainly could take that up with the Board as an item of question. I know that the Board has...is aware of Mr. Waldowski's concerns and has considered them on some level before. So it certainly something we can bring back before the Board and I'll be happy to do that. In terms of his specific situation, again, the County has offered, if certain changes are made, if we can go through this process of bringing the system into compliance, the county is willing to take ownership of that, but there would have to be...the HOA, or the entity would have to officially request it from the county and then we would have to go through a process to begin to bring it up to standards. I don't think, I certainly can sympathize with his concerns and...

Mr. Boswell: (Inaudible, microphone not on).

Mr. Bain: Also, they might sub-meter, but is the plumbing within the condominium units adequate to put individual meters per unit, or would that be almost impossible because of the way the plumbing was done. You probably don't know. You haven't been inside them, but it's something I was wondering about.

Mr. Towery: Again, yes, I don't know all the intricacies of his specific unit and every situation may be different. I know some of the entities prefer to do it this way, because they kind of, if you will, no pun intended, build themselves as a community that, hey, we take care of all your needs. So this is a service we provide. All inclusive. So I know that that has come through with the more recent one, that was something specific that they wanted to do and they used that same model in multiple other jurisdictions very successfully. So it is certainly something though that we're aware of, again, I think the County is more than willing to work with any customer that might have an extensive private system and want to bring it into compliance and be more than happy, again, to bring it up with the Board and see if there is any desire to make any action.

Mr. Randall: Madame Chair, I have a couple of questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Do you have an idea of how many we're talking about in the County that fall under this condition, or fall under this situation? How many HOAs per se, or many individual customers we're talking about?

Mr. Towery: I do not know off the top of my head. I'd have to go back and look. I'd be happy to get you back some information on that.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I'd be interested to know what that would be. The second question is, do these HOAs any...is there a way to get into the HOAs to find out what they're doing with their water, or do we just send them a bill, we get a check and then we kind of write off whatever they're doing on the backend. Can we go in and ask them? If we are for all customers in Stafford County, then shouldn't there be some way we could go in and say, hey, just give me last month's 100 bills for these 100 different people and see how we do this. Is there a way to do that, or is it kind of...not allowed, not available?

Mr. Towery: I'm not aware of any specific authority that the County has to do that at this time.

Mr. Wisniewski: Members of the Planning Commission, this is a discussion that is a little bit outside the scope of the water and sewer master plan recommendation, but it is certainly something that the Commission can raise with the Board of Supervisors and it would be something that we would have to work with, my office with the Utilities Department in researching what we can do here, what the authorities are. Typically HOAs they have a little layer of their own privacy as private entities, but there might be something that we can do here in the way of requiring meters.

Mr. Randall: And I didn't mean to take us down that road, but I'm very interested to see how this not only effects the one, but effects the many.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall. Mr. Randall, we will table this one...

Mr. Randall: Alight

Ms. Vanuch: ...and we will move on. And I realize Mr. Wisniewski is bringing us back on topic here. I just wanted to take the opportunity to inquire since we had you here because I personally didn't know, and I have heard him mention these comments many times before. So I think we will table that as a Commission maybe we will decide if we want to have a discussion with the Board and have them look into and work with the attorney's office on looking at that. So I guess at this time we are going to close out the debate on the Commission side and... does anybody want to make a motion on the approval of the Water and Sewer System Master Plan, or a non-approval or a deferral.

Mr. Randall: I make a motion that we approve the Water and Sewer Master Plan.

Mr. Bain: I will second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay I have a motion by Mr. Randall to approve the Water and Sewer Master Plan and a second by Mr. Bain. Mr. Randall any discussion?

Mr. Randall: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other members of the Commission wish to discuss? Okay then. I think it is closed to discussion and go ahead and vote. Well they are coming in slowly. Alright, so the motion passes 7-0 accepting the Master Plan. So now we will be pulling the meeting back into regular order and if we go back to the agenda, items number 2 and 3 on the agenda for the public hearings, the reclassification for



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Dunkin Donuts at Route 17 and Melchers Drive and the Conditional Use Permit for Dunkin Donuts at Route 17 and Melchers Drive. And I do want to state that, before we move forward with this item, the Commission did receive an email right before the meeting started from the applicant's engineer requesting a deferral as there have been some issues raised by Dominion Power at the location of the entrance. And so they have requested a deferral of this item. So I guess I will turn it over to Mr. Bain to ask what you would like to do with this item tonight.

Mr. Bain: Yes, based on their request I would like to make a motion to defer this item until the April 25<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. So a motion to defer by Mr. Bain...

Mr. Apicella: I will second that.

Ms. Vanuch: ... to the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting and leaving the public hearing open, correct.

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, alright. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, I will second that Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by Mr. Bain to leave the public hearing open and continue to the... what did you say...

Mr. Bain: April 25<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Vanuch: ...April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting and a second by Mr. Apicella. Any comments Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Any comments Mr. Apicella? Any other members of the Commission? Okay, so we can vote for the deferral. Okay so the motion passes 7-0. So we will have that item on April 25<sup>th</sup>. Moving to the next item on the agenda is the index of official road names. The proposed ordinance that would amend Stafford County Ordinance to change Big Spring Lane to Kelvic Way. This time we would like to recognize Ms. Andrea Hornung for the presentation.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2. **RC17151868; Reclassification - Dunkin' Donuts Rt17 & Melchers Drive** - A proposed zoning reclassification from the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, to allow for the development of a restaurant with a drive-through on Tax Map Parcel No. 53B-1-7 (Property), consisting of 0.2 acre. The Property is located on the north side of Warrenton Road, approximately 550 feet southeast of Solomon Drive, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: May 25, 2018) (History: February 14, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to March 14, 2018)**
3. **CUP17151869; Conditional Use Permit - Dunkin' Donuts Rt17 & Melchers Drive** - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a drive-through in the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 53B-1-7 and 53B-1-11 (Property), consisting of 0.83 acre. The drive-through is proposed with a restaurant use. The Property is located on the north side of Warrenton Road, approximately 500 feet southeast of Solomon Drive, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: May 25, 2018) (History: February 14, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to March 14, 2018)**

4. Index of Official Road Names - Proposed Ordinance O18-04 would amend the Stafford County Addressing Ordinance by amending the Index of Official Road Names to rename a road as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Current Road Name</u>	<u>New Road Name</u>
Big Spring Lane from the intersection with the public segment of Big Spring Lane to the terminus of the private segment of Big Spring Lane <b>(Time Limit: April 27, 2018)</b>	Big Spring Lane	Kelvic Way

Ms. Hornung: Thank you Madam Chairman, members of the Commission. This item that is on your agenda for this evening is the renaming of the existing private sector or Big Spring Lane. And... I don't see the arrow to forward it. Is it... oh that's right. I am sorry. This is a graphic that I took from the historic area that will show you the area in question. I think what I will do is I will go to the other one first. What happens is this Ordinance change for the Index of Official Road Names. It's from Big Spring Lane from... with the intersection with the public which is the yellow is the public right-of-way of Big Spring Lane and then the green is the private segment of Big Spring Lane. And what happened was when... in the past when the two parcels here, 102-C and 102-B, which is showing 56 Kelvic Way, those two parcels were developed through a major site plan and while working with Fire and Rescue because there were more than two structures on this private segment, staff had determined that the site plan would need to have an address so that that commercial project could be located. At the time staff had thought that the easement to that parcel was actually what would look like to the back toward 104. So that segment was named to Kelvic Way. The applicant for that site plan was allowed to pick the name of that easement. So then after that, in the meantime, staff had realized that we already had a private segment that was named Big Spring Lane or it retained the name of Big Spring Lane to the structure that is in the rear at 38-100. And so some of the things that staff had done is while we were processing this through the public hearing process, we allowed, you see in the bottom left, there is signage that shows 175 Big Spring Lane to the left in this graphic, as well as Kelvic Way. That was to appease both owners at the time because of the situation that had happened with the approval of the site plan so that the owner could get his permits as he was going through the process and also to maintain the 175 Big Spring Lane so that the owner at that residence would also still receive their mail. This graphic shows, at the top of it, 38-100 which the parcel is split into two pieces, shows that this particular parcel, the house at 175 Big Spring Lane is constructed in circa 1814. That's some information that staff could locate. Also the property associated with Accokeek Farm, there were two log buildings enclosed with and existing building... dwelling located, there are some outbuildings and terraces, civil war activity on the property and the house or another house may have served as a Union hospital and there may be some unmarked graves of Union soldiers. By the graphic you can also see that this dark line here at the... oops, at the time would be... would have been that boundary line of those properties as all... as well as the access to 38-100.

Mr. Harvey: Andrea.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Would you please press one of the color buttons on the top...

Ms. Hornung: Oh, I am sorry. Sorry about that. So this would be the private segment of Big Spring Lane that serves the ingress/egress to 38-100 and then this is the, at the time when this graphic was produced, which was about, I think, 2008 when the Phase 1 Architectural Study was done for another piece of property, this was the existing right-of-way for Big Spring. So this is the graphic that we have for you that shows in right here is now the public right-of-way for Big Spring that terminates here at this commercial property and this is this other one which is the green is the private access that serves all these properties, 102, 10-E...102-F, E, D, C, B, A, 102 and then on the west side 101 and 103-A. Currently 102-F, their address is off of the public Big Spring Lane and the rest of the parcels with the exception of these two are vacant. Staff had sent... when... once we... staff realized the situation with the... the address and while going through the Ordinance that we have, which is 28-141 through 160, which 150 to 160 are reserved. In order to change existing addresses of multiple parcels they have to go through the public hearing process. So what happened was staff had gone to the Community Economic Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors and submitted this information to them. After their review, the Board had decided to use the term... the road name Kelvic Way. The reason why they decided on that information was letters had gone out to all properties that were adjacent to this private segment as well as the kennel that is right here on 102-F, even they don't use this existing easement and their address is off the public right-of-way the information was sent to them. And all the people that are along this easement, they were given a form to fill out to give staff the top three names so that we would have three names for at least every parcel. So parcel 102-D and E did not respond, but the other parcels, 102-F, the kennel down here, as well as 38-100, they both agreed and submitted road names of Williamsons Lane, another name for Big Spring and Accokeek Farm. The only one that would have been viable would have been Williamson Lane because Big Spring Court would not have been appropriate for this area and not to have confusion with having two road very similar, Accokeek Farm was also was also too close to Accokeek Creek. So we tried to, when we are renaming roads, we try to be very careful on the naming of the roads so there is no confusion with Fire and Emergency Services and E911. Also the rest of the parcels all had agreed upon Kelvic Way, Kelvic Lane and another, I think, Kelvic Court. So when it went to the Board they had all this information and they decided to recommend to the full Board on their consent agenda to rename the street Kelvic Way. So when staff produced the staff report, staff used the recommendation, excuse me, from the Board of Supervisors to send to the Planning Commission for the public hearing. The main item is that this segment needs to be renamed because as the parcels along this segment become developed we will have multiple structures on this easement and we need to rename this portion so there is no confusion with the public right-of-way of Big Spring Lane and also so that no one along that easement will be having any confusion with their UPS, FedEx, postal service and 911. The reason for the sign being there showing both roads is so that both residences along that easement will not have any problems with postal service and E911. And staff has worked with USPS, we have not been able to communicate locally with USPS or UPS or FedEx because their 800 number is not local but our GIS staff member will try to communicate with UPS once they come to the office to try to discuss with them so that there won't any be a disruption in postal service. And I think that is most of the majority of the information that I wanted to provide to you. And so the naming of this road is for your recommendation, the Board has sent down the road Kelvic Way, but it is up to the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board on what this segment should be named.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Ms. Hornung. Does anybody on the Commission have any questions? Nope, okay, Mr. McPherson.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. McPherson: Yes Ms. Hornung, one question I had when driving down the road, one will notice that the first, I want to say quarter mile is well paved and then it turns into gravel/dirt road. Can you please explain why part of it is paved? I know it's a private road, it's not state maintained and why that is and if there are any plans as far as you know to extend that pavement.

Ms. Hornung: The pavement of the road was a requirement for the 56 Kelvic Way and the owner that... those two parcels when he developed he paved the road up to the end of his parcel and improved the gravel road all the way up to 38-100. And there is not to my knowledge any other information, VDOT does not maintain private roads so there wouldn't be any interaction from VDOT on that, so it would be all the responsibility of the owners along that easement.

Mr. McPherson: Thank you. So just to make sure I understand, he paved that road in order for it to be named Kelvic Way, pavement was part of that requirement.

Ms. Hornung: Yes, to pave the access to his property, since it was a commercial property.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Hornung: And to construct the road according to County standards.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: So this is still going to remain private, the naming does not in any way transfer ownership of the road right-of-way to the highway department or anything.

Ms. Hornung: Correct, that segment would have to be dedicated to the County with... and then VDOT has the memorandum of understanding agreement that they maintain all the County roads, once they are taken into the system.

Mr. Bain: So this just is a name change?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct.

Ms. Vanuch: Ms. Hornung, who owns the deeded access to the road now?

Ms. Hornung: That access is... the easement runs along all properties.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: I have some questions. So does the County have any guidelines for naming streets?

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: The guidelines that they have are in the Ordinance in that once a road is named by multiple owners, to change that or name it, if it's just a private drive that would have to go through the public hearing process. Where it would go to the Community and Economic Development Committee to give them the background information to be forwarded to their consent agenda where they would forward it to the Planning Commission for public hearing and then back to the Board for public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: I get the process. My question is more in terms of any guidance on preferences in terms of naming roads after historical figures or activity in the area or because to honor some person in Stafford County. Is there some kind of criteria along those lines?

Ms. Hornung: The criteria that staff uses for naming the roads are that they don't duplicate any, we are also working with some GIS staff members and public safety so that some of the roads that are widely known in the adjacent localities aren't very similar since the adjacent localities all interact with responding from Spotsylvania, Fredericksburg, Stafford and even some in Prince William. And also that there are no bad road names, you know language. We look at language and also the spelling of the roads so that if you pronounce that in dire need, you won't presume that it's something else. So we want to make sure that the pronunc... the way the road is named that there is no confusion. So if somebody wanted to name the road Lili versus Lily, we wouldn't do something like that. So we look at the spelling of the road, the sound of the road name that they recommend, and what we do is usually during the subdivision process, when we are creating road names or if it's just an access of a minor subdivision or family subdivision, we ask the applicant to recommend road names and then we compare it to our list, in our database to make sure that there's no confusion with road names or they are not similar in sounding or spelling.

Mr. Apicella: And how did we get to Kelvic on this particular...

Ms. Hornung: Kelvic was a recommendation of the applicant who developed 102-C and B. That is the name of the construction company.

Mr. Apicella: And do we normally name streets after builders, developers or businesses?

Ms. Hornung: There are some, yes. There's even some family sir names.

Mr. Apicella: I get the family sir names.

Ms. Hornung: Right.

Mr. Apicella: I am saying in terms of businesses or somebody who develops or pays for a road, do they get some entitlement to have that road named after them?

Ms. Hornung: We just look at a name that the applicant chooses and compare it, we don't make a distinction of whose name it is or this historic access... the historic name of the whatever they recommend. We just... we don't allow court and lane to be next to each other unless it's a subdivision. Sometimes we have let that happen where the same name is a court or lane. We try to make sure that we've stopped a lot of that, that we don't have like three names the same, in the... three that are the same in the same subdivision. So there is confusion for 911 because a lot of times people may not say it's a court a lane, avenue or a drive.

Mr. Apicella: Can you pull up the slide that shows the property at 38-100?

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I counted eight parcels that would front or be access by this road and what I heard you say is that you reached out to several or all of the property owners and only got two responses that were favorable towards Kelvic Way.

Ms. Hornung: No, there were only two that did not respond. What happened was 102-F and 38-100, their... those two parcels recommended the Williamson Lane or... let's see, Big Spring Lane North, Accokeek Farm Lane and Williamson Tract Lane. Then the rest of the parcels, if you don't mind I am going to go to the next one because it's glare, 38-103-A and 101 and 102 and 102-A, they are all owned by the same company, they recommended the Kelvic Way, Kelvic Lane or Kelvic Drive. And then also B and C recommended the same. But 102-D and 102-E did not respond for any type of a road name.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so can you go back to the previous slide?

Ms. Hornung: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Walnut Hill, that's the parcel 38-100?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct, from the information...

Mr. Apicella: And that has some historical significance? Is there any other parcel in Stafford also called Walnut Hill?

Ms. Hornung: I did not check that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Is there any street in Stafford called Walnut Hill? There is a Walnut Hill, I just checked on my phone, there is a Walnut Hill Farm. It's not a street, it's an actual location. So is there... to your knowledge is there any other parcel... is there any other street named Walnut Hill in Stafford. Lane...

Ms. Hornung: I don't recall at the moment. I would have to look at the list that we have, the address list.

Mr. Apicella: So one potential option to call out the historical significance of the area, would be to call it Walnut Hill something.

Ms. Hornung: It's possible as long there's no confusion that there is a Walnut Road or a Walnut Farm, we would try...

Mr. Apicella: Well it has hill, so there...

Ms. Hornung: True. We would try to... we would have to look and see what the other Walnut names are in the County.

Mr. Apicella: Have we chosen in the past to name road after the historical area that it is associated with...

Ms. Hornung: I believe so...

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Apicella: ... or geographic...

Ms. Hornung: Because we have, let's see, we have Accokeek Creek Lane that is, I believe near Colonial Forge and then there is Kellogg Mill, which I think I named after a mill, Ferry Farm, right. So there are some road names that are named after significant situations.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, and I am not trying to be pejorative, but there is no historical significance associated with Kelvic, it's just the name of the company that somehow owned property here and/or helped (inaudible).

Ms. Hornung: That is correct, I don't know of any historical significance for Kelvic.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: (Inaudible, microphone not on).

Mr. Bain: Not a question but following on Steve's... this is a private lane, so it's really not appropriate for the county to dictate the name that is selected. And that is why you went through the process of contacting the property owners, that's your normal process for private lanes, I guess.

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. When we realized... when staff realized that the access to the property for Kelvic Way was also the same access that was Big Spring Lane for the property of 38-100, that's when we started the public hearing process so that everybody is aware of that segment has to be named. And one thing I didn't mention that when we do send out the information that we would like road names, we require that 51 per cent of the property owners off of that segment would have to at least recommend a road name.

Mr. Bain: They have to agree?

Ms. Hornung: To agree, that is correct.

Mr. Apicella: It's a little unfair though in this case because 51 per cent is the... Kelvic, the same property owner.

Mr. Bain: The same property owner.

Ms. Hornung: No it's not the same property owner, the property owner that chose Kelvic is only B and C.

Mr. Apicella: I thought you said that four of the lots were owned by that same company.

Ms. Hornung: No four of the lots are owned by 7K Investments.

Mr. Bain: Oh, I understood her...

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Hornung: I apologize. No, 103-A, 101, 102-A and 102 are all owned by 7K Investments. 38-100, which is split into two pieces by our maps are owned by the same person, 102-B and C are owned by one

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

entity, the company. 102-D is owned by one persona and 102-E is owned by somebody else and them 102-F is the kennel.

Mr. Apicella: And this company, is that that building that we see over on the down side of the... Kelvic, where is that?

Ms. Hornung: This is Kelvic. This is what was, let me use a different color. This map shows an old structure, which is still there right now until... it will be razed once electricity is disconnected by Virginia Dominion Power. The 56 Kelvic Way, the new building is actually over right next to it, right about here. But at one point this structure was 56 Big Spring Lane. That is the reason for keeping the same number.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but I am still trying to under... the company itself, Kelvic is a company, right?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. Kelvic Construction owns 102-C and 102-B.

Mr. Apicella: And will they have a presence on this private road going forward?

Ms. Hornung: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: That is one of those...

Ms. Hornung: That's their access to the public road, of Big Spring Lane.

Mr. Apicella: Gotcha. Alright, thank you.

Ms. Hornung: It goes out to...

Mr. Apicella: What does it take in the long term, if this road... What would it take for this road to become a state maintained road in the future?

Ms. Hornung: Fifty... at least fifty feet of right-of-way would have to be dedicated so you would have twenty-five feet on each side of the parcels. Because right now the parcels actually go... they touch each other. This easement is shown because half the easement is on the parcel to the left, half the easement is on the parcels to the right. But I don't have that exact information because I don't have any survey that shows exactly where this easement is... runs along. But typically easements that are private run along the property lines of the parcels and half the easement is on one side of the property and the other half of the easement is on the other side. So somebody would have to... all the parcels would have to give up at least twenty-five feet on each side to make this a public right-of-way and then that fifty feet would have to be dedicated to the county, constructed to county and VDOT standards with inspections and bonding and then once that is accepted into the VDOT system then VDOT would maintain that road for improvements and snow removal.

Mr. Apicella: How does that happen now? Who maintains the road if there is a snow storm? How does it get cleared?

Ms. Hornung: If it's a private road it's up to the property owners along that easement.

Mr. Apicella: Is there some sort of agreement or association that takes care of that?



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Hornung: Sometimes there are agreements (inaudible) would be agreement. I don't know of any for this easement.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Hornung: I am not aware of any.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks.

Ms. Vanuch: I have a quick question. When Steven was making his comments, I have a road very much like this by my house except they did deed it to the County but they just never bonded it and finished the paving, so the residents got stuck with it. However, they... some of the residents have a road maintenance agreement. So my question is, if all... can we find out if the residents have a road maintenance agreement? And if we change the name, does that then make their road maintenance agreement null and void because it's a different named road?

Ms. Hornung: I don't know. I know that usually if the properties have a maintenance agreement we recommend that they record it. But I had not looked into that, I don't know if there is a recorded maintenance agreement for and I am not sure if changing the name, if changing the name would null and void or cause issues for the agreement.

Mr. Wisniewski: It would be a problem, obviously, for the private owners potentially depending on how the agreement is written. My guess is that an agreement like that would include a description of the easement and it would probably account for changes in the road name and you'd certainly want to consider that in drafting the agreement. But that is up to the private property owners.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, any other questions from the Commission? Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: One quick question. Can you go back to the map again please?

Ms. Hornung: Sure.

Mr. Randall: 38-100, what were their recommendations for the road names? Do you have that available?

Ms. Hornung: Yes their recommendations were Big Spring Lane North, as the first one. Accokeek Farm Lane as the second, and Williamson Tract Lane as the third.

Mr. Randall: So they were the ones that had that, okay.

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. And the only one that would be a valid name would be Williamson Tract, because Big Spring Lane North, we don't use directional...

Mr. Randall: Directions.

Ms. Hornung: There may be some roads in the county that were previously assigned, but we do not use north, south, east or west and Accokeek Farm is too close to Accokeek I think it's Creek.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Now I am looking at their application and they do have some reasons for those three names, but obviously that wasn't considered when the final decision was made, was that correct?

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: All the information that is in the staff report that was provided to the Board of Supervisors at their Community and Economic Development Committee.

Mr. Randall: When they made their decision.

Ms. Hornung: That is correct.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, any other questions? Okay, so now we will move on to, if nobody has any other questions, to the public hearing portion of the meeting. Where the public can come up and make comments. Y'all have three minutes when the green light comes on, one minute when the yellow light comes on and when the red light comes on please cease your comments. When you come up to the podium please state your name, your address and the district that you reside. Does any member of the public wish to come up to the podium to speak on the renaming of Big Spring Lane? Okay, come on down.

Mr. Hicks: Good evening Madam Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Dan Hicks I live in the Rock Hill district. I actually sent a view graph presentation, did you receive that and was it input into the system? It had three slides on it. Oh that's it, right there. So cool, it's up there and I think this is the push button, right? And you go forward just like a view... okay, so I am ready to go. Oh I already stated huh? Son of a gun, well alright. So what I would like to talk about is am against renaming Big Spring Lane to Kelvic Way and this map kind of shows, I did research on this and everything I found on the internet was... comes back to this address 56 Kelvic Way, which belongs to the Kelvic Construction Company Incorporated. So they have already, somehow, through the internet and official or unofficial GPS location has identified themselves as being on Kelvic Way. So I said well wait a minute, I guess this road has already been named, but apparently it hasn't. She explained why the two different signs and why it is, but I am still kind of perplexed why it's showing up on the internet and any kind of Google search. That's actually what showed up here. So the next thing is I would like to make this one, I support renaming the subject to Williamson Lane, also Walnut Hill doesn't sound too bad either, I mean again it's associated with the historical sites, good point on the Commissioner. And by doing... calling it Williamson we would recognize a long time Stafford resident and her contributions to preserving local and historical sites, buildings in the area. And one thing I am concerned about and this is why I am here, is because the unfair Stafford County bias towards a large construction company by placing the companies name on a Stafford road implying that Kelvic Construction Incorporated is considered special because now they have got a named road after them. I am a little concerned about that. I don't know that that's a precedent or what happened there. Then the other thing is Stafford County should... they have got to rename the road, I understand about the emergency services, no problem there, it's got to be renamed. But my... one of the questions, I can't ask questions I know that, but shouldn't the county have taken care of this when they extended Big Spring Lane east, when they incurred all that extra development. There's several buildings and so forth, and all they did was extend the name and kind of left Ms. Williamson out to dry. So I would like to show you the next view graph here, this is a different... this is a satellite presentation and you can see where that... where I've got it labeled Kelvic Construction, it's a pretty good sized development there for them, and their access to the road. And then you can see Ms. Williamson's house back there in the back. The other thing I would like to point out is the Williamson property is listed on the Historical American Building Survey, the HABS at the Library of Congress. There is evidence of Civil War activities that has already been brought out and the thing that kind of perplexed me is the address is already established on Google maps, it's already showing up,

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

multiple internet site show the address and I would like to know how and why this has already happened. But I kind of got the answer already, so that kind of answered my questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you.

Mr. Hicks: And I am done.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you so much. Would anyone else like to come down?

Ms. Williamson: I am Margareta Williamson. In 1963 we purchased a one hundred and fifty year old house on 62 acres at the end of a one mile long wagon road, which had no name. Our first address was a post office box, since then the County has changed our name five times. The sixth time is going to be this Kelvic Way, which is not historic as Eskimo Hill Road and Big Spring Lane are which mark historic spots in the area. Around 1994 Tridex changed the name to Big Spring Lane and that was east bound, but I talked to the Planning Commission and Jeff Harvey promised me the name would not be changed again, it would stay Big Spring Lane forever. This address is listed on maps, the Google, the GPS system as well as the Historic American Buildings Survey. In May 2016, Kelvic Construction purchased ten acres and was told by the County that the road had to be brought up to standard. Last September he illegally tore out the sign pointing to northbound Big Spring and the County sign that showed house number for each direction. It resulted in a complete obliteration of my address and my living quarters. It took me two weeks before they would put up another little sign that said Big Spring Lane that way for the fire and rescue and the physical therapist who helped me. I think it is unconscionable that a new person can come in and change a lane name for no reason, but for his building site and all other people along that lane have to cohere to that. I have three suggestions, one is of course Northbound Big Spring Lane, which is directional, two is Accokeek Lane, which would give the historic area of Accokeek Tract a precise spot and the third of course is the Williamson Lane for us who maintained the road and paid taxes for fifty-five years. Thank you.

Hi, my name is Angelita Crawford, thank you for allowing me to speak although I don't live in the County I am a Virginia State resident and I live in Fauquier County and formally I worked for Prince William County Fire Department, so I definitely see the need to address the road name change so that fire and rescue can easily identify how to be able to be able to respond to seek medical attention to the new resident that is there at Kelvic Construction and to Ms. Margareta Williamson, because I do care for her. I did hear Andrea say that they appeased both residents by allowing two roads, and as you saw on her diagram, two road signs, 175 Big Spring. Although when Kelvic moved in they did stay at the house and the county turned down them turning that place into a commercial building. As I spoke on Mike on September 27, 2017, he stated that they were constructing a new facility there at the property adjacent to it and he stated that he went to the local fire chief and the Fire Chief said that they could change the road name. So it was a good 'ole boy handshake that the name Kelvic Way came along. And I am not hearing that any policies and procedures were followed correctly and I thinking that if we FOIA those information that we could follow the paper trail that these were just a knee jerk reaction to go ahead and let Kelvic named their property. That way and not keep it Big Spring, but I would just suggest that it stay with Walnut Hill as recommend if it is not going to be named Williamson and I have put in a formal complaint with VDOT for the sign to come down because it is a state right-of-way and we don't allow... they don't allow signs to be put up like political signs. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Ms. Crawford. Come on down.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Zarn: Good evening, my name is Robert Zarn and I am owner of RDK Holdings, LLC, which is the property owner of the two parcels. I also own Kelvic Construction, who is the occupant of that subject property. It is true that in May of 2016 we did acquire the property after doing a sixty day feasibility study on what we wanted to construct there and how we wanted to operate. After that was concluded we actually purchased the property and began developing a major site plan for submission to the county. After we made that submission and had our technical review committee meeting, there were many things that came out of that meeting that didn't exactly line up with what we thought was going to happen during our feasibility period... our study. So we kind of went... and one of the things that came up and that was that the road must be named. It was currently an unnamed portion of the road, it was more of a pipe stem off of the main Big Spring public road. That was just one of the items, there were several items that came through there that were going to require significant additional expense for us to develop what we intended to develop on this property. So we began to have internal communications and meetings about how we were going to move forward with the additional expenses that were going to be needed to comply with the counties requirements for us to construct. And we had determined that the other property in Spotsylvania County would be a better solution for us because even though we were significantly vested in the Stafford property the savings that we would recognize in Spotsylvania County would outweigh the expense for the new water line, sewer line, the roadway construction that needed to be done in Stafford. So we were... we pretty much decided that we were going to abandon the project and try to sell the property and recoup what we could. During that process we were notified by Stafford Planning that our name choice, Kelvic Way was approved and that we would change the name on our general development plan... on our major site plan to Kelvic Way, which we did. We changed that name on the plan, it was approved. I have a copy of those approved plans, all of our permits were approved as 56 Kelvic Way. The utilities people that brought us utilities, that we installed, have all been installed with that new road name as per my plan. The road sign was installed per plan on the approved plan. So a lot of this is just a different, I am sorry, my time is up.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone like to come down?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Who is making, I heard applicant and that sound like this person is the applicant. Normally we can ask questions of an applicant. So is the applicant the County or is the applicant the gentleman here.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Harvey, who would be the applicant?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, there is not applicant. In this case the County is holding a public hearing to recommend that a street name be reassigned for this particular situation. So, in this case the county is the one that is instigating...

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: ... it for emergency response purposes but there is not applicant.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Okay, come on down Mr. Waldowski.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, the Rock Hill District. Now I have heard some good discussion here and if you looked on the map it said Shady Hill Lane. So I love that it is called the Kelvic Way, it just sound like wow, why don't we make it the Waldowski Way, which is the right way. But what also came up was Eskimo Hill Lane and I like Walnut Hill Lane. I like the Williamson Lane name, I think it is really great that we tie it with the historical significance of the County, look behind you, 1664. And I just don't understand why, just because the applicant, who's not in this. Just because you get something approved doesn't mean you did it legally. Public servants make mistakes, they made a mistake. I know all about private water lines, golly, I own a condo, it's the Days Inn, you are welcome to come stay. It's all furnished for you. Don't worry you can use all the water you want because they don't bill me. And there's confusion with the name Kelvic, it's just... if I was a firefighter, especially the volunteer firefighters, you know I don't worry about the paid ones, but the volunteer guys, you know, they work really hard to find it, you know. You know if I was on that Board there wouldn't be no paid firemen. That was one of my campaign promises, also just like getting rid of Utility Commissioners. Oh, I can't do everything you know, but I have got one minute and seven seconds. Now my dentist is Doctor Misto and he has a street named after him off 610. Now I think that was appropriate because there has been a couple dental emergencies within my family. And I just told them to Google Misto and they were able to right to Misto Lane, which is a good thing because public safety and taking care of our citizens is a great thing. I have a lot of empathy for Ms. Williamson, I love people that... 1963, God love you. Remember 11/22/1963 is when JFK got assassinated ad few of you know exactly where you were. So historical precedence is really important and I will finish with... if you are going to rename it, why don't we rename it the Shady Kelvic Lane?

Ms. Vanuch: (Inaudible, microphone not on) no one else coming forward I will bring it back to the Planning Commission (Inaudible, microphone not on). Does anyone on the Planning Commission have any questions (Inaudible, microphone not on).

Mr. McPherson: (Inaudible, microphone not on).

Ms. Vanuch: Okay Mr. McPherson.

Mr. McPherson: Ms. Hornung, if I can ask a question. And I believe I know the answer, I just want to make sure I am a hundred per cent certain. The Kelvic Corporation has in fact already built their building, made their improvements, not just the road, but all the things he was talking about is competed. Is that correct?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. They received their occupancy permit, probably one or two months ago. I am not sure of the exact date, but yes they are under operation.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, and my second question is there's a comment about before extending the current public Big Spring Lane. The current Big Spring Lane from where it starts at Route 1 until it ends, was that all one hundred per cent built before the private road was called also Big Spring Lane, or was the private road there before Big Spring Lane, the public part, was extended?

Ms. Hornung: From what I understand when I was looking into the date when Tridex Corporation was approved, their site plan was approved in 2008. So I was employed in 2006, so I don't have the knowledge of when the Big Spring Lane, when it branched. But I can presume that from the time that the Tridex Corporation was completed and approved they extended the lane and extended the public right-of-way from the intersection of the private... current private segment of Big Spring and extended the public right-of-way toward the Tridex Corporation.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you. So, I apologize, I don't remember the gentleman's name but it is quite possible that the public Big Spring Lane happened after the private had already been in existence quite some time.

Ms. Horning: It's possible. It could have ended at the intersection and would have been an easement maybe to that property, just in experience in what we see when you have an easement that end and there's vacant properties and once they develop there is the opportunity to either extend it to make public or, you know, add new roads like they do in subdivision when they are creating roads throughout the subdivision and they are dedicating right-of-way.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: So I am a little confused because I heard the last gentleman who spoke during public comment who is the proprietor of Kelvic Company, mentioned Spotsylvania and that kind of threw me for a bit of a ringer. Because he was saying he wanted to move to Stafford but then chose Spotsy because... for whatever reason it was cheaper. So I am still not clear what the final intent of Kelvic Construction is in relationship to one or more of the parcels based on what he said.

Ms. Hornung: Oh, the information that I know, that I... when being involved with the development of that project was that the Kelvic Construction was located in Orange County off of Germanna... I think the address was Germanna Highway, near Lake of the Woods. And they were looking to relocate because the majority of their employees lived in Stafford County so that's why they chose Stafford County. But if they were going to be continual issues and not being able to complete the project and receive the final occupancy permit there was the opportunity that he could have looked into Spotsylvania. But as we see he is now working in Stafford and is residing at that parcel.

Mr. Apicella: Can you again explain what improvements were made and why they were made on that road?

Ms. Hornung: When a commercial or non-residential site plan is coming to the county for development, typically and also in our ordinances we... staff requires, excuse me, and also VDOT requires that the access to their property is improved. If they are on a public road they may have to dedicate right-of-way. If they are on an easement, then that easement is to be improved to county standards even if VDOT will not accept it. Because in our ordinances we do allow if you want to call it private roads not maintained by VDOT, owned by the county for non-residential projects, similar to industrial parks where some of those roads are not owned by the county or maintained by VDOT but they are developed, constructed in accordance with county standards, which are very similar to VDOT standards. So that if in the future if that road is to be taken into the system and dedicated to the county then it's already constructed and we have plans that show the construction of that so that it's easier to take it into the system. Otherwise they would have to submit a plan for development of that road and then reconstruct that road to VDOT standards and county standards.

Mr. Apicella: So this would be true regardless of the circumstances on any private road. If you were a business and you wanted to operate and the roads weren't up to standards you'd have to make some improvements.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: Okay and their clearly not the only property owner along that segment of roadway, private or whatever.

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. If the parcels after Kelvic Construction become developed, they are going to be responsible for developing the road adjacent to their property for access. So they would have to connect to the existing end of paved right-of...paved road.

Mr. Apicella: So this wasn't done for some noble purpose to make the road to some additional standard. It was to their benefit to make those improvements otherwise they wouldn't be able to site their...

Ms. Hornung: What was required on the site plan was that they improve the road to county standards for access to the nearest public road.

Mr. Apicella: And we have no guarantee that they are going to be here for the next ten, twenty, fifty years. They can pick up...

Ms. Hornung: I don't have that information. No there's... I don't recall. I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. McPherson.

Mr. McPherson: Can a road have two names? Can it be Kelvic Way for the first quarter mile and change to Williamson Tract or Walnut Hill Road for the second part? Is there precedent for that and an easy way for emergency services to work that?

Ms. Hornung: It is possible, I mean we do have one in the county, but there is a division. If you look at Eskimo Hill as it goes toward the airport and after the bridge it becomes American Legion, that's one that I know of because I travel it frequently when I am at the airport for a meeting. I do not recall any other roads in the county that have that situation. I know some of the road you may see may have a east west or directional location on them. It may have been due to road realignment or road improvements that the county and VDOT had done in the past. I am not aware at the time of which ones that I could designate for you. But typically to change the name or have a different name for a road midway through, it would be very difficult. But if that's the case we would give... provide that information. It's not ideal but we would provide that information to 911 and our GIS for our mapping. Now... and we would also submit that information to USPS because I do have the Richmond address and the local address, so that when we have address issues that I can communicate with them. As far as the others, Google maps or USPS, I mean... sorry UPS or FedEx the county doesn't have any control when they update their maps, because we have another issue, we are trying to get a road updated on UPS and FedEx but we don't have any control with the other private delivery companies. All we can do is provide the information to the United States Post Office and hope that they will see that once the county has approved a road name that they will incorporate it into their master address list.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. McPherson are you done?

Mr. McPherson: How long would it take, in your estimate, the research a new road name like Walnut Hill, if that was to come up? Or any other, I am just saying.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: It wouldn't take me very long at all. Probably by the time I got up to my computer and I looked it up it would take a few minutes.

Mr. McPherson: As far as the viability and...

Ms. Hornung: What I would do is I would search Walnut Hill... what I would do is I would search Walnut and see what came up, what road names came up under Walnut. If it was Walnut Hills, Walnut Farm, Walnut and the then lane and I don't put in a suffix for it. And that way I could see all the names that are already approved in the system or reserved as a result of a subdivision under review.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: I wanted to try and understand, and maybe some of the Commissioners know this, why did the land development plan get approved with the name Kelvic Way on it then the GDP. Was that a situation where the owners of the property were doing their GDP and didn't have a name for the road so they just stuck it on there and the county didn't pick up on it or didn't questions that and it just got approved that way, or did the County say oh you can put any name you want on it? Jeff maybe you can offer some guidance there. How did it end up being semi-official when there was a road name there before they bought the land and put in their development plan, even though it was still Big Spring Lane, I presume it was recognized by the County as Big Spring Lane something. So how did it...

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Bain, basically the County staff made an error.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: The road had always been named Big Spring Lane and in reviewing the site plan it was brought up that we needed to correct the problem with Big Spring Lane having a fork in it in two directions. And the comments that were done during the review was to rename the road and they worked with Mr. Zarn, the owner of the project to name the road and they did so on a plat. Unfortunately that didn't follow the process that is required for changing the road name. The process for changing the road name is what we are doing right now, is to hold a public hearing with notice to all the affected owners.

Mr. Bain: Okay. So at this point it would not be difficult to go back and expand the process in some way and get additional input or incorporate the comments of the Planning Commission in this process, I presume. I am not sure I am ...

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Bain...

Mr. Bain: ... phrasing that correctly. I can understand the concern of the residents on the way Kelvic Way came about, but I don't think that should add any weight to the process. I don't know.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Bain, in order to... if you want... if the Commission wants to hold another public hearing, certainly you are free to do so. Because you had mentioned the question about public participation and notice, so we could certainly send out notice again to all the owners along the road to get more feedback. And the Commission can hold another hearing. But in one way or another we need to have a road name change and the Commission can as part of your recommendation, recommend whatever road name the Commission feels is appropriate.



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Boswell: I have...

Mr. Bain: Let me... let me continue here just a minute if you don't mind. The parcels that Kelvic Construction own, we know. But does Mr., is it Mr. Zarn, okay. Does Mr. Zarn own the other parcels under a different company name?

Ms. Hornung: No.

Mr. Bain: Those other three?

Ms. Hornung: No. Mr. Zarn is the owner of Kelvic Construction that owns those two parcels of B and C.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Hornung: Can we go back to the presentation please.

Mr. Bain: Alright, and you had said that in addition to B and C the owners of, I think it was A and 103-A and 101 also supported Kelvic Way?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct. In the...

Mr. Bain: And who owns those properties?

Ms. Hornung: In the staff report, I added the information from the street name application that I sent out to all the property owners along this easement. And I included 102-F even if their address was off of the public right-of-way. The parcels of 101, 102, 102-A and 103-A are all owned by 7K Investments, LLC. They submitted the street name application for their first choice Kelvic Way, the second choice Kelvic Lane and the third choice Kelvic Drive.

Ms. Vanuch: Do we know... really quickly, do they own 38-102-B and C prior to the purchase from Kelvic. Like did... are they the ones who owned the property that Kelvic purchased?

Ms. Hornung: I don't have that information.

Speaker from audience: Inaudible.

Ms. Vanuch: We usually don't allow...

Ms. Hornung: I have to...

Ms. Vanuch: We usually don't allow...

Ms. Hornung: I have to go back to...

Ms. Vanuch: We usually don't allow those types of questions. We will have to have Andrea research it.

Ms. Hornung: ... Commissioner information...

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: ... to check who was the owner prior to.... Well wait a minute, I might even have...

Ms. Vanuch: Because then that would make sense that those other three parcels aligned with the name because they bought... they probably paid them for the land.

Ms. Hornung: Actually, I have the Commissioner of Revenue...

Ms. Vanuch: Let's call Scott on his cell phone.

Ms. Hornung: No, I actually have the... I actually have the print out.

Mr. Boswell: While she is looking that up I just have a quick question. This little arrow right here says that this parcel is... the address is 56 Kelvic Way. Is that correct or is it a Big Spring Lane address? What is there address right now as we sit here?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Boswell the address that was issued for that property is 56 Kelvic Way. So again we have a problem with two... essentially two different types of addresses going on, on that segment of road. Big Spring Lane for Ms. Williamson's and Kelvic Way for Mr. Zarn's property.

Mr. Boswell: So this is a big goof, as we sit here right now.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Boswell: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall, we are going to... I think we are going to allow a couple more questions then I think Mr. McPherson is ready to move forward. Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Randall: It's interesting in the staff report that we have that it may be a mere coincidence but the list of different road names for 103, 101 is exactly the same as we have from 102-B and 102-C. My guess is based on the conversation that we have had, that there was some communication back and forth between the two, would be my guess. Do you know that to be a fact or not?

Ms. Hornung: I don't have that information.

Mr. Randall: Okay,

Ms. Hornung: No. But I did find... Madam Chairman, I did find that 102-B prior to the Commissioner of Revenue, when it was recorded in May, May 20, 2016 the owner was Hill 628 LP that acquired it 2006. And it just has a will and... will book... page book... page and will book number. I am sorry, page and book number from 1989 to 2006. It doesn't have a name, but January 31, 2006 is when Hill 628 acquired 102-B. 102-C was, the first information for ownership is 5/1/98 for Bryant Bunch, Trustee and they sold it to RDK Holdings 5/19/2016. So these two parcels were acquired by RDK Holdings May 19<sup>th</sup> and May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 for RDK Holdings which is Kelvic Construction and owned by Mr. Zarn.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: I am sorry to jump in. So I think Mr. Randall was kind of eluding to questions, and I am sorry if I am misinterpreting it. This... Kelvic is a construction company, right? Or has some business associated with construction.

Ms. Hornung: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: 7K Investments, they are a developer, right? As far as I understand it. I have seen (inaudible).

Ms. Hornung: I presume so, I honestly don't know for a fact.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Do we know if there is any affiliation between 7K Investments and the Kelvic Construction Company?

Ms. Hornung: I don't have any information for that. I am sorry. I am not aware of that. I don't have any information. I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Hornung: If there's any connection between the two companies.

Mr. Apicella: Alright or at least a business relationship.

Ms. Hornung: I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so I don't believe I closed the public hearing yet. So I am go ahead and close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission for hopefully a motion from Mr. McPherson, since it's in his district. What are your thoughts Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, I move that we do not make a decision tonight. That we hold another public hearing as soon as practical, say two meetings from now, and...

Ms. Vanuch: So would it be a new public hearing on a new name? How would that work Mr. Harvey because we've closed the public hearing? Do we have to... how do we... how do we move forward.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, the advertisement was based on what the Board had referred to the Planning Commission. So if you hold another hearing to get input, you would still have a recommendation to the Board as to what to name the road. So the ad won't necessarily change because this was the name that was referred to the Commission by the Board.

Ms. Vanuch: So, I guess... okay, I will let you finish so we can discuss.

Mr. McPherson: I have a question for Mr. Harvey, however.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. A mid-motion question?

Mr. McPherson: Our choice is either Kelvic Way or nothing at this point, this evening?

Mr. Harvey: No sir, I believe your choices are whether to accept Kelvic Way or recommend some other name to the Board.

Mr. McPherson: I move that we defer that choice to a... after more research and public input to make a... before we give a recommendation for another name to the Board.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Do we have a second for that Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I will second that and I hope that perhaps we can reach out, maybe to the Historical Commission and see if they have... or other stakeholders to see if they have any input on an appropriate name.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion from Mr. McPherson to defer this to a later date and to solicit public feedback and do a little more research on an appropriate name.

Mr. Wisniewski: Madam Chair, you should select a particular meeting, I am assuming you are talking about the next one. I am sorry, then you should also keep the public hearing open for that meeting as well.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Wisniewski: If you intend to solicit additional public input.

Ms. Vanuch: So we can do that even though I have already closed it?

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, I move that you reopen the public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Alright. So we'll just leave the public hearing open then and we will hold another public hearing to get the public input and Mr. Apicella has requested that we also get information from the Historical Commission as well. Any discussion Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Just a brief comment if I may. I do appreciate Ms. Williamson, you taking the time, and her friends to come up and Mr. Zarn coming up. I would like to point out that my opinion is everybody has played by the rules so to speak. People are saying who is more special? And who is not special? I think that everybody has done what they were told was legitimate and to be done and that the name ended up as Kelvic Way due to Mr. Zarn doing what he was told he had to do. Having said that I think we do need to consider this further. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: I mean... I think folks can see kind of where I might be headed on this and I just want to say that we may be missing an opportunity to highlight the historical significance of the area and that would be lost if we name it the way that's been proposed.

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else on the Commission have any comments? Okay and I am not one hundred percent I stated the date for the public hearing for the record, so we will just go with the first meeting in April, which I think is April...

Mr. Harvey: April 11<sup>th</sup> Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: April 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Boswell: Is that enough time to get...

Ms. Vanuch: Is that enough time to get... solicit input from the Historic Commission? Is that enough time to advertise to meet deadlines for public hearing?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, since this is a continuation of the public hearing, we don't need to do another ad.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: So we are good there. I don't recall when the Historical Commission meets, so we will have to get... we will try to notify them if we can't speak to them specifically at their meeting we can solicit input from their Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, great. Alright so we will move forward with April 11<sup>th</sup>. Okay, seeing no other discussion from the Commission we can vote on deferring to April 11<sup>th</sup>. Okay so the motion passes 7-0. Okay so moving on to the next item on the agenda, which is the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning Districts. For this we will recognize Ms. Blackburn for the presentation.

5. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O18-05 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-35, Table 3.1, "District Uses and Standards," to establish requirements for retirement in the RBC, Recreation Business Campus Zoning District. The proposed Ordinance would set requirements for minimum yards, maximum height, minimum lot width, and minimum lot size for single-family, duplex, townhouse, multi-family, village, patio, and weak-link townhouse type dwelling units. Additionally, the Ordinance would clean up other zoning ordinance provisions relating to executive housing in the RBC zoning district and removing references to parts of the Code no longer in existence. **(Time Limit: April 27, 2018)**

Ms. Blackburn: Good evening Madam Chairman and Planning Commissioners. This evening you are asked to consider proposed Ordinance O18-05 which will amend Chapter 28 of the County Code regarding re-establishing lot size, lot width, and setbacks for retirement housing in the Recreational Business Campus, RBC, Zoning District, and to remove reference to regulations that no longer exist in the Ordinance. The RBC Zoning District allows for retirement housing as a permitted use, and the standards refer to Table 5.1, R-2 Cluster Regulations, for minimum lot sizes and building setbacks. The Board of Supervisor's adoption of Ordinance O12-20 on March 20, 2012, repealed Table 5.1 as part of a complete revision of the County's cluster subdivision standards, but Ordinance O12-20 did not retain any standards for retirement housing in the RBC District. So, this proposed text amendment would re-establish the lot size, lot width, and setback standards for retirement housing and the lot size, width, and setbacks for townhouses, duplexes, and single-family dwellings would be the same as those permitted in the former Table 5.1 and, therefore, would not create any non-conformities for existing developments. The

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

amendment would also include standards for the other types of dwellings that are included in the definition of retirement housing, which are village, patio, and weak-link townhouse units. And these standards are the same as those permitted in the R-3, Urban Residential–High Density Zoning District for these types of dwellings. And these standards were chosen because the density calculations for both districts are the same. And the proposed amendment would also delete remaining erroneous references to Table 5.1 in the Zoning Ordinance and this is particular for the R-2 and the R-3 Residential Zoning Districts. And the Community and Economic Development Committee reviewed this proposed Ordinance at its meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> of November in 2017, and voted to forward the Ordinance to the full Board for referral to the Planning Commission. On December 19<sup>th</sup>, the Board voted to refer the proposed Ordinance to this Commission for their review and recommendation. And staff recommends the Planning Commission vote to recommend approval of proposed Ordinance O18-05 for it will re-establish standards in the RBC district and will enable development of retirement housing to continue in that district, and remove references to regulations that no longer exist. And Resolution R17-321 does provide for the Planning Commission to make recommendations but it does not provide for any changes to be made to the proposed Ordinance. And do you have any questions?

Ms. Vanuch: Commission, do you have any questions? It'll be a first for tonight. Alright, so no questions.

Mr. Apicella: It was just such a great staff presentation.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so seeing no questions from the Commission, I'm going to go ahead and open up the public hearing on this item. And so now would be the time for any member of the public to come down and make comments. You have 3 minutes (inaudible - microphone not on). State your name, address, and the district you live. Does anybody wish to come down? Alright, seeing no one rushing the podium I will close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Does anyone on the Commission have any comments for discussion?

Mr. English: No comments, but I'd like to make a motion to approve the proposed Ordinance O18-05.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so a motion by Mr. English, second by Mr. Boswell. Mr. English?

Mr. English: No comments.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Commission members? Seeing none we will go ahead and vote, and I think show for the record that Mr. McPherson is out of the room for this one. Okay, so the motion passes 6 with one absent/abstention (Mr. McPherson). Alright, so now we'll be moving on to item number 6 on the agenda which is Unfinished Business. This is the Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review for the Stafford County Northern Fueling Station. For this we'll recognize Mr. Geouge for presentation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

6. COM17152019; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review - Stafford County Northern Fueling Station - A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2232, for the placement of a county vehicle fueling station on the site of the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, Tax Map Parcel No. 30-3B, located on the north side of Coal Landing Road, approximately 550 feet east of Greenridge Drive, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: April 15, 2018) (History: Deferred on February 14, 2018 to March 14, 2018)**

Mr. Geouge: Good evening Madame Chair, members of the Commission. I'm Brian Geouge, Planning and Zoning. This is a Comprehensive Plan Compliance review for Stafford County northern fueling station. A public hearing for this application was held on February 14<sup>th</sup>. Some concerns were expressed at that time regarding the preservation of the existing, wooded buffer along Coal Landing Road and potential visual and noise impacts on nearby residents. The applicant has revised the concept plan based on input received at that meeting. Changes include a more accurate depiction of resource protection areas, which is hard to see on this, but I'll try to highlight the limits of that. And also more accurate depiction of existing, wooded areas. The fuel pumps, wash station and restrooms have been shifted to the north end of the development and they have also added some dimensions for areas, the wooded areas that would be preserved and it's estimated at approximately 50 feet of that wooded area would be preserved along Coal Landing Road with this layout. Staff has also recommended that they shift the proposed development to the north to occupy more of the existing cleared area, but the applicant has stated that they cannot determine if this is feasible until final design, due to topography and environmental constraints. They did provide an example of what the fueling station could look like. This one is currently in use on Wyatt Lane. You can see it's a tank surrounded by the pumps with bollards for protection. Staff the notes the positives with this application is that it's consistent with some of the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, consistent with the established industrial use at he Aquia wastewater treatment facility, and negative is still, that there is potential reduction of existing natural buffers and greater impacts on nearby residents. And finally we are recommending approval of this application, pursuant to PCR18-01 and we believe that the applicant will make their best effort to preserve that buffer at the time of site plan.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Geouge.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Does anybody on the Commission have additional questions? No questions and this is not a public hearing item, so we won't be pausing for that. So if no one has any questions I'll turn it over...oh, Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Just one. You say that they have to get to final design before they know for sure what the impacts will be. Is there any opportunity for this to come back to the Commission, if the impacts turn out to be significant, or they can't do the plan the way they're showing it now?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not aware of a scenario, where they would have to come back to the Planning Commission. The only thing I can think of is, if for whatever reason they can't provide the amount of landscaping that's required by code, they would potentially have to come in for departure of design standards, but I don't foresee that happening.

Mr. Bain: Alright. Thank you.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: And I didn't ask if the applicant wanted to come up, which the applicant technically is the School Board, so, would the School Board, would you like to come up? Does anybody have any questions? Okay.

Mr. Randall: Madame Chair. I do have a couple of questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: If you don't mind Mr. Horan. I'm sorry.

Ms. Vanuch: You thought you were getting off easy.

Mr. Horan: Yes, Scott Horan from Stafford County Public Schools, Assistant Superintendent for Operations.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. Looking at...can you pull up the plan? I walked the lot a couple of days ago. Is your black line where that fence is on that lot, is that kind of where the outline is of where you expect to be putting the wash station and the fuel pumps?

Mr. Horan: It is. Yes sir.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. And then the parking, do we expect busses to get in there that way, to get in and out, or is that parking just a symbol of what could be potentially there, but not necessarily accurate to location?

Mr. Horan: Exactly. It's just a concept and actually, when we start the design process, parking is the least of our priorities.

Mr. Randall: Totally agree. Totally understand.

Mr. Horan: We're just trying to capture some advantages. So if there are several busses there, or several public utility vehicles there, they can park and what have you.

Mr. Randall: Okay, and the reason why we were hesitant to move it a little farther north out of the buffer area, more into the open spaces, repeat that for us again.

Mr. Horan: There is RPA over there and so as the topography, we've surveyed the site, but as we develop it, we may have to incur some additional cost in terms of retaining walls and those ideas as we approach that. So we'll certainly try and mitigate the impact on the buffer along the road and try to move it to the north, but we certainly can't tell you right now we'll definitely do that. So this our best concept...

Mr. Randall: I understand. When I was out there, it seemed like that was a fairly large buffer between where we would be parking, or fueling cars, busses and the neighboring houses. I'm concerned that if we cut too much out of there that it reduces that buffer and would be more of an impact to those local houses.

Mr. Horan: I agree.

Mr. Randall: That's all I have. Thank you Madam Chair.



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Randall. Any other questions? Okay, seeing none...

Mr. Horan: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you so much Mr. Horan. Okay so we bring it back to the Commission. Mr. McPherson, this is in your district.

Mr. McPherson: Madame Chair, I move that the Planning Commission find that the proposed County vehicle refueling station detailed in application COM17152019 with the revised plan is substantially in compliance with the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan and therefore that the Planning Commission should...and the review 18-01 be considered approved.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so I have a motion...

Mr. Randall: And I'll second that motion.

Ms. Vanuch: ...for approval. I have a second by Mr. Randall. Mr. McPherson, would you like to make any additional comments?

Mr. McPherson: Just real quick, I'd like to commend the applicant. Thank you for making the changes requested at the last hearing prior to the deferral and I think it's a very good use of the land and I know that you'll do anything you can to keep the buffers in place. That was the great concern. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: I have no further comments. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else. Okay, seeing none, let's take a vote. Okay, the motion passes 7-0. Alright, now moving on to new business, which there is none. Planning Director's report. Mr. Harvey?

**NEW BUSINESS**

NONE

**PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Harvey: Madame Chairman, I have no report.

**COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. County Attorney's report? Mr. Wisniewski?

Mr. Wisniewski: I plan to keep the tradition of maintaining the county attorney's report short, so I'm going to stop talking probably right about now.

Ms. Vanuch: I was going to say, you have already exceeded. No report at this time. 5 words.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Wisniewski: I also intend to maintain the tradition of providing sound legal advice to the Commission. I look forward to working with all of you. I'm excited about the opportunity and I appreciate the opportunity. So thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Awesome. We're very excited to have you. I've worked on lots of ordinance changes with you, so you're one of my favorite County Attorneys.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Ms. Vanuch: So, now moving on to Committee Reports.

☆ Sign Ordinance Committee  
*Next Meeting: TBD, if needed*

Ms. Vanuch: Sign Ordinance Committee. Who's one that one these days? Mr. Boswell? The never ending sign committee. Mr. Harvey, does anyone know what's going on?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Madame Chairman, it is a sub-committee of the Board, so whenever the Board wants to reconstitute it, that's when we can have additional meetings, if that's the desire of the Board.

Ms. Vanuch: So can we take it off of our agenda at this point, if it hasn't even been reconstituted? Maybe it's null?

Mr. Harvey: I think that would be the fair thing to do.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright so let's get it off the agenda, so we can stop asking Mr. Boswell when his next meeting is.

Mr. Boswell: Should we float a little note up to the top and see if they want (inaudible)

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, let's do that. Let's take it up to the top ranks, find out what we can do with it. Alright.

☆ Landscaping Standards Subcommittee  
*Next Meeting: March 28, 2018, at 5:00 p.m.*

Ms. Vanuch: Landscaping Standards Subcommittee. I think that was Mr. English.

Mr. English: It is. Next meeting is the 28<sup>th</sup> at 5 o'clock and we should be wrapping things up that night.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. Sounds good.

☆ Parking and Drive Aisle Standards Subcommittee

Ms. Vanuch: Parking and drive aisle, which is myself and Mr. McPherson. We actually have a robust presentation for you all this evening. Ms. Hornung has...well, it's not really that long. Don't pack your stuff up yet Mr. Boswell. So, Ms. Hornung, on your agenda packet the parking and drive aisles changes were on there. Mr. Apicella did bring to my attention two changes that I don't remember us going in depth with, but this has been going on for quite some time, that I may have forgotten. One was regarding

*Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018*

townhome parking vs. visitor parking and then the next was hospital parking. So those were two items that I'm sure he's going to make a comment on, but I just wanted prep you to cover those first and then kind of highlight for everybody some of the changes we've made, if they feel it's necessary so we can kind of get a sense as our subcommittee, what the Commission would like to do. Do we need to make additional changes or can we just move this along?

Ms. Hornung: Whatever the Commission would like. In the staff report I itemized the items that the Board referred to you and then the details of the parking/drive aisle commission that met since last June and I outlined a lot of items, but if you would like me, I understand you want me to go one by one, I can do that quickly.

Ms. Vanuch: I don't think...Mr. Apicella, you're the one who had that concern, so I want you to...

Mr. Apicella: So I'll just say that my overarching concern is whether or not with these changes we've identified sufficient customer/visitor parking, so that's globally. And what stuck out at me having been an HOA president at a townhome development, were the number of spaces required, or the change from 2.2 to 2.0 spaces per unit, which essentially means...Let's say you got a 100 unit townhome development, that's 200 spaces. I'm not quite sure where guests would park. I know that's often an issue at townhome developments and it presume or it would rely on some of those residents to be single drivers and I don't know that cutting it down to 2.0 is going to be sufficient. I can tell you, my experience was, even based on the previous standards, we did not have enough guest, or visitor parking and it often became a battle between the residents and people who came to visit. And the second thing was, on the hospitals, I'm not sure if I'm saying it right, but it says that the number of spaces would be based on one employee at the largest shift. So if you had the largest shift and you have one space per employee, where would people park, if they were coming to visit the hospital, or if they had medical services that they needed at the hospital. I don't see parking for those people. No, I don't see that. It says from one parking space per two parking spaces plus one per employee. Oh I got you. So it would twice the number of spaces per employee, so if you had 100 employees, it would be 200 spaces. I mean, did we check with...we have one hospital in Stafford, did we check with Stafford Hospital to see if that makes sense?

Ms. Vanuch: Maybe Ms. Hornung could help provide some clarity for us.

Ms. Hornung: Madame Chairman, members of the Commission. To answer your question, Mr. Apicella, on the hospital, that was originally one space per two beds plus one per employee on the largest shift and the new recommendation should state, two spaces per bed plus one. Because before it was one for two beds and so now it would go up to two per bed plus one on the maximum employee shift.

Mr. McPherson: So that would be a quadrupling of the parking spots per bed.

Mr. Apicella: What's the current standard?

Ms. Hornung: The current is one space per two beds plus one per employee on the largest shift. So it would increase and it would be actually two spaces per bed instead of two spaces per two...two spaces per four beds. Yes, it's increasing, that is correct, for that one. For the townhouse question, yes it was 2.2 space per unit and now it's 2.0 spaces per unit. The reason for those spaces for townhouses, that came from the private sector and that's how we started with revising this parking/drive aisle ordinance. And they wanted less parking.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sure they do, and I can tell you from my experience, that would not be sufficient. So...

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: And we did compare to Prince William, Spotsylvania, Henrico, did we do the City? Not the City but the counties. We compared across the board and looked at a lot of the parking spaces, compared to them. We also added B-1 and B-2 uses. I can go through really quick and let you know which ones, which uses were added to this parking list, that were not in the list before, because we just had a commercial low, high, medium intensity per square footage, and so we had to make a determination that way. So this will be clarifying what uses and how much parking will be for those uses. But I did write down the items that significantly changed, if you wanted me to go through that really quick.

Ms. Vanuch: Does anybody want her to go through it?

Ms. Hornung: There's just a few that changed in amount, whether it's significant or not, but all B-1 and B-2 uses are now in this table that weren't all captured before.

Mr. Apicella: I guess I'd want to know where we reduced the requirement versus... I mean, I now understand the hospital one. That makes more sense to me now, now that it's been explained, but in cases where we actually reduced, aside from the townhomes, what was the change.

Ms. Hornung: Let's see, that was, I believe that was an increase... hotel/motel was one per rental unit, now it's one per two beds. So that actually increased, because it wasn't per rental unit, so if you have one unit that has two beds, it's going to be two, compared to what it was before, which is per unit. That increased... Oh, lounges, etc. that was 10 per 1,000 and we... it was reduced 1 per 1,000.

Mr. Randall: So that's a 90% reduction? Is that what I'm hearing?

Ms. Hornung: That's correct.

Mr. Boswell: Why was that?

Mr. Randall: What's the definition of lounges?

Ms. Hornung: One moment please.

Mr. Randall: Okay, you're looking through your computer?

Ms. Hornung: I am sorry.

Mr. Randall: You're looking through your computer?

Ms. Hornung: I am, yes sir.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright.

Ms. Hornung: Oh, I can tell you, while she's looking that up, restaurants; restaurant, fast food and drive through were 15 per 1,000 and it was reduced to 11 per 1,000.

Ms. Vanuch: And that's what lounges are?

Ms. Hornung: No, no, no I'm sorry, I just went to some others while she's looking up lounges.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Harvey: Madame Chairman and Ms. Hornung, I believe the lounge one may be a typo, there probably should be zero after it, because I don't recall us ever discussing reducing, plus there is a footnote that says the Board of Supervisors could reduce the parking based on the occupants building design, so reducing it below 1 would be nothing.

Ms. Vanuch: Just a helicopter club.

Ms. Hornung: I apologize. I will correct that, so that stays the same. But the restaurants; restaurant sit downs remain the same at 11 per 1,000 but fast food drive in was reduced from 15 to 11.

Ms. Vanuch: And I remember a very robust discussion about this, because we were much higher than the other local municipalities around us and it was a consistent feedback that we got from site plan from fast foods with drive throughs and in the public input conversations, that we requiring way too many spaces. And staff felt comfortable with reducing that and matching others. One other quick question that was a tie off of that. I remember in the last meeting we talked about doing a new drive through, if it's a drive through only, and currently we would still require spots, did we address anything in the final version of this regarding drive through only, because I remember, like I went to the Starbucks drive through only in Prince William County by the Potomac Mills mall and they don't have any parking spaces. It's literally a drive through only. That's it. And so I don't know if we want to make any changes to our ordinance on drive through only for these innovative coffee shops. Hey that's a question for the commission.

Ms. Hornung: I will check. I did miss one of the meetings.

Ms. Vanuch: Well, it was part of a shopping center, so I'm assuming somebody else's parking spot. I'm not saying that no parking spaces would be suitable, but having a modified number perhaps.

Ms. Hornung: Then what we probably do is, we'd use stacking and I believe that's 8...it depends. So we would look at it for stacking and that is...you are correct, I recall, because I missed the last meeting that you had and I was talking with Ms. Blackburn, because I did see that drive throughs weren't listed when I was making the comparison of both, the repealed on and the new one. And then there is a section in the Zoning Ordinance that specifically talks about stacking for drive throughs, so that's where it's covered, how many parking spaces. I don't recall the details.

Ms. Vanuch: What did you say Ms. Blackburn?

(Inaudible)

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so maybe we can work on that. Okay. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I hate to keep harping on this one, I would strongly recommend that you reach out to HOAs at townhome developments not run by the developer to see what they think are the appropriate number of spaces, because I have a feeling that they're going to agree with me, that two spaces per unit is probably not sufficient. And not all townhomes are the same. Some townhomes are huge, you know, some townhome developments may be huge. So if you got a 2,500 – 3,000 square foot townhome, which is not impossible, you may need even more spaces than 2.2. Just some food for thought.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. So we want to look at that. We're good with hospitals?

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Apicella: With the explanation I think we're good.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we're good with hospitals. So you're going to look into the townhomes. We're going to make the adjustment to lounges. We're going to make the edits for, or proposal for the drive through only. Did anyone else have additional comments? Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Madame Chair, I have a couple of questions. Removed business requirement; What was the initial business requirement? You removed it, but what was there initially for 100 students for elementary and middle schools, just out of curiosity.

Ms. Hornung: We didn't change anything. It stayed the same, because in the schools you had for elementary 1.5 for 25 students plus 1 bus per 100 students. That's the same as it was before. The only thing that was added, High and Prep did not list 1 bus per 100 students, but we made them all consistent. So all schools are consistent. So we did add, or staff did add, when looking at the repealed...the existing parking ordinance it did not specify 1 bus per 100 students, but that was added to be consistent with the other students. Is that what your question was?

Mr. Randall: Well, on the list of things it says you removed the business requirement per 100 students for elementary and middle schools. I just wanted to know what exactly that business development, business requirement was.

Ms. Hornung: Oh, was that my autocorrect? I must..."bus", that's my autocorrect for business. I apologize. Where is my...Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Do you have other questions?

Mr. Randall: I do.

Ms. Hornung: There it is. Oh, that actually, that I should...when I wrote it, yes, at the...yes it is a typo. I did fix it in one place, but probably when I went in there "bus" is my autocorrect for business, so I apologize for that. At the time that bus requirement was removed...

Mr. Randall: It should state bus requirement, not business requirement?

Ms. Hornung: That is correct, but you can eliminate that statement, because the bus requirement was not eliminated. It stayed the same. I apologize for that.

Mr. Randall: Okay, thank you. Not a problem. The second one is, it's the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> one down, being a golfer myself, I'm questioning reduced the golf facility requirements per hole instead of total spaces per green. What's the difference?

Ms. Hornung: What happened was for golf, well at one point in the old, in the old...in the existing ordinance for 9 or 18 hole golf courses we had 25 spaces plus 3 spaces per green and it was just changed to 4 spaces per hole.

Mr. Randall: I'm not sure that's a reduction. I can't do the math that easily, quickly.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Hornung: It was removed that the 3 per green was removed and the miniature had 10 plus 3 per green and driving range was 1 per T plus one per...that was increased, driving range was increased. It went from 1 per T to 2 per T. And the miniature went from 10 plus 3 per green to 1 per hole.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Madame Chairman. I have one additional question. I apologize. I'm reading the background on the staff report, page 1, towards the end and I'm just going to read this section and then ask how it was changed. It says the zoning ordinance definition of street creates some problems for commercial developments. The definition of a street is an access way that serves 3 or more properties, imposing street construction standards within a commercial development, may be costly and overly burdensome. How was that addressed in what was the final change?

Ms. Hornung: Were you reading from the staff report or from the zoning ordinance?

Mr. Apicella: I'm reading from the staff...so there was a reason why this subcommittee was put in place and that the Board of Supervisors charged it with taking a look at parking and drive aisles standards. So I'm just...if this was a reason, I'm trying to find out what was the end result of...so this is a concern or comment made by somebody.

Ms. Vanuch: Originally it was a comment by a developer, that our single family dwellings were requiring too many parking spaces per unit and that we didn't count garages for the parking spaces and we were significantly higher than other local municipalities for our single family dwelling units. That was the one reason that we know we got...multi-family, okay.

Mr. Apicella: Okay but this is about commercial. So it says the Zoning Ordinance of a street created some problems for commercial developments. The definition of a street is an access way that serves 3 or more properties. So that's the definition that somebody has a problem with. Imposing street construction standards within a commercial development may be costly and overly burdensome. So that was somebody's concern. I'm trying to find out if and how it was addressed.

Ms. Vanuch: Well the only other thing that we were told was the issue with that street parking wasn't allowed.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I'm just reading from the staff report. So there's got to be a reason that's there.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella, we can go back and look at the meeting notes and see if that was ever discussed. I don't recall specifically.

Ms. Hornung: It came out of the process re-design, right?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, yes ma'am.

Ms. Hornung: So a lot of those items came out of the process review committee from the Board members.

Ms. Hornung: They were supposed to be discussed with this committee for parking and drive aisles, because that's part of the drive aisles, but I'll...we can go back to check our notes to see if that was ever addressed.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Apicella: And if it's not, then maybe that's something you might want to take another look at. I'm not saying how it should be fixed or if it should be fixed. I'm just saying it might bear some additional consideration.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, any other questions from the Commission? I think we have the edits that need to be made, so if we can have those ready maybe by the next Planning Commission meeting and have the report ready for the full Commission to review and if everybody can make sure they review that ahead of time so we can take a look at it, so that way we can hopefully try to move this along. Anybody else have comments?

Mr. Harvey: Madame Chairman, I do have one comment.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: Last week staff met with the representatives from the Department of Conservation Recreating in regards to Chesapeake Bay Act requirements and they were auditing our program, and one thing that they mentioned and probably will put into their actual report is that for Chesapeake Bay Act requirements localities are supposed to demonstrate that they're minimizing impervious area, so one of the suggestions they had for us was that maybe we would be recommended to have a maximum parking ratio. Right now all of our parking requirements are minimums, but there are no maximums. We do have some uses that typically provide more parking spaces than the minimum. So we have to see what the recommendation is from the Department of Conservation Recreation, but right now we don't know specifics.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay and do you know when we'll get that back from them?

Mr. Harvey: They indicated probably by the end of the month. We may want to still move forward with this process, but I just want to make the Commission aware that we may be revisiting parking at some future time.

Ms. Vanuch: And so, remind me, if we move forward with this at the next meeting, we review it and let's say we like all the changes but we're still lacking that information, this was a Planning Commission initiated activity, so we can go ahead and send it to the Board and then they'll send it back down to us to hold public hearings on, and then we would potentially be able to add the maximum in during the public hearing process, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, that is correct.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Great. Alright, I think that's it for the parking and drive aisle subcommittee.

☆ A-1 Uses Subcommittee  
*Next Meeting: TBD*

Ms. Vanuch: A-1 uses subcommittee.

Mr. English: We're going to revisit that maybe another month, before way get back on that.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so one month, alright.



***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

☆ Cemetery Ordinance Subcommittee  
*Next Meeting: TBD, if needed*

Ms. Vanuch: Cemetery ordinance committee. No changes. I know staff is working on the report.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

☆ Historic Preservation Awards Nominations

Ms. Vanuch: Chairman's Report this evening, the historic preservation rewards nominations, so for those of you who are new to the Commission, every year we get the honor of coming up with a nomination for the historic preservation awards. Typically staff provides us a few recommendations or one of the commissions that provide recommendations. So staff has identified a few, which you have a PowerPoint of. Mr. Harvey, would you like to expand any of these items?

Mr. Harvey: Sure Madame Chairman. There is two items that staff identifies as potential candidates. One is the reconstruction of the George Washington Ferry Farm home and you can see on the screen the image of what the home may ultimately look like when it's completed. The Ferry Farm Foundation is going to great length to try to recreate the home, constructing the structure based on period style construction methods, as well as period style materials. The second potential project is the Knight House in Embrey Mill. The applicant who is developing Embrey Mill project had proffers to retain that house. They have now put it in one of their neighborhood parks and they have rehabilitated the house. So these images show some prior pictures from 1940, 2006 and the current condition today. These are two potential candidates the Commission could consider.

Ms. Vanuch: And I think in an email you had also told me the other Commission's and what they have identified. One of them was the Armed Services memorial, am I remembering that correctly? And what was the other one?

Mr. Harvey: Yes. I don't recall what the other one is right now.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Does anybody else on the Commission have any, I think our timeline means that we kind of need to pick one of these this evening or can we wait till the next meeting.

Mr. Harvey: Madame Chairman, it'd be helpful if the Commission could come up with something soon, because the Historical Commission will be making their presentation of the awards to the Board of Supervisors in May, so there's some lead time they need in order to meet and determine who the winner is of the various categories and then also to have the awards manufactured.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Mr. English.

Mr. English: Madame Chairman, I wanted to recommend for Jerry Knight and Ricky McGregor, I mean Jerry McGregor and Ricky McGregor for that award, but I talked with her and they definitely do not want it, but I would like to recognize them as potential recipients of this award. I would just like to make a motion, can we accept both of these? Mr. Harvey, can we accept both of these?

Mr. Harvey: If that's the Commission's desire, yes.

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Mr. Apicella: Can we rank order, you know, just in case.

Mr. English: Yeah, I mean, I'd rank George Washington first and then the Knight House second.

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else have any...I guess Mr. English, do you have any comments?

Mr. English: No, like I said, I just wanted to make sure that it got on record that the McGregor's have done a lot and I would like to recognize them, but she definitely was adamant that they didn't want any recognition, so, but that's it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Mr. Apicella, I believe you seconded.

Mr. Apicella: Madame Chairman, let me start out by saying I'm a big fan of the Armed Services memorial. I think it's awesome. It's one of the best ones I've ever seen, certainly when at localities level and I know the Historical Commission is already considering it, so since this is going to the Historical Commission it's already kind of on the list of things to be considered. I want to say with regard to the Ferry Farm project, not just the house itself, but the years of efforts that the folks of Ferry Farm have undertaken to preserve the site, to interpret the area, to promote tourism, the events they have every year and then this specific recreation. I think it's outstanding and it certainly deserves merit in some way if possible. It's tough for me to choose between those two projects, Armed Services and the Ferry Farm project, but I also think it's worthwhile to, you know, a developer preserving a house that's almost 100 years old, is also something that's noteworthy. So again, I think the two that we're recommending in addition to the Armed Services memorial that's already under consideration, are worthy efforts.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, any other comments from the Commission? I think my only other comment is just to make sure that the Historical Commission also knows that even though we're ranking these 1 and 2, we already know they're considering the Armed Services memorial and are supportive of that as well. So if they want to give out three awards this year, that's okay with us. Do we need to include that in the motion to make it official for them to know?

Mr. Harvey: Certainly. It can't hurt.

Mr. English: Alright, I'll just a substitute motion to add the Armed Forces as third.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Alright I'll accept that as an amendment.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion ranking 1, 2 and 3, Ferry Farm, Embrey Mill House and then the Armed Services Memorial, so seeing no other comments, if we'd like to vote. Alright, motion passes 7-0.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

7. TRC Information - March 28, 2018
  - ☆ Little Forest Baptist Church - Griffis-Widewater Election District
  - ☆ Shops at England Run Retail Ctr - Hartwood Election District

***Planning Commission and Utilities Commission Joint Minutes  
March 14, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Other business on the agenda, TRC, Griffis-Widewater, you have Little Forest and Hartwood, you have Shops at England Run. Approval of minutes is none, so meeting is adjourned.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

NONE

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.