

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**March 28, 2018**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, March 28, 2018, was called to order at 6:30 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, Brian Geouge, Susan Blackburn, Andrea Hornung

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Any declarations of disqualifications on any items on the agenda this evening for any Commissioners? Okay, seeing none this evening.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Vanuch: Now we'll move on to public presentations, but before we move on to the public presentations, the Commission would like to honor a special guest this evening. Supervisor Coen, would you come down to the front please? So this evening we have Mr. Supervisor Coen with us and most people probably don't know that and I was trying to think what I would say to you this evening, and I've actually known you half my life, believe it or not. So I was a student at Brooke Pointe High School and I can tell you, I've never met an individual who wants to serve this County more than Mr. Coen. He's had a life time of service, not only as a teacher, 4 years on the Planning Commission, but now as a Supervisor. When I work at the polls and I talk to students occasionally, I've never ever heard students' talks so highly of a teacher that engages them and brings them into the community. Tom was, when I was appointed onto the Planning Commission, Tom, it was in his blood to sort of bring me under his wing, teach me what good planning standards would be, to make sure he rubbed of his good planning skills and made sure that I at least understood what all the acronyms were, like CUP, TGA, RPA, all of that stuff which was quite an uphill battle. So I know you're going to do great things as a Supervisor and the Commission would like to thank you for your 4 years of service. It's definitely in your blood to take care of the Stafford residents and our children, and so this evening we would like to dedicate a proclamation for your hard work and making Stafford such a great place to live, and so we have your proclamation here. I'm going to sit this down, because we all chipped in and got you something very special. So on the Commission we took a vote on what we should get Tom and I was on the "get Tom a serious gift" side and I was the one with the money that had collected it, so I won, but they really wanted to get you a candy dish, so we settled for a candy bag. So Tom always is in charge of bringing us our candy to eat at the meetings and so we're definitely going to miss that. We've appointed Commissioner Bain to bring the candy now. So, the gift the Commission got you is a gavel and it's inscribed with your time of service on the Commission, your name and a quote from George Washington that states "It is impossible to rightly govern without god and the bible." So we knew that would mean a lot to you.

Mr. Coen: Thank you so much. Thank you. It was an honor to serve on the Planning Commission. Many of the people that I got to serve with are still up here. I learned a lot from them. The new members I know from many different ways and they are amazing individuals. You're amazing, I've known that for...and you're only 25, so...it's just been a great pleasure serving, the staff is phenomenal.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

I cannot speak highly enough of Mr. Harvey and all his staff, speaking of which. And it's just been a great honor to work with people of such high quality who really care about the County and put a lot of work towards it, so thank you very much. I appreciate this.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, thank you Supervisor Coen. Now we move on to the public presentations portion of the meeting, so at this point in time, if any member of the public would like to come down to the podium, please state your name, address and the district that you reside. You'll have three minutes to speak. When the yellow light comes on you have 1 minute remaining and when the red light comes on, your time is up. You can come down and talk on any item that is not a public hearing item. So if you have anything other than the two public hearing items this evening or three public hearing items this evening, you can come down. Does anybody wish to come down to speak? Okay, seeing no one, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting, uhm the public hearing portion of the meeting and move on to item number 1 on the agenda, the reclassification Stafford Airport Industrial Park.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC17151715; Reclassification - Stafford Airport Industrial Park - A proposed zoning reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-13 and 38-33, consisting of approximately 65.99 acres (Property). The Property is located on the south side of Ramoth Church Road and west side of Centreport Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: July 6, 2018)**

Ms. Vanuch: And for this presentation I'd like to recognize Mr. Brian Geouge.

Mr. Geouge: Good evening Madame Chair, members of the Commission, I'm Brian Geouge with Planning and Zoning. I'll be presenting agenda item number 1, which is Stafford Airport Industrial Park. This is a request for reclassification from the A-1 agricultural to M-1 light industrial zoning district to allow commercial and industrial development on assessor's parcels 38-13 and 38-33, consisting of 65.99 acres. The applicant is Daniel Payne with Ramoth Road Investors. The agent is Lee Cherwek with Hilldrup Properties and this is in the Hartwood district. Again, this property is zoned A-1 agricultural. It's located on the south side of Ramoth Church Road and west side of Centreport Parkway. The surrounding uses include the M-1 zoned Stafford Regional Airport to the south, M-1 and M-2 zoned commercial laundry facility and equipment supply to the east, and A-2 zoned single family residential to the north. The Comprehensive Plan designates the property within the central Stafford business area, a more detailed land use concept for this area shown here recommends business and industry uses for this property. The property is mostly wooded with varying topography. The area near the intersection of Ramoth Church Road and Centerport Parkway is relatively level and steeper slopes and stream valleys are located in the central and southern portions of the property. The property includes a small non-contiguous piece of land located at the intersection of Ramoth Church Road and Centreport Parkway on the eastside here. This was area that was split from the larger parcel when Centreport Parkway was realigned and no improvements currently exist on the property, apart from an access road on the eastern parcel. You can see the cleared trees for that and I believe this was used for equipment storage and staging during the realignment of Centreport Parkway. There are no know critical resource protection areas on the property, however some wetland areas exist along these streams located in the central part of the property. There is a small family cemetery with 13 grave sites located on parcel 38-33 and that's show as the red star. The cemetery was surveyed in 2007 and recorded as the Embrey family cemetery number 3. Graves are marked with dates ranging between 1819 and 1899. Here's a view from the west, or to the west from Centreport Parkway, showing the existing access road. The Generalized Development Plan submitted with the application depicts 7 buildings totaling 462,525

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

square feet located on the northern portion of the property. Uses are not specified apart from warehousing on the two larger buildings shown here. One full service access is shown on Ramoth Church Road and one full service access is shown on Centreport Parkway. A primary access road within 90 feet of right-of-way is shown in the general location of the existing access road.

Mr. English: Mr. Geouge, may I stop you for a second? In reference to the access that's on Ramoth Church, is that on the straight end or is that on the, like on a blind side, like on the curve on Ramoth Church Road. From Centreport Parkway, I guess, you're going to be going east on Ramoth, correct?

Mr. Geouge: Leaving the property, yes.

Mr. English: What does that look like as far as topography right through there?

Mr. Geouge: It is located near a curve. There could be sight distance easements, I guess the easements would be on their property, but there could be some clearing needed to be done for sight distance purposes.

Mr. English: Okay, that was my question. Okay thank you.

Mr. Geouge: A 50 foot transitional buffer along the western property line exist, or not exist, is show on the Generalized Development Plan and that's here. That's required by the Design and Construction Standards Manual. The access easement to the cemetery is also shown; along with a fence and a 35 foot undisturbed buffer and these are required by Code. And following up on your question, Mr. English, the applicant has not proffered conformance with the Generalized Development Plan or proffered the types of uses to be located on the property, so the ultimate site configuration is subject to change.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Geouge: The Comprehensive Plan identifies Ramoth Church Road and Centreport Parkway as a in need of 4 lane divided upgrades. A transportation impact analysis or TIA was submitted with the application. The analysis was based on 500,000 square feet of industrial development with an anticipate traffic generation of 3,633 vehicles per day. It's estimated that 981 of those trips would be on Ramoth Church Road and American Legion Road to the east of the development. The TIA states the current traffic volume on Ramoth Church is approximately 2,000 vehicles per day. The TIA recommends a provision of turn lanes into the development on Ramoth Church and Centreport Parkway and the TIA also chose degradation of eastbound American Legion Road at the US Route 1 signal from a level of service C to a level of service D and that's specifically during PM peak hour. Staff has reached out to VDOT for their recommendation on improving that level of service. VDOT felt that the addition of a right-turn lane would be of the most benefit at this intersection. There are no improvements for this intersection in VDOT's 6 year improvement plan. County transportation staff has provided a rough estimate of 911,000 for the construction of a turn lane. Also based on information provided on the TIA, under 2025 build out conditions, the development would account for approximately 45% of eastbound traffic on American Legion Road at this intersection during the PM peak hour.

Mr. Apicella: Brian? I'm sorry. Can you go back?

Mr. Geouge: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: That 3,633 total vehicles per day, you said that's based on industrial uses, right?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Geouge: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: But there are other uses under M-1 that could occur on this property?

Mr. Geouge: That's correct.

Mr. Apicella: And some of those uses could be far more intense than an industrial use?

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And we don't actually know what's going to go on this property? We just know that the cap is 500,000 square feet and that could be one building or many buildings.

Mr. Geouge: Yes. That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Geouge: As far as airport impacts, the Comprehensive Plan establishes airport impact zones with the development. It provides development recommendations for each zone. This site falls under zones 1, 3 and 2, or 1, 2 and 3. The majority of the site is in area 3, or the H-1 horizontal inside flight zone. Development is most likely to occur in zone 3, which lists M-1 uses as compatible or in need of additional review. Key review component for that is the anticipated population density. Staff does not anticipate that the population density recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan would be exceeded with the proposed industrial development. And we've also reached out to the Airport Authority and they've not expressed any concerns with the proposal. Analysis was also provided by the applicant, which demonstrates that the height of structures on the property will not interfere with the navigable airspace per federal aviation regulation part 77.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry Mr. Geouge, can I take you back? So I see a boundary line that's in close proximity to the runway. What's the distance?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not certain. I'd have to check on the distance.

Mr. Apicella: I though the airport land use compatibility plan indicated that there should be some, what's the right terminology here, some gap between a use and the airport. I don't really see that in the proffers. So I'm a little concerned. I thought that was supposed to be 3,000 feet, but I could be wrong.

Mr. Geouge: I'd have to go back and look at that requirement.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Geouge: Proposed proffers include that the site development will be limited to 500,000 square feet, right-of-way will be dedicated along Ramoth Church to accommodate future widening, the property will be designed such that features and landscaping will not attract birds. A 3 foot berm and solid right-of-way of evergreen shrubs will be provided along Ramoth Church Lane and turn lanes will provided into the property entrances if warranted at site plan. And also, any office or hotel constructed on the property 3 or more stories in height will include fire sprinklers and a stand pipe system. And this was in response to concerns expressed by fire and rescue.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. McPherson: I do have one question regarding the right-of-way dedications along Ramoth Church Road for the future widening. Is that only along the portion of Ramoth Church Road that abuts the property, because if so, that would only make an impact if it was widened all the way to the intersection of Route 1? Is that correct?

Mr. Geouge: Yes, so that would include just right-of-way along frontage of this property. That is correct.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, so after the road left that property, we'd go back to a single lane, so that would probably do more harm than good, having it go to 2 lanes and then back to 1 lane again, and having a merge.

Mr. Geouge: I guess it could be accommodate in two ways, either development of future properties on the road would be required, when they're developed, to dedicate the necessary right-of-way for future widening, or if VDOT came in and decided they wanted to go ahead with the widening, but they didn't have all the necessary right-of-way, then they go work through the process of getting that right-of-way, or purchasing that area from the property owners involved.

Mr. McPherson: All the way to Route 1?

Mr. Geouge: All the way. Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Geouge: Staff notes the positives are the M-1 zoning is consistent with the land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. This is consistent with the established development patterns. Proffers may help limit transportation impacts and proffers will help reduce visual and noise impacts on residents along Ramoth Church Road. However, staff notes the negative is that transportation impacts have not been addressed in accordance with Comprehensive Plan policy for that PM peak hours approach at the American Legion and Route 1 intersection. Finally, staff is supportive of the application with conditions pursuant to Ordinance O17-23 that suggests Planning Commission consider measures which could help mitigate the impacts on that intersection. Now I'll take any questions.

Mr. English: Mr. Geouge, in reference to that property, you said there was a laundry facility already established there? Is that open yet?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not certain. I know they were working on that recently. I don't know if that's been completed or not. Jeff, do you know?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English and Madame Chairman, that project is still under construction. It's not been occupied yet and it's located on an adjacent property.

Mr. English: Do you know...I mean, it's a laundry facility, but is it just...what is it, I mean is it doing hospital laundry, is it doing...

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. English, it's a commercial laundry, so they do a variety of different products that they provided to their customers. I don't know all the details of their clientele, but usually it deals with hotels and, you know, linen and towels and uniforms and things of that nature.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Mr. English: So you don't know, at this point you don't know how many vehicles are going to be coming in and out of there, or do you? And there's no open road from that? The only road access to that road is from the Centreport Parkway, correct? There's nothing off...

Mr. Harvey: That's correct. The adjacent property has access to Centreport Parkway. It's the only means of access in and out of their property. Staff can verify with what the vehicle count is for that use based on the approved site plan.

Mr. English: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Madame Chairman. A couple more questions. Given the site location and its proximity to the airport, are there any M-1 uses that would cause you some concern, that might not jive well with the airport?

Mr. Geouge: I did look through the uses. I didn't see much jumping out at me as far as incompatibility in terms of the use. However, as it was noted previously, there are some uses that kind of stand out as far as high traffic generators, those include restaurants, convenience center, convenience store, building materials sale and service yards and vocational school. And there are also some uses requiring a conditional use permit that are high generators, such as medical clinic, motor vehicle sales and then the commercial retail uses.

Mr. Apicella: Okay and how do we know we're not going to get something like a structure that has smoke stacks on the site, or something else that might cause some problems for an aircraft as they're trying to land on the runway?

Mr. Geouge: As far as smoke stacks, I'm not sure if there are any uses by-right in M-1 that would have that type of feature.

Mr. Apicella: So manufacturing might not have a smoke stack?

Mr. Geouge: I guess it depends on the type of manufacturing.

Mr. Apicella: Right, so it's possible.

Mr. Geouge: I suppose. I'd have to look at M-2 versus M-1 to see if there is a distinction there between the intensity of manufacturing uses to have a real answer for you there.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Can you again show the, I think it was the Generalized Development Plan that showed proximity to the airport. I think it's not that one. It's closer to the front of the presentation.

Mr. Geouge: Oh okay. Was it this one?

Mr. Apicella: Uhm...I guess that'll work. I don't know if with your pen you can show where the proposed buildings are at this point.

Mr. Geouge: I can give you a general idea. Sort of in this area.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so for the remainder of the property, or the part that's closest to the runway, again, that...the first part of my question is for the remainder of the property, there is no guarantee that there

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

won't be something further down on that parcel, based on the fact that the Generalized Development Plan is not proffered.

Mr. Geouge: Right. Correct.

Mr. Apicella: And for the building that's closest to the runway, again, I'd be concerned, I'd want to know how close that building is. Again, it's kind of a moot point, because we really don't know where the buildings are going to be, but in general I'm concerned about buildings close to the runway, especially since there's no...I think 65 feet is the max proffered in the...

Mr. Geouge: For the height. Yes.

Mr. Apicella: For the height.

Mr. Geouge: And that may be something the applicant's engineers could answer, as far as distance from the airport.

Mr. Apicella: If and when this gets approved, we wouldn't, and I say ultimately by the Board of Supervisors, the project wouldn't come back to us. We wouldn't see a site plan. We wouldn't have any ability to have any input on what actually ends up on the parcel in terms of the Commission, not the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Geouge: I'll have to defer to Mr. Harvey. Is there any Planning Commission input during site plan process approval?

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Geouge. Mr. Apicella the Planning Commission member for that district would be notified at the TRC meeting and could provide input at that point, however there is no other mechanism to bring the site plans back to the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors, or could allow for administrative review. The exception would be if there was a conditional use permit type of use that's being proposed on the property or some other use that would require a special exception, it might go to the BZA.

Mr. Apicella: Although later tonight we're going to talk about a potential change to the process that kind of eliminates the mandatory requirement for a TRC, is that correct?

Mr. Harvey: No, the e-plans still would keep the TRC process in place.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but there is not necessarily a TRC meeting. I thought that was going to be at the request of...

Mr. Harvey: As requested meeting, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Right. And certainly the airport authority might not have some ability to have some input on the final state of the site and what goes on that site. Is that correct?

Mr. Geouge: Right. I think a suggestion was made about proffer relating to notification to the airport during site plan and I guess there will be an opportunity for them to provide input, but it may not necessarily be required that they adjust the plan based on their input.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella and Madame Chairman, staff currently sends out notices to the airport authority for any site plan for a project that's within the airport compatibility zones. So they have an opportunity to weigh in if whether or not they have concerns. Certainly if they have concerns it may not result into an ordinance requirement that we can change specific aspects on the site, but usually are advisory comments.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Maybe we can let the applicant come up and then we can...maybe they can answer some of the questions that we were already kind of thinking in our mind. Can we do that? Let's let the applicant come up and then we'll have another chance for questions.

Mr. Cherwek: How is everybody doing tonight? Lee Cherwek with Hilldrup Properties. I guess I'm the applicant. Any questions I can answer? I can run through a presentation. You tell me what...

Ms. Vanuch: I think why don't you quickly run through your presentation and then we'll just probably stop you if we have a question.

Mr. Cherwek: That's fine. Brian actually touched on most of my stuff so it'll be kind of a repeat, so I'll go quickly. First off, this is Stafford Airport Industrial Park. Some background information. Ramoth Road Investors bought it in 2010. Ramoth Road Investors is comprised of Danny Payne, or Daniel Payne as well Richard McDaniel. Both of them are local Fredericksburg people that have done a tremendous amount of work in the area. Mr. McDaniel probably has 15 to 20 different industrial buildings and Mr. Payne probably has 10 to 15. And so they were able to purchase this land. They had, I guess, originally planned on doing some sort of forestry slash residential component and with the additional industrial demand going up and down Centreport they thought it'd be good to submit for a rezoning. 66 acres, 2 parcel, one, it looks like 3, but one of them was actually bisected when the Centreport Parkway was realigned. It's currently zoned A-1. It's got one entrance off of Centreport Parkway and it actually has another entrance off of, an existing entrance off of Ramoth Church Road, rolling topography and access to utilities. Overall kind of a high altitude map of where it's located. Next up you can kind of see, these are the parcels that we're talking about and there's also this little portion over here. And this is just another areal elevation showing you the surrounding businesses. Alright so this is a conceptual plan. Not proffering it. It's not being developed at this point to this plan. Basically we're looking to transfer from A-1 to M-1 and wanted to give you an idea of how this could develop. Am I guaranteeing how it's going to be? No. But I wanted to show you potentially how it could be. One of the things to know is, we're proposing, I think per the acreage and everything else we could have up to 1.5 million square feet of industrial product on the property. That just doesn't fit real well and it's just too much, so we scaled it back to a third, 500,000 square feet. On here it does kind of address some ideas to give you how the property could layout, but of course, when it comes time for development, it would go through the normal site plan process where everyone would have seat at the table and be able to adjust, to modify things as needed. Some general impacts on the rezoning; Right now it's currently serviced by two entrances. The primary entrance would be on Centreport Parkway, a secondary entrance off of Ramoth Church Road. After several discussions, including with Fire & Rescue, they actually required us to keep the secondary entrance just because, hey, what happens if a tractor trailer turns over at the entrance, it still give them an opportunity to access the project.

Mr. English: Mr. Cherwek, but if the use, like you were just saying, you're not proffering these business, this could, it could be one business and you may not need the entrance off of Ramoth Church Road, correct?



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Cherwek: It maybe someone that says listen, I want to build a 50,000 square foot warehouse and have a nice quiet area where no one's going to bother me. Then it's going to be developed as such.

Ms. Vanuch: So you're saying you're going to get Amazon down here? No.

Mr. Cherwek: Honestly I knew that was going to come up. If Amazon is interested in the project, we would love to work with them. I got a feeling they're going to want more than 500,000.

Ms. Vanuch: Are our economic development people listening? No.

Mr. Cherwek: I think they're going to want more than 500,000 square feet, but you never know. And so if you have any ins with Amazon, we'd love to talk to them. Utilities will be serviced by water and sewer. On here you'll see some calculations. Basically just did the by-right existing 22 residential homes versus what we're proposing for 500,000 square feet and we took these numbers based off of other warehouses and industrial products that we have in the area. As you can see, the proposed development would be about a third, or maybe 25% of what the by-right usage of water and sewer would be. Schools; if this is rezoned, we would no longer have any residential units on there, so there would actually be a lessening of the impact on the schools. Tax revenue; where it stands right now with an A-1, and we went through and did 22 residential units, you would have an annual, between real estate taxes and property taxes, off roughly \$79,000 a year. With a full build out of M-1 zoning we're looking at, between real estate taxes and personal property taxes, of roughly \$500,000 a year, so about 6.5 times the difference in tax revenue. Currently, because we are still considering forestry of timbering the property, it's in land use. Should the rezoning occur, we would be responsible for the 5 years of back taxes and a payment of roughly \$21,000 would be due. Environmental; it lies within flood zone X, which basically means it's outside of the flood zone. Adjacent, I think Mr. Geouge addressed these concepts, but the south property is industrial, the east of the property is industrial. There are residential uses to the west and to the north. We are proffering as well as the site plan mechanisms are in place to provide a buffer to lessen the impact on the surrounding residential uses. There is a, historical wise, there is a cemetery on the property. Per the site plan process we're required to give an easement access as well as a buffer and a fence, to make sure, and that's no matter how it's developed, so that anybody that is relative to the people in the cemetery can come and go as they need to visit their relatives. Proffers; we proffered the following, 500,000 square feet of gross floor area. We will also dedicate 55 feet or right-of-way from the centerline of Ramoth Church Road at no cost. We will use commercially reasonable efforts to develop the property where it's called no bird landscaping. That's to basically be a good neighbor for the airport. We are also proffering to do a 3 foot berm and a solid right-of-way of evergreen, broadleaf shrubs along Ramoth Church Road to provide a better visual buffer between the M-1 use and the residential uses across the road. We are also proffering the fact that we will do an analysis to whether or not turn lanes will be required at site plan. Lastly, and this was a new one for me, we are proffering that should an office or hotel be build higher than...three stories or higher, we will make sure it will be fire-sprinklered as well as have a stand pipe system in compliance and request from the Fire Marshall. That's about all I had, so I'm happy to answer any questions or address any comments and concerns.

Mr. Bain: I have a couple of questions, if I could.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: You indicated that you're willing to do an analysis for a turn lane at the site plan stage. Are you also, I didn't hear but I'm asking, are you also proffering to construct that right-turn lane onto Route 1, I guess it's American Legion.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Cherwek: What I'm proffering is site specific. So if during our site plan process it says hey we're doing 500,000 square feet and you tripped a left-turn lane going from Ramoth Church Road providing a turn lane into the entrance on Ramoth Church into this property, we will do that, because, in all quite honesty it's going to be required per the site plan process.

Mr. Bain: Okay, so that you would construct.

Mr. Cherwek: If it's required by a site plan. So if we do 100,000 square feet and that's all that's done and it's not required, I'm not going to build a turn lane, but however, if we do 500,000 square feet and it goes through the site plan process which says, hey, because of the following components you're required to do a turn lane into the property, then that is something we would have to do for site plan.

Mr. Bain: Alright. I'm concerned about the traffic on Ramoth Church Road.

Mr. Cherwek: Okay.

Mr. Bain: That many square feet generating that much traffic, at night, everybody trying to get out and get over to Route 1 in all likelihood, I can envision tremendous backups to get out there and get on Ramoth Church Road. Did you look at any other opportunities for a roadway and access to Centreport Parkway further south? It would require having a right-of-way across some other property, but it would be a very short distance of adjoining property. It seems to me that that might provide some relief because then, some of the employees could take that exit and go the other way on Centreport and not...

Mr. Cherwek: What do you mean by "the other way on Centreport"?

Mr. Bain: ...go on Centreport to the south and therefore not cause such a constriction that the...

Mr. Cherwek: Well anyone coming out of the project that wants to go south, I mean I can't guarantee what everyone's going to do, but the logical aspect would be to flow through the road leading to Centreport, make a right turn and flow down that road.

Mr. Bain: Except that if there's 400 cars ahead of them wanting to turn left, they can't get to Centreport to turn right. That's the scenario I'm envisioning.

Mr. Cherwek: We're going to have a stacking plan inside of our project that will not allow someone to turn right? I'm just making sure I understand.

Mr. Bain: I guess I'm asking that. Would there be dual lanes coming out to Centreport or to Ramoth Church that you'd have a left and a right turn lane to those...

Mr. Cherwek: I'll be honest, I don't have an answer for that right now, due to the fact that we don't know how the project is going to develop. We do have intentions that Centreport is going to be the primary exit and I know in going through this we submitted out transportation impact analysis through VDOT and other localities and they had their comments and VDOT was acceptable with what we're trying to do.

Mr. Bain: Okay, well, I'm just... I'm still concerned about the traffic impact on those roads obviously. So, alright...

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Cherwek: I guess, let me do this. Let me answer all the questions or if you'd like our traffic engineer who actually did all of the TIA and the study, he's here and he's happy to answer any questions you like on that as well. So you just let me know when you'd like to do it.

Ms. Vanuch: Let's finish up with you and then we can move on. Okay. Mr. English, I know you had a question.

Mr. English: Mr. Cherwek, have you spoken with the airport? Have you worked with them about what's going on with that? They kind of give you blessings, or...

Mr. Cherwek: I've been working...our engineer for the project is Hamilton Palmer who has been very tied in with the airport for many years, and he agrees that this would be a great project. He even sees it as the fact where the airport could expand into this project if they ever got to the size and volume and needed additional hangars. I know there was some concerns with regards of buildings next to the airport, of reflective surfaces, noxious gases, stuff like that. In, and I'll let Jeff or Brian correct me if I'm wrong, inside the Comprehensive Plan there is land use compatibility guidelines that have things like lighting, like aspects when you're locating next to an airport that...I can't shoot beams straight up, I can't have smoke sack going, I can't have reflective surfaces,...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, those are guidelines. They're not mandatory, so that would be a concern of mine that even though we think that certain things should or shouldn't happen, in the absence of proffering, for example that your approach would be consistent with, you could proffer some language that says our approach would be consistent with the AR...I can't even pronounce the acronym, consistent with those guidelines. There is no way we could enforce those.

Mr. Cherwek: I mean I have no desire to have any planes land on buildings or things like that so...

Mr. Apicella: I don't think you do.

Mr. Cherwek: I was under the impression that that wasn't really, it was a requirement that had to be met. I could be wrong on that.

Mr. Apicella: Again, it's a guideline. It's not a requirement.

Ms. Vanuch: So I guess maybe to try to address Mr. Apicella's point, would you be willing to just put a line or two in the proffers stating...

Mr. Cherwek: Initially in the process I had proffered the fact of...that the property would be developed in compliance with the land use compatibility guidelines through the process, because that was already in place. That was pulled out. And so if that's something that, you know, we need to...

Mr. Apicella: Jeff, is that something we can add back in? Do you see any concerns with that?

Mr. Harvey: If the applicant so desires, they can make that proffer, yes.

Mr. Apicella: I think that would be very helpful.

Mr. English: Are you willing to do that then?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Cherwek: I need to read through everything, but if it's in compliance or basically saying that I'm not going to put reflective surfaces...if I want to build as a good neighbor next to the airport, I think that's a reasonable thing to do and I think that should be fine.

Mr. English: You're willing to step up and do that?

Mr. Cherwek: I'm willing to do it. I just want to read to what I'm committing to, before I do that, but yes, if what I envision the land use compatibility guidelines states, I would be willing to proffer that, yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Other questions on the Commission?

Mr. Apicella: Madame Chairman?

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: My fellow Planning Commissioners wouldn't be surprised that I'm not a fan of generalized rezoning and that's what I consider this project to be, because it involves a lot of uncertainty. I do appreciate that you've put a cap on the square footage and that being one third of what could otherwise occur here, but it still leaves me some concern that we don't know what specific uses are going to go on this parcel. Some uses that are allowable by-right are more intense than others, and I'm, again I'm not saying that you're going to do this, but you could put 10 restaurants on that site, which would far exceed the 3,633 number of vehicles and if you've driven down Ramoth Church Road, and I think Mr. English would agree, it is not one of the safest roads in Stafford County. So adding more traffic on there, even a small amount, is in my view not very desirable. So I think one way to additionally ensure my comfort level and I think the rest of our Planning Commissioners comfort levels, and we've done this on other projects who were not willing to proffer specific uses is to proffer a cap on daily vehicles per day. And I'm not going to throw out a number. I'm not going to say it needs to be 36, but I think 10,000 would probably too much. So as you're looking at potentially the airport use compatibility guidelines and potentially offering a proffer in that regard, I would ask you to consider a cap on the daily traffic count per day as one additional method to mitigate the traffic concerns that could stem from this parcel and the way it's...

Mr. Cherwek: I'll be honest with you, I... part of the reason why this process is taking so long, we tried our best to get someone on the hood and they hey, because it makes less questions for you guys, less questions for... at the end of the day we had talked to several different groups about this project and they were very interested in it, however, we were the wrong zoning. So they're like, listen, we can't sit around. You've got zoning here, zoning there. It is our intent, and I will review it. I'm not proffering to it at this point in time, however some of the more intense uses that you see, I don't realistically see as a market driven opportunity for us. I know you...you know, I've been wrong before, I'll be wrong again and it may be something that occurs. However, from what we've looked at in basically Fredericksburg as well as Richmond, we generally see industrial products around airports. I don't know how viable 10 restaurants would be at that location, but I understand your concern and I'm going to take a look at it. Sure. There were a couple of questions that I know they were asked previously, I just wanted address. The building in front of our property, Virginia Linens, it's a commercial driven business that basically does linen services for businesses, for Quantico on a commercial basis. It's not something where you could go up and have your linen services done. It's a large industrial warehouse. With regards to Ramoth Church Road, I understand that that road is not the newest, biggest, best built

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

road out there right now, like Centreport Parkway. That is one of the things we're doing, we're proffering 556 feet of right-of-way, so that way when projects come along and improve roads, they generally have to go to each individual owner and negotiate or condemn right-of-way in order to take it.

Ms. Vanuch: Really quickly on that, Mr. Harvey, what's the average? What do we typically try to get for the right-of-way?

Mr. Harvey: Madame Chair, it depends on the category of road. In this case, as Mr. Cherwek said, this is in the Comprehensive Plan for a 4 lane road, that's why we have a 55 feet from centerline dedication recommendation. 2 lane roads are generally 30 feet from centerline.

Mr. Cherwek: We are dedicating enough right-of-way to meet you guys' plan in the future.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. So where is that in the CIP in terms of enhancing the road network on Ramoth Church Road?

Mr. Harvey: The project...there is no project to improve Ramoth Church in the 10 year CIP currently.

Mr. Apicella: So the 55 feet, while it's helpful, again, it's only part of the puzzle we're trying to fix a Ramoth Church Road and there is nothing in the near term to make that happen.

Mr. Harvey: It saves the county money in the long term when we can make improvements. Also the applicant did provide the County with right-of-way for the reconfiguration of Centreport Parkway interchange that created that offset small parcel. They did that, to my knowledge, without a charge to the County.

Mr. Cherwek: So that's...when they were straightening...Centreport Parkway used to have a dogleg right and they came through wanting to straighten that out to make it safer and we gave it to them at no charge. And to be fair, there's a little triangular piece of land that we really can't do anything with, because of how it relocated and outlined or lined up, so by the fact that we're donating 55 feet of right-of-way, we've already realigned Centreport Parkway at no cost, kind of left with the little island of land that we really won't be able to use and the fact that inside that development the 55 feet of right-of-way, when we go for site plan or what not, it is there for clear cutting. It is there for smoothing. It is there for sight distance to help make Ramoth Church Road a safer road.

Mr. Apicella: I definitely appreciate where you're coming from and I'm not trying to beat this horse, but I look at these projects in the context of what is allowable today, which is 22 homes, versus what you're proposing, which is a 500,000 square foot footprint on this property, which, at a minimum you're saying, is 3,300 plus cars, which is a lot more than 22 units can provide. So my concern is, what is that going to mean for Ramoth Church Road as well as Centreport? We don't have to go any further. I'm just telling you that I think, in the absence of certainty, again, some maximum daily vehicle traffic count would be helpful to me and I think to others who are reviewing this project.

Mr. Cherwek: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have not done the public hearing part. So you'll actually get another chance to answer questions. I'm thinking it might be really helpful to move forward with the public hearing, then you can address any more questions plus the public comments that are brought forward, if any are

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

brought forward. Okay, so at this time we're going to open up the public hearing for item number 1 on the agenda, the reclassification for the Stafford Airport Industrial Park. So if any member of the public would like to come down and speak on this public hearing, you can come to the podium. You have three minutes to speak. When the yellow light comes on you have one minute and when the red light comes on that means that your time is expired. Would anyone like to come down? Okay. Seeing no one rushing the podium I'm going to close the public hearing and bring it back up here to the Commission. I guess, the applicant, you want to come back up and we can finish up our questions.

Mr. Cherwek: I also...my traffic engineer is here who has done the ITE...I don't know why I'm walking away...done the traffic study as well as looked at several things that staff brought to us and so he's got a presentation as well to address these. If you guys have a few minutes, I'd like to have him run through it.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, why don't you go ahead and run through a few of those? Yeah. You should have started with that. No, just kidding.

Mr. Riley: I've always wanted to use this. Pardon me.

Ms. Vanuch: I have never seen it do that.

Mr. Riley: I learned that after far too many meetings. I'm John Riley with Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, JMT, a consulting firm and I notice a lot of new faces here. Mr. Harvey will attest I've been through a few of these explaining traffic studies to the Commission here, so Madame Chairman and members of the Planning Commission thank you for a couple of minutes just to shed some light on some of the questions that had been raised about the traffic. Fair questions all of them. I've got 4 quick slides and I think it'll help put some of the results and especially the level of service D question that's kind of pesky, put that into perspective. But this is an aerial, I think you all can see, of our study area. So our site is over on the left where the green star is. We originally went in to VDOT and the County, thinking all we needed to do was study the entrances and the soon to be realigned intersection. I think at the time we started this, the intersection of Centreport and Ramoth Church was still under construction. After a lot of back and forth, VDOT and I think the county as well asked that we include Route 1. We felt like that was a mile away from the site, but it was apparent that there were concerns and so we did include the signal at Route 1 and American Legion. See if I can get this right. So Mr. Geouge spoke to the level of service requirement, we got a different part of the County's language that speak to level of service C. I think, as I see it, the goal is to meet overall level of service C at the studied intersection, so for a signal there's kind of puts and takes, if you will, depending on which lane you're in and you can control level of service to a certain extend with signal timing. And what we have shown in the study is, and I'll focus on the signal, we can talk about other items. There's a table in our study that summarizes the level of service overall at the bottom and also by individual lane movement for the Route 1, American Legion, Eskimo Hill intersection. And I'm going to try to use the highlighter here. So I got very excited because after many, many studies in this County, it's extremely hard to get overall levels of service, like we have here, B and C. So I thought we're in great shape. We're in absolutely great shape. I got kids that are in school. I don't like to see Cs, I really don't like Ds. Bs are great. Level of service though a little different animal. It's very hard to get a B even, much less C overall in Stafford County. What the overall is, it's a way to average. You take all the approaches of the intersection and you average the delays for all of them to get that overall number. So and an individual approach basis in the AM peak we have As, Bs and Cs. In the PM, this is where we got into a little bit of a, I think an issue or concern, which is, we have the two Ds, really one D. It's the same overall for that approach. That's the eastbound leg. This is in the PM peak year 2025. This includes background growth, if we do nothing, we've grown traffic, there's other developments happening and others that will happen. We've grown

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

traffic on Route 1 at 2% a year for 10 years in this study and we've also grown traffic on Ramoth Church, American Legion for 2.5% per year for 10 years apart from our traffic. It's like layers of the cake. The start with the existing traffic, we layer the growth and then we layer Stafford Airport Industrial Park on top. All those layers are what you see here and it turns out that, yes, we do have a D on the eastbound approach. To VDOT that's fine, but I know that you all hold your roads to a higher standard C. What I would submit is that the overall C that we have achieved meets your Comprehensive Plan and the D is, you know, there's kind of some winners and losers depending on which approach you show up on. We got an A over here. We got a lot of Bs. So you take the good and the bad. You look at the aggregate and you get a level of service C. To me that's an excellent result. Enough about the table. There is one more slide. So you might say, what does a D actually mean in real life traffic? Obviously it's very personal. We all drive. So we all have an impression of what good and bad traffic is like. So that D is on the west leg, so the eastbound approach. What's happening there, let me back up for a second, these are queue links, 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues. So 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues is about the worst case stacking of traffic you could expect to see according to our study in that peak hour. The result that we came up with in our model is 189 feet, so on average 20-25 feet a car, you're talking about maybe 7 to 9 cars backing up. I estimate that condition might occur 3 times in that hour. All the other cycles you're going to get less than that. And the way our model shows this running is that stack of cars there would get about 20 seconds of green time and they would all get through. So that's what this D is. Some folks would say if you get stuck for more than two red lights, that's unacceptable. That's not what's happening here. This D clears every cycle and like I said, it probably only occurs 2 or 3 times in an hour. So I wanted to shed some light on what that is. I think when you look at the big picture, the dedication of Centreport Parkway right-of-way, the dedication of Ramoth Church Road right-of-way, the access points which actually operate great, to Mr. Bain's question, they're going to operate with level of service B, even though we have a lot of cars coming out. There's not a lot of opposition to them leaving the site, so not all worried about stacking for people getting out of the site, especially in the PM. We will be building the turn lanes needed as the applicant said, and I think when you look at the greater context, this intersection wasn't even in our study, we sort of included it as a favor I think, just to show what would happen. The overall level of service is a C. We feel, and I feel personally, it's kind of a speck in the ointment if you will and I think this is something that we could all live with, so I hope that sheds some light. I'd be happy to take any more questions on traffic.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Could you show me on your...if you have a slide, where those turn lanes...if your site plan determines that a turn lane is required, where those turn lanes would be?

Mr. Riley: So, I'll try to draw on here, this is probably too high altitude, but we projected possibly a left turn lane coming into this site on Centreport here and then likely a right taper, not even a full turn lane, but it would kind of be a wedge, like a triangular wedge for right turns in on Ramoth Church. That's what our numbers indicate with the 500,000 square feet.

Mr. Randall: Okay, right now there wouldn't be a dedicated left turn lane?

Mr. Riley: On Ramoth Church?

Mr. Randall: No, from Centreport Parkway.

Mr. Riley: There would be. That would be a dedicated left...

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Randall: Right, based on what you just said about Centerport Parkway, not being a lot of traffic on there, would that effort be better spent doing something more with the entrance into Ramoth Church... from Ramoth Church, rather than something off of Centreport Parkway?

Mr. Riley: No we're...well, our projections are showing most of the traffic coming to and from the interstate direction or the Route 1 direction. So we went back and forth with VDOT and the County a lot on where these trips are going to come from and we do think offers a free shot down to the interchange...

Mr. Randall: I don't disagree.

Mr. Riley: ...and a lot of the traffic will use that entrance.

Mr. Randall: So you think most traffic...so if those buildings as your potential layout shows, if those buildings are all off of Ramoth Church, you think people would come through the backway from Centerport, or would they drive up to Ramoth Church, make a left on Ramoth Church and try to get in that way? That's my concern is that I think most of the buildings that would be south on the lot would be warehouses and you'd have a lot less traffic, I think, wanting to turn left off of Centreport Parkway, where most of them would want to drive into the businesses from Ramoth Church.

Mr. Riley: Yeah, it's really...without a final layout, I think, it's somewhat speculative. We typically assume most people take the path of least resistance. If it's going to take them longer to wait at the stop sign to turn left onto Ramoth Church, after one or two trips...you know, these are probably deliver folks who get pretty familiar and employees. And employees aren't going to take a long time to figure out...

Mr. Randall: No, I don't disagree. Again, it's based on...

Mr. Riley: I see Centreport...

Mr. Randall: Right, we really don't know what's going to be there and if there are business there, then it may change the vehicle traffic on how they get in and out, whether they can...whether they have to park and walk to the front of those business, whether they want to park in the front.

Mr. Riley: We assumed an interconnected site. So anybody could get in from either entrance and get out the other entrance by traversing through the site. I think at the time it was a reasonable assumption. I think if it's built out, interconnectivity would happen and hopefully that provides a path of least resistance so people don't have to go through that stop sign at Ramoth Church.

Mr. Randall: Sure, okay. Thank you.

Mr. Riley: Is there another question?

Ms. Vanuch: Thanks Mr. Randall. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yes. Can you go to the next slide? I'm sorry, I guess the next slide after that. Okay, so these figures, calculations are based on certain assumptions, right?

Mr. Riley: Correct.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, and those assumptions are based on, I think in part what I heard from Mr. Geouge, which is this project being built out with mostly industrial uses, right?

Mr. Riley: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So, to the extent that this project changes, there could be...these figures could change to the better or to the worse.

Mr. Riley: If it's still an industrial use by the book, this is the worst. If it's some other use, certainly. Then you're talking about different calculations. Could be better, could be worse.

Mr. Apicella: Right, so what is a C might not turn out to be a C.

Mr. Riley: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions from the Commission? Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Riley: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, so at this point we'll bring it back to the Commission. Mr. English, this is in your district. What are your thoughts so far, how you would like to move forward?

Mr. English: I would like to go ahead and ask for a deferment until our next meeting and get with Mr. Cherwek and make sure we can work out the language in reference to the last proffer saying that you'd look at and some numbers and then bring it back. So that's my ask, that we just defer it until our next meeting.

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that Madame Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. So we have a motion by Mr. English, second by Mr. Apicella, to defer to the next meeting. Mr. Apicella, any further comments?

Mr. Apicella: I think I've expressed my issues and concerns.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Mr. English?

Mr. English: No, the only thing I have is I think this is a good way to go, try to get it A-1 get it M-1 like it should be and get some building around that airport and I think they are working with the airport to try to get some resolution out of this, so I think it's going to be a good project, so...that's all I have.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Any other questions or comments from the Commission. Alright, so we can take a vote now. Alright, the motion passes 7-0. See you next time. Okay so now we're going to move on to item number 2 on the agenda, which is a conditional use permit for a 5 Twelve convenience store in the Rock Hill district. Mr. Geouge, sounds like you are up for this one too.

2. CUP17151679; Conditional Use Permit - 5 Twelve Convenience Store Expansion - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the expansion of a vehicle fuel sales facility in a B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on Tax

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Map Parcel No. 19A-1-42. The Property consists of approximately 2.47 acres, and is located on the south side of Garrisonville Road and east side of Patton Drive, within the Rock Hill election district. **(Time Limit: July 6, 2018)**

Mr. Geouge: Good evening again Madame Chairman, members of the Commission. Item number 2 on your agenda is a conditional use permit for a 5 Twelve convenient store expansion, and this is to allow the expansion of a vehicle fuel sales facility in the B-2 urban commercial zoning district and HC, highway corridor overlay district on parcel 19A-1-42 consisting of 2.47 acres. The applicant is Nicholas Khatchi and the primary contact is Jeff Keith with Advanced Engineering LLC. This is in the Rock Hill district. The property is located on the south side of Garrisonville Road and east side of Patton Drive. Surrounding uses include B-3 zoned office and A-1 zoned church to the north, R-1 zoned single family residential to the south, A-1 and A-2 zoned single family residential to the east and B-2 zoned adult and daycare center to the west. The Comprehensive Plan designates the property within the suburban land use designation. The plan notes that commercial developments within suburban designated areas should be conducted in a manner that minimizes visual and noise impacts on established residential uses. The property is developed with the Patton K Plaza convenience center with several tenants. The conditional use permit would allow for the expansion of the fueling station associated with the 5 Twelve convenience store, which is located on the south-east portion of the property. Parking is provided along the areas of the building that front Garrisonville Road and Patton Drive. And a service drive aisle runs along the back of the building. A clear, level area is located on the south-east edge of the property. This area would be utilized for the proposed expansion. The Generalized Development Plan depicts existing conditions and the proposed fueling station expansion. Currently there are two fuel pumps, or fueling positions on a single island. The canopy for that island is shown in orange. The proposed expansion would replace the existing pumps and canopy and provide a total of 4 pumps or 8 fueling positions under a single canopy, which is shown in red. Additional pavement would be provided in the existing cleared area to accommodate the expanded facility. Due to the location of the property in the HCOD a sidewalk must be constructed along the highway frontage and that is shown on the Generalized Development Plan. Although the expansion only applies to one tenant on a portion of the property, the sidewalk must be provided along the entire frontage of the parcel. The applicant has shown that again on the GDP and that is one of the conditions. A 7-foot board-on-board fence would be provided along the property lines adjacent to the expansion area. The proposed fence would be consistent with the existing fence located along the western property line, adjacent to residential uses. That fence is required by proffered conditions on the property. A future interparcel connection is also show to the property on the south side of this development and reserving a space for this connection is also required by proffers on the property. Since a use on the property is being expanded, the entire parcel becomes subject to the current standards for buffering. Meeting these requirements is not possible without a major reconstruction of the entire parcel. So a departure from design standards would be required to allow for the existing minimal buffer conditions, particularly that between the property line and that service drive aisle. During this process the applicant will need to demonstrate that landscaping will be provided across the entire parcel where possible. This should result in increased buffering across the entire parcel, particularly on those road frontage areas where there is space for landscaping. The applicant has provided renderings of the proposed canopy within the Generalized Development Plan and conformance with the styles, colors and materials in conditioned. The proposed design is consistent with the existing canopy. Proposed conditions include general conformance with the Generalized Development Plan. There shall be no more than 8 fueling positions on the property. The sidewalk is required along Garrisonville Road. A 7-foot board-on-board fence is required along the south east property line. Fuel canopy lighting restrictions and speaker restrictions, for instance there won't be any lighting at the fuel canopy on any side, other than that facing Garrisonville Road, so there shouldn't be any impacts on adjacent residential properties from that perspective. And the fuel canopy design will be in conformance with the rendering provided. Staff finds the positives that this is consistent with the land

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

use recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan, consistent with established development patterns. Conditions will help minimize impacts on adjacent properties and transportation network and it will result in improvements across the entire parcel, not just the area that is being expanded, and that includes the additional landscaping and sidewalks. And no negative aspects are noted. Finally staff recommends approval of the application with conditions pursuant to resolution R18-70. Now I'll take any questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anybody on the Commission have any questions on this item? Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Could you go back to the site...do you know where the tank is located for this.

Mr. Geouge: I'll highlight the tank in blue here.

Mr. Randall: Ah over there. Okay.

(inaudible)

Mr. Geouge: That is existing. The applicant has indicated that those tanks would be replaced during this process to adhere to current safety and environmental regulations and they would be replaced in the same location.

Mr. Bain: I think that's one of the concerns I have. Those tanks are adjacent to the residential properties on the other side of the fence, and I was just wondering if it would be possible to move the tanks maybe to the front of the site, so that they're a little further away...I'm not so concerned about fire, but odors, when the tanker trucks come in and load up, there's always odors associated with that filling operation. So that might be something for the applicant to consider. And second question, you had mentioned about landscaping. Were you talking about along that fence between the property and the residential areas? Because there is no room there.

Mr. Geouge: Correct.

Mr. Bain: ...and so the only landscaping they could be providing would be to the parcel where they've got the inter-parcel connection set aside. That would be the only area that landscaping could be done.

Mr. Geouge: There is, in the area of the expansion, there is an overhead powerline. They should be able to provide some level of landscaping along this portion of the property, so really the area that is adjacent to the expansion itself should be better buffered than the remainder of the property.

Mr. Bain: I just had the impression you were saying they were going to landscape all along the existing fence, but they're not.

Mr. Geouge: No, that's correct. One of the reasons they need to pursue a departure from design standards, just because they can't adhere to the current buffer standards.

Mr. Bain: Okay, and on the canopy, I'm assuming that the canopy is taller than the fence, the existing fence. And so I'm a little worried about light spillage from lights under the canopy. There are not going to be any other flood lights or anything around the perimeter, is that right?

Mr. Geouge: Not that I'm aware of.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Bain: Okay. As long as the canopy only has lights pointing downwards, I think it'll be alright. There'll still be some spillage, but it won't be too bad, but I think we want to make sure that there are no flood lights to try and light up any other perimeter areas.

Mr. Geouge: And this will be subject to the lighting ordinance requirements, which controls the maximum level of lighting along property lines that are used for residential purposes.

Mr. Bain: Good. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Bain. Any other questions? Okay. I do have a few questions for you Brian. Do we describe the type of landscaping that's going to be used?

Mr. Geouge: We do not. That would be detailed in the departure application.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. And then, regarding the entrance, right now that is pretty steep, it's a short, steep hill and so you're coming down. Are they going to do anything to the entry way to make that less of a steep gradient or is that going to stay the same?

Mr. Geouge: Not that I know off, because they'd still have to tie back into this grade here for the existing parking and drive aisle, but I can defer to the applicant. He may know something I don't as far as that's concerned.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. Is there a possibility to even widen the entrance?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not certain. I suppose there is a possibility. Again, I'm not sure. I just...that's very close to my house and this is a nightmare to get in and out of and it is like you literally, if you drive a stick shift I feel bad for you, because I know I couldn't get up that hill. And when you're pulling in to get the gas, you can't turn around, you're like gridlocked in there. And then when you're trying to get out, you're going sort of uphill and I just see that that's a potential issue. And my other question was, do we do any analysis if we're bringing in more pump stations, obviously there's going to be more traffic in and out of the gas station. There is no light right now at that entry way. So I guess my proposition would be one of two things. Either close this entrance off all together and make all the traffic go down to the light that is there and come up through...all the parking spaces over here you see on the screen on the left hand side, you'd come and get there from that direction or looking at putting a potential light in at that...at the curb. Just a couple of questions. Uhm, okay so nobody else had any questions, so I'm going to go ahead and bring the applicant up, if you'd like to come up and talk.

Mr. Keith: Good evening. I'm Jeff Keith with Advanced Engineering. I'm here with the owner, Mr. Khatchi. He's owned the property for 26 years and the convenience store has been there about the same amount of time with no problems. They're asking for a minor expansion of the fueling facility just so they can compete with the newer gas stations in the area. The fuel tanks we discussed. The existing is a single wall tank. They're replacing that with up to date, code, safer double wall tanks with containment.

Ms. Vanuch: Really quick. Wouldn't they be required to do that if out of code right now? Shouldn't they be replacing tanks that aren't of current safety standards?

Mr. Keith: I'm not sure that they're out of code but these are just safer tanks that they're wanting to install. So that's essentially the project. I think we've discussed. We're in agreement with the conditions set forth by the planning department and we can answer any other questions you have.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Does anybody else have questions for the applicant? Okay, no questions. So, and the reason why I'm kind of more vocal on this one is, this is in the Rock Hill district. So the fuel tanks, have you looked at being able to move those previously?

Mr. Keith: We haven't brought up...the station's been in operation since 1992. The fuel tanks have been in that location and they're not aware of any complaints from the neighbors of fumes or anything like that, so...that's something they could look at.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Keith: We haven't discussed that before. There hadn't been any complaints from that aspect of it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay and do you know how many accidents have been at that entrance?

Mr. Keith: No, I don't.

Ms. Vanuch: Maybe we could get staff to follow up and let us know if there's been any accidents at that intersection there. Okay. Thank you so much. We don't have any other questions right now. So then we'll move on to the public hearing and you'll be able to come back up one more time. Okay? Sure. Okay, so at this point we're going to move forward with the public hearing, so I see a couple of people who can't wait to come down here. So you'll have three minutes to talk. When the yellow light comes on you'll have one minute...hang on one second...you'll have one minute to talk and then when the red light comes on, your time will have expired and if you could state your name, your address and the district that you reside. And this is the point where you'll get to conversate with us. You'll be able to talk, but we will not be able to answer questions.

Mr. Lumbra: Could you put that picture up?

Ms. Vanuch: Can we have the computer?

Mr. Lumbra: No, the visual, the google type picture.

Mr. Geouge: The aerial?

Mr. Lumbra: Yeah. The overhead picture.

Ms. Vanuch: Sorry, we're having a computer malfunction apparently. Hang on one second.

Mr. Lumbra: While they're doing that, let me address what you addressed.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, there you go. Name, address and district really quickly.

Mr. Lumbra: My name is Larry Lumbra. I live on Patton Drive which is right behind the subject and...I live right behind the shopping center in this area right here and the problem is I've been there since 1978. Two lane road. Now it's 4 lane road with shopping centers all over the place. All of the water that falls out of the sky goes right in front of my house. My ditch has been rebuilt by the state three times. It needs to be done again. You can't put 10 pounds of water in a 5 pound bucket. It don't work. Everybody knows that there's erosion problem in Vista Woods and Garrisonville Estates. It's a known fact. If you take this property, or this portion which absorbs water and cover it with hardtop, I got more water coming through my yard. I've asked the state, I've asked the county to address it. I'm not

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

opposed to this at all. I'm opposed to the fact that I get no relief from all of this damn water coming in front of my house. My backyard floods. The water comes off of the building, it's supposed to go down behind the building into a retention pond and when there's overflow I have a flood going down the side of Patton Drive. All of this used to be property that was absorbed. And the other thing you mentioned was ingress egress, the hill. If I'm coming out and you're trying to come in, there's no room for two cars at the same time and your question about an accident, within the last three or four month someone tried to turn in to the gas station and some idiot...the speed limits on 610 are suggestions, some idiot plowed into the back of that car with kids in it. Because they slowed down to turn in, it's a very narrow turn, egress, like you said. If it did get widened because two people, one could go out and one come in at the same time. Right now it's if the person leaving is hogging up the entrance, the next person has to slam on their breaks because they can't turn in. So that addresses what you said.

Ms. Vanuch: I'm sorry, but your time is up.

Mr. Lumbra: Well that's what the state and everybody else says about my ditch too. My time is up.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you.

Mr. Lumbra: I've had to steal rocks to fix my own problems. It's called reallocation of county assets.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Would anyone else like to come forward?

Mr. Kimes: My name is Lawrence Kimes, I'm the property owner at High Street, directly behind the proposed improvement. In reference to the tanks, I have called the Stafford dispatch for the gasoline smells on more than one occasion, so the location of the tanks, when the wind blows, it smells like gas and I don't know whether there's a leak going on, somebody's pumping, so I'm for relocating the tanks, because once again, it's right across from my property line. In reference to the fencing, fencing would not be enough for sound abatement, because right now everybody's clicker, you here every time somebody locks their car to go in, I'm hearing clickers all day long. Within the last six month they put a light up which shines directly into my bedroom, so at night I've got daylight. So I don't know if there is current restrictions on that, but they've got a light pointing backwards, which, like I said, goes directly into my bedroom. So I have objections on not putting in more landscaping for more sound abatement, because I'm hearing all the cars and all the conversations and all the sounds that I'm hearing. Water also is potentially going to be an issue, unless it's directed into the retention pond and then, where is that overflow going to go, or is it going to come right directly into...

Ms. Vanuch: His yard. He's going to have a swimming party.

Mr. Kimes: My neighbor, what can I say. Security is also, because we've had many people come around the fences trying to cut through my yard and my neighbor's yard to get up there and it'll just kind of exasperate that, because there'll be more...well anyway. Let's see. Security, once again, fencing and well put some thorns or some other landscaping up to abut. I can't think of it. I think that's about all I got right off hand, but like I said, I have called the county fire department about the gas smells, the gas fumes. I think that's all I've got right now.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. And if you think of anything else, you can always feel free to email us.

Mr. Kimes: Okay uhm...

Ms. Vanuch: We can get you the email addresses.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Kimes: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else who would like to come down?

Ms. Walker: Hi, my name is Jill Walker and I live on High Street as well. I'm Mr. Kimes resident and I just wanted to reiterate that yes, gas smell, especially in the summer just wafting over and we've had to call because we didn't know if there was a leak or you know what was going on with that and security is definitely an issue, because with more light and more sound there's going to be more people wanting to come through our yard to get there and yes, there's people that actually say, well we just want to jump the fence, you know, and I'm like, I hope you get poison ivy from going through my yard, you know. And the noise now is terrible. If there is double the amount of cars going in there, it's going to be even worse. And I think you mentioned something about you wouldn't be putting up anymore fencing behind that would take care of noise and light and all that? I think that needs to be addressed. Okay? Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else would like to come down and speak? Okay. Seeing no one else I'm going to close the public hearing. If the applicant would like to come back up and address any of the things brought up in the public hearing and then we'll move on to the Planning Commission questions.

Mr. Keith: I'm going to touch on a couple of the items. The entrance is a full commercial entrance, full width commercial entrance. I believe it's 30 foot. We meet the requirements for VDOT from separation from the intersection. It's a good 200 foot from the intersection, so, but the entrance is a full commercial entrance. With the addition of the additional pavement the entrance configuration will be going from coming in and making a 90 to it's almost a straight in entrance, so the improvements, or the proposed plan will improve the entrance situation by taking out that 90 degree turn they have in there right now, but it is a full width entrance. The erosion situation...

Ms. Vanuch: Hang on a second.

Mr. Bain: Looking at the drawing, you're not proposing any changes to the entrance in terms of turning movements to get in and out, other than if they go to one of the fueling stations, one of the new fueling stations, but you still got a problem of vehicles coming from the, let's say, the parking area and coming over and having to make that turn to get up to the highway. They're not given enough distance to really align themselves perpendicular to the highway and be out of the way of somebody else turning in. And I think that's sort of what has been (inaudible) implying and one of the residents there, that the cars in the parking area that are trying to get out, are blocking the entrance for cars on 610 to come in.

Mr. Keith: Right, I understand.

Mr. Bain: So I think the idea of maybe widening that entrance would be really a viable alternative.

Mr. Keith: That is something we absolutely could look at.

Mr. Bain: Okay, and I think...well alright. I think you should look at that.

Mr. Keith: Yeah, we absolutely could look at that.

Ms. Vanuch: And Mr. Harvey, just for my own education, he said that that's a typical size for a commercial entrance. It's 30 feet?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Harvey: That is correct.

Ms. Vanuch: And that's for both, in and out?

Mr. Harvey: Yes ma'am. There are...VDOT will allow wider entrances under certain circumstances.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Gotcha.

Mr. Randall: Madame Chair, if I could.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Currently that in and out is not marked, correct?

Mr. Keith: I don't believe there are any pavement markings on the entrance.

Mr. Randall: Would that...maybe that's something that you could do, is mark the pavement so that it's clear coming in and out. The other thing that some businesses are using are stanchions, you know, moveable stanchions that you could put in there that would completely delineate, this is the out, this is the in.

Mr. Keith: Yeah, they could absolutely delineate the traffic flow.

Mr. Randall: I think there's some things we need to do in order to fix that. Most of the questions have been revolving around that entrance and so there may be some things you need to look at that could potentially alleviate or mitigate some issues at that point.

Mr. Keith: We absolutely could do some improvements like that. That wouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Randall: Okay thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead.

Mr. Keith: The other thing as far the tank, until tonight I wasn't aware of any complaints, but they certainly could look at relocating the tanks to the front of the lot. I don't think it would be any issue to do that.

Mr. English: Question. If you said you haven't heard any complaints, if they've called the fire department or the 911 on it, the fire department had to be coming by and checking with you. So you haven't had the fire department or anybody coming by.

Mr. Keith: Not that I've heard.

Ms. Vanuch: That's the owner I think. Do you operate the convenience store or you're just the owner of the property.

Mr. Keith: We're just the owner of the property.



***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: I do love what you've done with the concrete, the signage, that looks awesome. We go to that dry cleaner and she's very happy with it too.

Mr. Keith: We're doing the complete facelift on it and we're trying to make everything look nice. I think, personally, it's going to be one of the nicest looking buildings on Garrisonville Road.

Ms. Vanuch: It does look nice.

Mr. Keith: We're still in the process. We did add...we had some concerns that there wasn't enough lighting, so we upgraded the lighting to LED lights. We don't have any shining in any homes. They're in the same positions they've always been since 1992. They didn't move them in any way. So we're just kind of trying to make the area safer so we don't get people crossing fences and all, because I've heard that some students hanging out and we're just trying to deter all that.

Mr. English: Could you meet with these people?

Mr. Keith: No, this is the first...

Ms. Vanuch: He's asking you to.

Mr. English: No, I'm asking you would you meet with these residents at night time and see what their issues are, maybe try to correct it>

Mr. Keith: Sure. Absolutely. I don't have any problem with that whatsoever.

Mr. McPherson: Can we look at the drainage issue as well while we're looking at all this?

Mr. Keith: Absolutely.

Mr. McPherson: This gentleman's yard is flooding every time.

Mr. Keith: The drainage would absolutely be taken care of in the site plan portion of it. We'd have to meet all the new state regulations as far as outfall and retention and all that type of thing. The whole thing would have to be brought into compliance with the site plan.

Mr. McPherson: I'm sure it had to come into compliance last time, but it's not working and I've been the recipient of some of that before too, so...yeah, okay.

Mr. Keith: The new drainage regulations are pretty stringent, a lot more stringent than what they had when they developed the property.

Mr. Bain: Yeah I would say visually you're adding 10 to 15 percent additional impervious cover to that site, so that's a significant change.

Mr. Keith: Our footprint is a little bit under 10,000 square foot, impervious footprint.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions on the Commission? No, no other questions? Okay. I think as far as my comments, I think it would be great if you guys could look at potentially moving that fuel tank a little further from the residences and let us know what possibilities there are, like propose like an additional site and determine whether or not you'd be able to build that into the proffers, moving that. I

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

also would love for you guys to bring us a couple of alternatives for entrances, whether that be widening it, or closing that one down and moving everybody to the light, or widening it and adding a little concrete median in the middle and working with VDOT on what the options are there. I realize that what we might be thinking is maybe not ideal in VDOT's perspective, so if you could just come back to us with what those options are and then really coming up with a good stormwater management mitigation technique and definitely meeting with the residents and trying to be a good neighbor to them and if there's a light shining into somebody's bedroom, you know, let's try to figure out how you can address that light and make sure that that wouldn't happen in the new canopy. And then also addressing, if there needs to be something done on the back of that property to help buffer the noise, whether it's upgrading the fence or putting some type of a sound barrier, I'm sure there's techniques that can lower the sound carrying from the tank area to the residents. So those would be my comments. And since the Commission doesn't have any others I'm going to virtually pass the gavel over to Mr. Apicella, the Vice-Chair.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Vanuch, this is in your district, how would you like to proceed?

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Apicella. I think at this point I would like to grant you guys a deferral, just to give you time to work on these issues, instead of us taking a vote now, because my guess is that you probably wouldn't have a successful vote if we voted right now, to give you time to work through all of this and then come back and give us some options to how we can address some of the concerns that the public had. I would say, probably the end of April, if you feel like that is a good amount of time. Do you think you could have that feedback back by the end of April?

Mr. Keith: I think we probably could, yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so my motion is to make a motion for the end of April.

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Apicella: So this is a motion to defer to the second meeting in April, seconded by Mr. McPherson. Any further comment Ms. Vanuch?

Ms. Vanuch: No, I made them all on the front end.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Okay. Please cast your vote. Motion carries 7-0. Passing the baton back to you.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And Madame Chairman for the applicant and the citizen's information, the second meeting in April is April 25<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so for those of you who are in the audience and are curious about how this will track, the next meeting will be April 25<sup>th</sup>. Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

3. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O18-06 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code, Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms," to amend the definitions of home occupation; home business; retail sale; home business, rural; manufacturing, light; and manufacturing, heavy; and to create definitions for e-commerce, home business II, and handicraft. This amendment would also amend Zoning Ordinance Sec. 28-35, Table 3.1, "Table of uses and standards" and Table 3.1(a) "Transfer of Development Rights" to allow home business I and II as accessory uses in the single family dwellings in the Agricultural Districts, home business I as an accessory use in the single family dwellings in the Residential zoning districts, home business II as a special exception in a single family dwelling in the Residential Districts. **(Time Limit: April 2, 2018)**

Ms. Vanuch: So moving on to item number 3 on the agenda, the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance on definitions of specific terms for home businesses. I'd like to recognize Ms. Blackburn for her favorite topic.

Ms. Blackburn: Good evening Madame Chairman and Planning Commissioners. This evening you are to consider an amendment to the County Code Section 28-25 that will create a definition for e-commerce, home business II and handicraft and amend the definitions for home business, home occupation, home business rural, manufacturing light and heavy and retail sales. This amendment would also amend Section 28-35, tables of standards and uses, or uses and standards I should say to provide for these business uses to be permitted as accessory uses to single family dwellings in the county and either as by-right uses or as special exceptions. And this subject was first discussed back in August of 2017. And the Board of Supervisors referred Resolution R17-210 to the Planning Commission for their recommendations and modifications to what was then proposed Ordinance O17-30, and this ordinance was proposed to create a definition for e-commerce and clarify its use in the Zoning Ordinance. This proposed ordinance was initiated due to requests for businesses operating in a dwelling increasing and becoming more complex, in particular, the request to sell and/or conduct firearms transfers from a residence. To obtain a Federal Firearm Transfer License (FFL) from the United States Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), one must have a physical location for the business that is open for inspection 24 hours per day. The transfer of the firearm must be an in-person transfer. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance defines a business that has customers coming to the dwelling as a home business. If the property is zoned A-2, Rural Residential; R-1, Suburban Residential; or R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density or R-3, which is Urban Residential high density, a home business requires approval of a special exception by the BZA. The intent of this original proposed ordinance was to draft a definition for e-commerce that would allow sales of firearms from a dwelling without requiring the special exception. And this would be done without affecting the regulations for the sale of other commodities from a dwelling. Well at the October 11, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission was informed that the County has no authority to impose different standards between a home-based firearms transfer business and another home-based business, and this is per Virginia Code 156.2-915. Well, with that information the Commission then focused their discussion on businesses conducted in the home toward the definitions of a home occupation and a home business. They wanted to know the differences between the two as they are defined in the Zoning Ordinance; how Spotsylvania County regulated businesses out of the home; and how businesses might impact a neighborhood. You as a Commission mentioned items such as how many customers a day, deliveries of merchandise, and number of employees. Questions were also asked concerning the difference between manufacturing and creating items from sewing, arts and crafts, etc. Staff provided the regulations for home businesses from the various counties and you have those attached in your packet and highlighted the differences in the two definitions of home occupation and home business and upon review of all the material, the Commission agreed that the subject required more time to discuss and determine the best course for potentially changing the regulations for all types

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

of home businesses, in addition to e-commerce activities in the County. They, you voted to request more time from the Board of Supervisors and Resolution R17-298 was granted by the Board of Supervisors to give you a 100-day extension. And the Planning Commission, you created a committee and met in January and February to work on the proposed ordinance. You reviewed the ordinances from the surrounding counties, drafted regulations for businesses that can be conducted out of a dwelling, amended them and agreed on the regulations in proposed the Ordinance O18-06. Now currently, the Zoning Ordinance defines three types of occupations and/or businesses that can be operated out of a home. They are home business, home occupation and home business rural. The home occupation is permitted in dwelling types, in all dwelling types and does not allow for any customers to the dwelling. The home business is only allowed in a detached single-family dwelling; allows for customers to the home on a limited basis; and requires approval of a special exception in all the districts except the A-1, Agricultural district. And a special exception is an approval granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The home business, rural is only permitted in the A-1 district; allows for customers to the dwelling, employees at the dwelling; and permits a large amount of square footage to be devoted to the business. An approval of a special exception from the Board of Zoning Appeals is also required. In addition to these types of businesses, the ordinance also defines retail sales, manufacturing, light and heavy, which have an impact on the how the businesses can be conducted. Proposed Ordinance O18-06 amends the regulations for these uses; creates a new type of home business; amends definitions; and creates new ones. A summary of the proposed changes are as follows: It amends the definition of home occupation to include e-commerce as a type of business and further clarifies how a home occupation shall operate. No other changes are suggested. It amends the definition of home business to home business I and allows the following: The use as an accessory by-right use in all single-family detached dwellings without the approval of a special use permit; customers to the home with a limit on the number per visit and the number of visits per day; hours of operation and off-street parking to be provided. The proposed ordinance also creates a new use, home business II, as another level of home business permitted in a single-family dwelling. It allows and restricts the number of employees, limits the number of customers and the hours of operation, provides off-street parking, regulates location and amount of indoor and outdoor storage and requires approval of a special exception. The proposed ordinance also amends home business, rural, to clarify the requirements for the use which includes the size and type of sign permitted for such a use. And this ordinance also creates the definition of e-commerce and handicraft and amends the definitions of manufacturing, light and heavy, and retail sales to better reflect the standards set forth in the home business categories. And this proposed Ordinance O18-05 provides performance standards for conducting businesses out of a residential dwelling by limiting the number of customers and the hours of activity; restricting such activity to single-family detached homes; and reducing the need for additional approvals for such businesses. The committee reviewed the definitions and amended them so they reflect these regulations and did not conflict with them. And staff believes the proposed ordinance is a comprehensive change to how businesses can be conducted out of residential dwellings and recommends the Commission vote to forward this document to the Board of Supervisors with the recommendation of approval. And per the resolution R17-298 action on this ordinance is required by April 2<sup>nd</sup>. Do we have any questions?

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Ms. Blackburn. Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: Yes, I have just a clarification.

Ms. Blackburn: Yes sir.

Mr. Bain: In the home business I category, the business has to be contained entirely within the residence, or...what I'm wondering about, if somebody has a detached garage, can they use their garage or does that automatically classify them as a home business II?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Blackburn: If I remember correctly, let's see.

Mr. Bain: Because there is no...I don't think there is any mention of an auxiliary building under home business I.

Ms. Blackburn: Then there would not be. It would only be allowed to be conducted within the home.

Mr. Bain: Within the residence?

Ms. Blackburn: Within the residence, yes. It was the home business II that does start allowing for accessory structures to be used.

Mr. Bain: Alright, great, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions on the Commission? No. Okay. No questions. Alright so we'll move...Thank you Ms. Blackburn, you did so good there is no questions. So we'll move forward to the public hearing portion for the proposed ordinance amendment of home businesses. Again, same, come down, state your name, address and the district you reside. You have three minutes to speak, one minute when the yellow light comes on, and when the red light comes on your time has expired. I see a gentleman coming forward.

Mr. Grotenrath: Jack Grotenrath, I am the owner of JC Firearms. I've been conducting my business for 7 years. I'm not sure where the complaint came from. I'd love to know where the complaint came from. I deal with people from the Secret Service, from the DA, from the FBI, CIA members, just about anyone you can imagine I've dealt with. I've helped them out. You guys like a good story? I got a great one. So I had an individual come in. He bought his AR-15 online bushmaster, pretty cheap one. He arrived to my place of residence that I work out of. I have just two rooms I work out of and that's it. I work by myself. I see you guys talk about, you know, water and lighting and these sorts of things, and traffic flow. I don't have those issues. Actually I have a back parking lot that can only accommodate a couple of vehicles. I do things by appointment only. So I don't have people just come in whenever they want. I specifically put on my website, I do not want people just randomly showing up, because I don't appreciate that. I don't want signage. I don't advertise signage. I never had a break-in, never, and for good reasons. I talked to the Fredericksburg...two detectives, I had two calls from in the past and it was about gun stores being broken into. Just about all of them been hit. I've never been hit, and it's mainly because it's too dangerous to break into a house that has firearms. It's very dangerous. I don't want a store front. I'm not interested in a store front. I've considered this many of times. They're too easy to break into. They advertise too much and the amount of business I do is not a lot. It's only about maybe on average 1 to maybe 6 people a day, at most. I've never had a complaint, again, in 7 years. Now back to my story, I was telling you about, where I think this complaint originated from. I got an individual locked up and put in jail. He was mentally ill and he came to my premise intoxicated. It was extremely irresponsible what he did. And it was right around the time frame that you mentioned that this happened. Actually I still have to get a court order for this guy. So he shows up. He's intoxicated. I didn't initially see this, you know, I don't look for intoxicated individuals buying AR-15s. That just doesn't happen. That's the first time I've ever seen that in my entire life. So he comes in and I had one other individual in the home with me that I was working with at the time. He had bought something else online and I just had to chip in to do the transfer, that was it. In this process, he comes in, he goes up, he's looking around in the room. He's looking around different things and I asked him, hey do you own any other firearms and he snapped at me. He's like "what does that matter for". I was like, my gosh, who is this guy. I'm like Santa Clause. People come in...I know.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: inaudible...it's a cliffhanger.

Mr. Grotenrath: You're going to hear the end of the story because it's a good one.

Ms. Vanuch: I know, but unfortunately we can't.

Mr. Grotenrath: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: You can email us.

Mr. Grotenrath: Well, I mean I've seen the other people that are owner and operators and that are (Inaudible) permits.

Ms. Vanuch: You're not an applicant on this issue, you're just a regular member of the public...inaudible

Mr. Grotenrath: Okay, well you mentioned firearms so I'm curious where the complaint came from. I have no idea, but the story I'm telling is compliant to where this complaint came from.

Ms. Vanuch: inaudible...Thank you so much.

Mr. Grotenrath: Too bad for the story.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, does anybody else want to come down? Okay, since no one else is coming down, I'm going to close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, may I ask Ms. Blackburn to step up?

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, Ms. Blackburn, come on up.

Mr. Apicella: So I just want to clarify, I'm not quite sure, the gentleman who just spoke about this specific complaint he was eluting to, sounds like he has a concern about this firearms business, and just to clarify a firearms transfer business can occur under an HB I use, by-right and under an HB II use with a special exception?

Ms. Blackburn: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so really there's really no significant impact potentially to his business and especially if he's already got a business in place, I think the rules are grandfathered.

Ms. Blackburn: Exactly and as I stated and hopefully it was clear, that this was to remove the requirement for a special exception for any type of business, particularly a firearms business of people coming to your home.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it wouldn't remove all special exceptions. It would remove the special exceptions within the parameters of an HB I use.

Ms. Blackburn: Yes sir.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall, did you have a question?

Mr. Randall: I did. I just wanted to make sure that everyone is clear that this ordinance needed to be changed. By the prior ordinance everyone that did a business out of their home had to have a special exception. They had to come before the Board, they had to get a special exception. We word diligently to make sure that special exceptions were for special exceptions requirements and that we were able to make the HB I so that if most businesses, home based businesses fell under those guidelines and allowed those businesses to be able to go on under normal circumstances without anything else. So I just wanted to make that known. I appreciate staff's effort to help us put that together and that's it. Thanks.

Ms. Blackburn: Well thank you, and if I may say something, I do appreciate all the work that the Committee did. It was a large task and you all did very, very well. So thank you very much.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Any other comments from the Commission? Mister...no? Okay. I'm going to make just a couple of comments. I don't really have questions, I just want to make a few comments to address a couple of things. The first, Mr. Randall was absolutely right, most of the businesses that were operating out of a home were against the previous ordinance anyway and I know in previous meetings I brought up this and just wanted to reiterate things that were like LuLaRoe, Rodan & Fields, or Mary Kay were technically being operated illegally based on the previous ordinance out of the home and so we were really trying to update our ordinance with the times and allow some of the stay at home moms to be able to earn an income from their home, but with recognizing that there are impacts on the neighbors, there are impacts on the neighborhood and to make sure that there were certain restrictions in place to allow that to happen, but to also continue to be a good neighbor to your neighbors and not have, you know, 50 different people come into your home every day. And in regards to the gentleman who came forward to speak about the firearms business and the whole definition of potential retail sales, that was something else that I was very adamantly strong that we not restrict gun sales from licensed FFL dealers, because otherwise it's just going to happen in a parking lot in some shopping center to somebody who doesn't do a background check. My father is previous military police officer and also holds a FFL dealer license and I know how important it is for them to do those background checks and I think, if we can make it easier for these FFL dealers to be able to operate so they can do background checks before selling a weapon to somebody that would be great. So, it's not meant to mitigate that and I hope that that is not the interpretation that the public got, that this was impacting the FFL dealers or gun sales. It's really meant to impact multiple burdensome trips to a home or manufacturing things in a home, that shouldn't be manufactured. So those are my comments. Does anybody else have anything they'd like to chime in on? Okay, so the next...

Mr. Apicella: Madame Chairman, I'd like to offer a motion recommending that we send forward to the Board the revised Ordinance O18-06.

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

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by Mr. Apicella, a second by Mr. Randall to approve. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yes ma'am. I have some comments to make. I would like to say that the Planning Commission and its subcommittee worked on this issue for about 6 month. I want to thank my colleagues, Ms. Vanuch and Mr. Randall, as well as our terrific staff for their work on this matter. Our overarching goal was to modernize Stafford's approach to dealing with home occupations and home businesses. It takes into account the growing amount of commerce that's occurring over the internet and out of people's homes. The new regime attempts to strike a balance between encouraging residents to

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

conduct certain business activities out of their home, while also addressing and mitigating potential impacts on their neighbors. As staff mentioned, under the revised home occupations and the new home business I definitions a number of business activities can occur by-right in all residential districts. Some of those activities which were not previously allowed by right. And under the home business II and rural home business definitions, again, certain business can occur with an approved special exception from the county's Board of Zoning Appeals. I think this measure provides a scaled approach, based in large part on where, when and how many customer visits would be appropriate in a given set of circumstances and in given locations. As part of our process in determining where these kinds of activities could occur, we considered the availability of sufficient and dedicated off street parking. Again, parking was a very strong consideration in our minds and the proximity of potential home businesses and neighboring residential units in determining where those potential customer visits could create conflicts. So we were trying to avoid those sets of circumstances. It also provides a mechanism for firearms transfers to occur, again, in HB I, by right and under the HB II use with a special exception. I think another important thing that we did is, we created a new handicrafts definition. This insures residents can make crafts out of their home without being considered a manufacturing operation. So I think the bottom line, I believe this is a balanced and prudent measure that brings Stafford County into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Thank you Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Apicella. Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: I have no additional comments, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. Anyone else on the Commission like to comment? Okay. Seeing no further comments, we shall take up a vote now. Okay, so the motion passes 7-0. Items 4, 5 and 6 are deferred... items on the agenda for either April 11<sup>th</sup> or April 25<sup>th</sup>. There is no unfinished business and no new business. So now we move on to the Planning Directors report. Mr. Harvey.

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) (History: March 14, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to April 11, 2018)</b>	Big Spring Lane	Kelvic Way

5. 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) (March 14, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to April 25, 2018)**



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

6. 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 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) (March 14, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to April 25, 2018)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Cluster Development
  - Referral
  - Approved Ordinance
- Community Drainfields
- E-Plans

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Madam Chairman. At the Board of Supervisors meeting last week on the 20<sup>th</sup> they were very busy and sent a number of things off to the Planning Commission and also took some decisive actions. In particular I will start with cluster development. The Board of Supervisors adopted a new ordinance that affected cluster development, specifically where cluster development can occur in the county. The new map that reflects where the cluster development can occur generally encompasses the Urban Services Area and areas adjacent to the Urban Services Area. The ordinance would specifically do that in a means to look at complying with state code. Because as you recall the Planning Commission previously held a public hearing at the Boards request regarding repeal of the cluster regulations. So what in affect happened with the adoption of the map, it was a partial repeal. So the regulations were repealed for properties located outside the designated area, but still remain in effect for properties within the designated area. The Board also sent some ordinance amendments for the Planning Commission to hold public hearing on as well as Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Those amendments, the Board had requested action by the Planning Commission by the end of May. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment would adopt the map that was referenced in the ordinance amendment. Also it would restructure some of the existing language and performance recommendations for cluster developments to have one set of recommendations for cluster development in the Urban Services Area and also cluster development in the rural areas. The Comprehensive Plan would also address and explain how the cluster approved areas were derived, specifically stating how that area meets the minimum 40% requirement in State Code for undeveloped land to be eligible for cluster development within the locality. The Board also with, with its ordinance amendments, asked the Planning Commission to take a look at restructuring our Zoning Ordinance in how we list cluster development. In particular, right now

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

for each one of the zoning categories, A-1, A-2 and R-1 and the standard use table list cluster development at one of the permitted uses and has setback standards, lot sizes and things of that nature. So that information will be taken out of the main table and put into a separate table so all of our cluster standards will be in one location. Also the ordinance would establish some performance standards for cluster developments and address the ability to use or not use stormwater management ponds and major utility easements towards counting towards the minimum required open space. The Board also, on another note, made referrals to the Planning Commission and the Utilities Commission on two separate ordinances dealing with community drainfields. The Planning Commission ordinance amendment would be amending the Subdivision Ordinance, specifically to require that all drainfields be on the lot where the residence is located. So that in effect would no longer allow community drainfields for new subdivisions. And then finally the Board referred a proposed amendment to the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance for electronic plan review. That is something our Public Works Department has already implemented and Planning and Zoning is working on that as well, so applicants for site plans and subdivision plans could submit their applications on line in an electronic format. It is noted that a number of code sections talks about submitting paper copies of the plans, specific size of the plan sheets, and number of sheets in a plan which would no longer be applicable in the context of electronic plan review. So that's the essence of the proposed code changes with that amendment. Both the community drainfields and E-plans referrals don't have a specific time limitation. We would default to the normal code standards. For community drainfields, since it is a Subdivision Ordinance amendment, it would be 60 days that the Planning Commission would have to hold a hearing and make recommendations. With E-plans it's both the Subdivision which has a 60 day time limit and a Zoning part which has a 100 day time limit. And that concludes my report.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Harvey. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I don't know if my colleagues have had a chance to look at any of the items that the Planning Director just spoke about, but I was wondering if we could go through some of them and perhaps consider sending them to a public hearing with any modifications that you all think that is appropriate. Maybe we can start from the bottom up, on the E-plans.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: The only change that I can see would be under... on page 3 on the E-plans, which I think is listed as number 8, under Section 22-61 where it talks about who may trigger a meeting. I would ask that we include as a... county staff another entity that could generate a meeting or request a meeting. If county staff is too broad then perhaps the Planning Director.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. We just... on a couple of the agendas the links didn't come through...

Mr. Apicella: Oh.

Ms. Vanuch: ... so they weren't able to follow along so we were trying to figure that out.

Mr. Apicella: So this... I think this is an item that we talked about at the last meeting or maybe the meeting before that, I can't remember. But we were asked for some comment on this potential change that would no longer make these TRC meetings mandatory, but that they would occur at the request of certain individuals or bodies. So again, the only change that I saw potentially missing, because I mentioned it at that point in time, is I thought again maybe some county department or staff might also want to have a meeting.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah. To add in that provision.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: And Mr. Harvey, we have to vote on when to send this to public hearing, correct?

Mr. Harvey: At some point in time yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: And then...

Mr. Boswell: Tonight?

Mr. Harvey: No sir. The resolution does allow the Planning Commission to make modifications as you deem appropriate and necessary. If you so desire we can add the word in there regarding the agent, that implies the subdivision agent or site plan agent, which in both cases is myself. The County Administrator has delegated his authority to me, so our office, Planning and Zoning is the coordinating agency for the technical review of plans. So if any other department asks to have a meeting, we will make sure that happens. So we can add agent into that section.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I don't... there is not necessarily a necessity to put it on a public hearing. I don't know what our public hearing schedule looks like, but it doesn't seem to be that these are fairly... this one is fairly complicated, so I could go either way. It just depends on the rest of my fellow Commissioners think is appropriate.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else have an opinion on this? When to send it? Anybody? Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: I think that is a good suggestion, I definitely support that.

Mr. Apicella: So moving forward with it?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: With that change?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I will make a motion to that affect, to put it to the first available public hearing.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. So we have a motion by Commissioner Apicella and seconded by Commissioner Bain. Mr. Apicella, any comments?

Mr. Apicella: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No ma'am.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: Any others? Okay, so we can vote to send it to public hearing at the first available date. Alright, motion passes 7-0. Okay. Community drainfields, if we are working backwards.

Mr. Apicella: Yes ma'am. So I think Mr. Bain pointed that there might have been a typo, I don't know if he wants to speak to it or I can speak to it. It's on page 2, section 22-118 4C.

Mr. Bain: Yes, in that section specification of the design capacity says one hundred and fifty and in parenthesis 150 gallons per day in parenthesis GPD bedroom and it should actually be per bedroom. So 150 gallons per day per bedroom is how to develop the design capacity. And I think Mr. Harvey had responded that could be corrected.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bain did you see anything else that needed to be fixed.

Mr. Bain: Not in the community drainfield.

Mr. Apicella: So with that change, Madam Chairman, I would recommend that the proposed ordinance be sent to a public at the first available date.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion. Do we have a second?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Apicella and seconded by Commissioner McPherson. Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Nothing further ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Nothing further.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anybody else? Any comments? Okay, so we can vote on that item to send to public hearing as well. Alright motion passes 7-0. Alright moving on to clusters.

Mr. Apicella: On the clusters. So I have a question to ask of our Planning Director. Were there any actions or portions of the referral that the Board sent our way where we can't make any changes and we essentially just need to take an up or down vote?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella and Madam Chairman, the referral from the Board of Supervisors allows the Planning Commission to make changes to the text of the comp plan amendment as well as the Zoning Ordinance amendment. However, the Planning Commission is not at liberty to make changes to the map that would be in the comp plan. Because that map would be the same map that was adopted by the Board by ordinance.

Mr. Apicella: How about the table of uses and standards? Can that be changed or is that as presented?

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Mr. Harvey: My recollection is that the referring resolution allows you to make changes to the text of the document. So that would be text.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so what I am hearing is the only item that was referred to us that can't be changed is the map.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Boswell: So we are stuck with the Map 3. I want to make sure that I am clear. They were presented with three and they narrowed it down, and that's what we have to up or down Map 3.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Boswell: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: And we adopting it to our comprehensive plan, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: So our Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance will be in harmony.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: So Madam Chairman, seeing that we can't make any changes anyhow on that specific piece, I would recommend that we put that specific portion of the referral or action item to a public hearing at the nearest possible date.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. So we have a motion by Mr. Apicella to send that to public hearing since we can't make any changes to the closest possible date. Do we have a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, so a second by Mr. English. Mr. Apicella any further comments?

Mr. Apicella: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Harvey:

Mr. Harvey: For the information for the Commission, there will have to be some text to the Comprehensive Plan to accompany the map to explain what that is and how it fits into the comp plan.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Apicella: Right, but we would take care of that at the appropriate time, after... or as part of the future process.

Mr. Harvey: As part of this public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, Mr. McPherson go ahead.

Mr. McPherson: I do have a question too. The Option 3 map is an up or down vote, we are allowed to change the text. However the text might depend on option 3. So shouldn't we talk about the text first before we up or down the map. I think that there is other discussions going on. We wouldn't want to approve or disapprove Option 3 before we have gone over the text, I don't think.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: And again we can't make a change to the map. The map is going to be what the map is, that is what the Board referred to us. I think the language in the referral specifically said, or as I recall in watching the hearing, that we could not make any changes to the map. So that piece... yes the text could change, but the map won't change. So I don't see any harm in moving forward with the map and then further amending the comp plan as necessary to address the textural change requirements.

Mr. McPherson: My comment is not that we can change the map, but once we have approved or disapproved it then we are locked in. I think that we should discuss the text first or approve them at the same time.

Mr. Apicella: I think we are locked into the map no matter what. So it's sort of... we can talk about the map when we talk about the text, but it doesn't change... it won't change the map.

Ms. Vanuch: And so, in regards to the text Mr. Apicella, are you wanting to move forward with that at a slower pace, because we can make edits to it?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: I am saying this so everybody is on the same page here. And so you want to move forward with the map first and then the text so we are able to make changes and make sure that all the language marries up to the map.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. And Mr. Wisniewski are there any issues in separating the two?

Mr. Wisniewski: Madam Chairman, there are no legal issue with separating the two, but when you create multiple public hearings it might create some confusion for the public potentially, it could. That is something for your consideration.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, alright. Mr. McPherson do you have any more comments on it?

Mr. McPherson: No I have made my comments, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Anybody else?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Randall: I do.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: I guess that would be my... I understand what we are trying to do and get everything out of the way that can potentially get out of the way as soon possible. I understand that. I am concerned, again what as was mentioned, that there may be some confusion and we maybe duplicating effort if we have two public hearings regarding the cluster, whether it is the map or the text. I am not sure the basic understanding will be that rather than doing them all together we can say public hearing on everything, I understand the map is not going to go anywhere but we are going to move the map and the text together and we are going to present them together, they are going to be shown together, we are going to talk about them together. I just don't know if we gain much by separating them out, although I do recognize that... try to get this done and get everything out of the way...

Mr. Apicella: So when this goes back to the Board, since the Board has already approved the map, when they actually take up this item they won't be taking a look at the map, right? They have already approved the map, there is no further action from them on the map.

Mr. McPherson: But they sent it to us for up or down vote.

Mr. Harvey: From the Zoning Ordinance standpoint, that is correct.

Mr. Apicella: And in my six years on this Planning Commission it's not the first time that we've bifurcated the map and text associated with the map. Is that correct? We have done that before.

Mr. Harvey: I am sure we have.

Ms. Vanuch: Well...

Mr. Apicella: Again, it just seems to me that... I understand... we've done it before. The map can't be changed. It's, for lack of a better term, it's a done deal. I don't see what the harm is in just moving forward with it since it's ...

Mr. Randall: Sure...

Mr. Apicella: ... in any event going to happen regardless of what we do further on...

Mr. Randall: My understanding is it is not a done deal. It's an up or down vote. Do we have to have a public hearing then if it is something that can't be changed? It has already been approved... adopted by ordinance. Is there a public hearing requirement for that?

Mr. Apicella: There is a public hearing requirement that puts us...

Mr. Randall: For the text...

Mr. Apicella: ... gives us the responsibility to make changes to the comp plan including maps, so we are kind of following the action already taken by the Board on the map piece. I understand that it's not the normal process, but you know we still have an administrative responsibility to approve the map

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: Does that answer your question Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: So we do have to approve the map?

Ms. Vanuch: (Inaudible) the comp plan.

Mr. Apicella: We have to take action on the map.

Ms. Vanuch: ... into the comp plan.

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, I think that is an important caveat, because it is not like if we vote down the map it kills the cluster ordinance, just into the comp plan to bring it into compliance with the current ordinance. Mr. Harvey, really quickly remind me what are the time limits on the map from the Board and the text? Are they the same time limits?

Mr. Harvey: Yes ma'am the time limit is... the Commission has to vote on the comp plan amendment as well as the Zoning Ordinance amendment by May 31<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so let's play this out. So let's say we vote to move forward with the map, when would that public hearing be?

Mr. Harvey: That public hearing would be your second meeting in April.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay and let's say that we decided to make changes to the map that would give us...

Mr. Apicella: We can't make changes...

Ms. Vanuch: ... not to the map. I am sorry, I am sorry, I am sorry, I know that. Make changes to the text amendment, not the map. To the text, that would have to be done by the end of May. So it would just give... it's a month difference basically.

Mr. Harvey: It could be. Depends on when the Commission wants to move forward with the public hearing because you could finalize the text at your next Planning Commission meeting or the second meeting in April and still have either your first or second public hearing in May for the hearing and decision.

Ms. Vanuch: And so if... let me just play devil's advocate. If we move forward with the text to public hearing tonight, and Dan says well there's something in there that, you know, we probably should have changed then we would have to advertise for another public hearing, Correct.

Mr. Wisniewski: Madam Chairman, it really depends on the change. How substantive it is and what we advertised.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Wisniewski: So it depends on the change.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Apicella: I would definitely say that we are not ready to make any...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: ... or take any action on the text.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: We should talk about the process no matter what we do on the map piece, because we don't have a lot of time to deal with it, so.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Well hopefully that gives everybody a better idea of the timing and I agree I don't think we are ready to take any action on the text currently. So, does anybody want to... so we already had a motion, I think. Let me think back 20 minutes ago, so we had a motion. The motion was to send the map to the first available public hearing and it was second by Mr. English. So, are there any alternative motions? Okay. Yes Mr. Harvey.

Ms. Harvey: Madam Chairman just to clarify, when we hold a hearing on the map, I believe we would also need to include the text that... in the provision on attachment 5, page 3 of 7, it talks about cluster subdivision areas, which describes the map...

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: ... and how the map was derived. So I think that part would also need to be in the comp plan text.

Mr. Apicella: I amend my motion with that in mind.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Alright.

Mr. English: I second it, with that in mind.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. So, any further discussion? Okay, so let's move forward with the vote.

Mr. Boswell: What are we voting on?

Ms. Vanuch: Don't make me say it again. To send...

Mr. Apicella: The map and the language associated with the map.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, the map and the language...

Mr. Apicella: To the first available public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch: ... associated with the map to the first available. Not all the text amendment, just anything that the map requires... the text required of the map or however you want to say that.

Mr. Apicella: No, I didn't.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we good?

Mr. Apicella: Yes

Ms. Vanuch: Anymore discussion? Alright so we are ready to vote. Okay so the motion passes 5-0 to send the map to the first available...

Mr. Apicella: 5 to 2.

Ms. Vanuch: I'm sorry, 5 to 2 (Mr. Randall and Mr. Baines were opposed). I just eliminated two people, it's past my bedtime, 5-2. Alright, so now do we want to talk about the text?

Mr. Apicella: I think there's a lot there. I wonder if it... and you know, it has to be done quickly. I wonder if it's worth setting up a quick subcommittee to kind of delve into it and maybe come to the Commission with a recommendation.

Mr. Randall: I would agree.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, I can see the staff is very excited about a subcommittee. But I actually do agree with the fact of creating a small subcommittee just to have one meeting to discuss the text. Even if it's just a two member subcommittee, I don't think it needs to be massively large to work with counsel to make sure that we've got good language going into the next meeting. Because this does need to be done very, very, quickly. Does anybody want to volunteer? Otherwise I can appoint some folks. I know that Mr. Randall would like to be on the subcommittee because we've already discussed that potential.

Mr. McPherson: I also would volunteer.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. McPherson, okay. So we have Mr. Randall and Mr. McPherson. Anybody else want to volunteer or are we just going to cap it at two? Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bain can do it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, you want three? You want four? You want...

*Inaudible, several Commission members talking at once.*

Mr. Apicella: Three, I think would be appropriate and I think some fresh perspectives will be good.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, you guys better bring something good.

*Laughter*

Mr. McPherson: And meet tomorrow afternoon.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah and it's due by Saturday. Okay. So then I guess we are going to appoint a subcommittee, just for the viewers watching. So they understand what just took place. And the subcommittee is going to work to have language to the Commission by the next meeting, which is April 11<sup>th</sup>. And so the members of the subcommittee are going to be Mr. McPherson, Mr. Bain and Mr. Randall. So there we go, all the newbies. Okay, so moving on. We are done with that, thank goodness, County Attorney's report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Wisniewski: Madam Chairman, I have no report.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, committee reports. The sign ordinance committee is pretty much no longer in existence, so can we take that off of the agenda moving forward?

Mr. Boswell: You are the Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, I know I asked that last time and it's still on there, so can we just take that one off? Landscaping Subcommittee?

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

Mr. English: Yes ma'am, we met this evening and we came up with the final draft and it should be... We are going to present that the 25<sup>th</sup> of April. It will be presented to the Commission and then we will go from there.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, thank you. Parking and drive aisles. That would be me and Mr. McPherson, and I know we had... oh we have these lovely print offs and Ms. Hornung has been chomping at the bit to come talk to us all evening about parking and drive aisles. So there's two little handouts for everyone. Ms. Hornung.

- Parking and Drive Aisle Standards Subcommittee

Ms. Hornung: Thank you Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. What I ... just a little background, update. When we met at your last meeting I... you got a copy of the ordinance to repeal the parking, loading and then a new ordinance that showed all the B-1, B-2 uses included because the way the parking regulations are currently, the commercial uses... commercial retail uses are listed as low, medium and high intensity. So the committee... the subcommittee asked that the B-1 and B-2 uses be included. And so you have two handouts. The one handout which is on the non 8 ½ x 14, it highlights in yellow, those are the B-1, B-2 uses that were included in the new parking standards. And then there were some questions and recommendations of some inconsistencies and those were fixed for square foot land area, where it should be recorded versus GFA. So some of those... information was corrected. Also, I noticed that under data and computer services per was missing which actually is in red. So it would be 1.5 per number of employees on maximum shift. Now the rest of the ordinance ... everything in yellow is a B-1 or B-2 use that was not originally included and then the... it was grey in the original, but the way it got copied it looks like a grey, blue grey color, on the other items. Those were the designations that were changed from the existing. And if you would like me to let you know exactly what the existing number is versus the proposed, I can do that. I have that in my list.

Mr. Apicella: So this seems to be a breakout of various localities in how the compared to Stafford. Is that correct?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Hornung: Right. I didn't get... I was going to get to that as well.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I am sorry.

Ms. Hornung: That's okay. I can talk about that now if you like.

Mr. Apicella: No, because I have one specifically I want to mention.

Ms. Hornung: Oh, okay.

Mr. Apicella: Which is the same one I mentioned last time.

Ms. Vanuch: He also is chomping at the bit.

Ms. Hornung: Well let me ask you this, would you like me to go through item by item in the proposed parking regulations for those items that have changed from the existing regulation?

Mr. Apicella: I would like to talk about the one...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, I think we've...

Mr. Apicella: ...heartburn...

Ms. Vanuch: ... done this so many times.

Ms. Hornung: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: I think we all should have seen this by now, so go ahead Steven.

Mr. Apicella: So what I see here is that for comparable localities they don't breakout townhomes from apartments. Is that correct?

Ms. Hornung: Correct. What happens is townhomes are... in Stafford County looked at in a similar fashion as single family dwellings, because they are on individual lots. Multi-family is the structure whether it is an apartment, condo or townhouse, but the land is not subdivided. And those are the developments that you will typically see with a parking lot in the middle, where everybody can park and then a number of parking spaces at the front of those structures. Similar to an apartment complex or a condo, because I believe in Woodstream there is a section where the buildings look like townhouses but they are actually on one piece of land. They didn't subdivide the land, so that would be looked at as a multi-family use, when we are looking at parking. Now on the townhomes, because Stafford designates them differently, the townhomes are looked at as a single family dwelling lot. They are a lot and it's just the building is a townhouse versus a single family house. But it's still a separate lot, so you will have a road going through that development and parking might be at the end of one of the roads as seen in Rappahannock Landing. You have the roads going through, there are townhouse structures, they are individual lots, but at the end of the road there might be a few parking spaces.

Mr. Apicella: I got you. In my view townhomes are not apartments and they are not single family detached. And the difference being a between a townhome and a single family detached is a single family detached is probably going to have a garage and a driveway where you can park a car.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Hornung: And we are seeing some townhomes... single family attached is similar to the townhomes, but the townhomes we do see some of them have garages, like in Embrey Mill...

Mr. Apicella: Some of them do but a lot of them don't.

Ms. Hornung: ... and Celebrate.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm still... having been an HOA president, having seen numerous parking issues, I strongly believe that reducing the number from 2.2 units to 2 is not going to be sufficient, because in a townhome you are likely going to have at least two drivers taking up two spaces and so we have accommodated zero spaces in a townhome development for guests. So you know you've got a row of 5 or 6 townhomes, you've got 10 or 12 spaces, where's the visitor going to park if they are only held to the same number of parking spaces as drivers they have in that residential unit. That's my concern and I have seen a number of townhome developments including the one that I lived in and helped oversee battles for limited guest parking. And here there is no guest parking. So I just think that... I think that something got lost in translation between multi-family, maybe the comment about multi-family and how it related to maybe apartments versus townhomes and how that's wrapped into a multi-family construct in Stafford. So I really think we shouldn't make that change from 2.2 to 2.0 for townhomes. I think that would create numerous problems in townhome developments. So I would recommend that we not make that change.

Ms. Vanuch: Ms. Hornung, can you remind me if a townhomes builds a garage do the garage... like let's say it builds a 2 car garage, or even a 1 car garage. Do those spaces count to the County as parking spaces?

Ms. Hornung: I believe they do. I don't know how many, maybe 1...

Mr. Harvey: No they do not count towards parking.

Ms. Hornung: Not the garage.

Mr. Harvey: They still have to provide parking spaces on your driveway and/or in the case of townhomes an axillary parking area.

Mr. Apicella: The other thing I would offer on townhomes, kind of like with our E-commerce discussion and how parking is limited and why we didn't necessarily want to have customers visiting townhomes it because in most cases the resident doesn't own that space, it is owned by the association. The association manages those parking spaces and either allocates them generally to anyone who... it's a free for all or assigns specific spaces. Again that creates a huge problem where people are trying to find spaces to park. So even with a garage, I can tell you, my townhome had a garage, what do you do with that? You probably put most of your stuff... it becomes extra storage especially in a townhome where you don't have a lot of extra space to put stuff. I just think we are creating a huge problem for the County if we reduce the number of parking spaces in a townhome development.

Ms. Vanuch: Are there... Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair, to that point was there a thought... is the expectation then that when they allocate that they will only allocate 1 per townhome and the rest of them will be visitor spots? Or was there an expectation through the Committee that there would be no visitor spots in a new development?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: So when we looked at it, we looked at the difference from the other localities and that it was at 1.6 versus our 2.2. And the fact that we don't allow garage spaces, so I think that we were, just maybe over assuming that townhomes would build garages, people would actually... they build a 2 car garage and at least park 1 of their cars, so if we could have alleviated at least the 0.2 space...

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Ms. Vanuch: ... then they would have 2 spaces, so you know, that would be a good amount. But I guess it is not necessarily encouraging garages to be built. So I think, you know, my thoughts after hearing Mr. Apicella comments, would either be, you know, if there is a 2 car garage built then, you know, then they could have the 2 spaces. But if it's a 1 car garage or no garage at all then 2.2 per unit. But I don't even know if we can do that.

Mr. Randall: You mean separate out like that?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, separate it and say if you are building a 2 car garage then you can do 2 outdoor spaces...

Mr. Randall: Right, there is surely a large difference between Embrey Mill building the townhomes with garages...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: And the townhomes on Highpoint that were built a number of years ago...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, that have no garage.

Mr. Randall: ...that have no garages and again having been over there numerous times...

Mr. Boswell: No place to park.

Mr. Randall: ... there is no place to park. Visitor parking is very limited and if you go to 2.0 then the requirement... there won't be any visitor parking...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: ... allowed. An so otherwise, you know, they will only say these 3 will only have 1 spot, these 3 will have 2 and those types of things.

Mr. McPherson: Jeff.

Mr. Randall: So I think there is some validity to leaving that at a 2.2, unless of course...

Ms. Vanuch: Roy says 3.

Mr. Randall: ... we can separate them out.

Mr. Boswell: Make it 3.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. McPherson: Can we add in? Can we differentiate between townhomes with 1 or 2 garages and not? Is there any reason we couldn't do that?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. McPherson, we could make that differentiation. The one thing we would have to say is if there is any unit that have garages, they all would have to have garages to meet that requirement. And so we would ...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, it does get cumbersome, I agree. Or we just leave it at 2.2 and just.

Mr. Apicella: I think 2.2 is the bare... the 0.2 is the bare minimum.

Mr. English: It should be 3.

Mr. Apicella: I don't disagree, but I am just saying going down to nothing is just going to create huge problems.

Mr. Harvey: And Madam Chairman, as you recall this charge to develop this revised ordinance requirement came from the Board of Supervisors Community and Economic Development Committee. They felt that there was some concern in the community that maybe some of our uses were over parked. However this recommendation is the Planning Commission's recommendation. And it will go back to the Board and if the Board sees fit, will hold a public hearing on it. So it's at the Planning Commissions discretion and pleasure, as to what you want to have in the proposed amendment.

Ms. Vanuch: Just hold on one second. So we can actually change it to anything we want right here. And we are just recommending to the Board, hey we did this research, this is what we think we should be the parking standards and then they will vote whether or not they want us to hold a public hearing to even move further with the project or just leave it alone as it stands.

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Ms. Vanuch: So that way everybody understands. Because I know some people are newer than when started this, it feels like almost a year ago. And so then, when we send it to public hearing, that is when the numbers have to be firm. We can't make those changes. So if we want to change anything, now is the time.

Mr. English: Can I...

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, Mr. English.

Mr. English: Can I make a motion?

Ms. Vanuch: Well, yeah. Yeah go ahead.

Mr. English: Can I?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, yeah, go ahead.

Mr. English: You are sure.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. English: Huh?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. English: I make a recommendation we make it 2.5 for the townhouses.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Well I don't...

Mr. English: Can we do that?

Ms. Vanuch: I don't know if we need a motion. I think we can just make the change.

Mr. Apicella: I would definitely support 2.5, based on my experience, absolutely.

Mr. English: I have lived in a townhouse before and I know exactly what you are saying.

Mr. Boswell: I have towed out of them and I know exactly what you are saying.

Ms. Vanuch: So yeah, we don't... I don't think we... Mr. Wisniewski we don't need a motion to do that change right?

Mr. Wisniewski: You need something Madam Chairman, to agree on to vote too. So it should be clarified.

Mr. English: Yeah, so see.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, so there's his motion. Who seconded?

Mr. Boswell: I did.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, Mr. Boswell. Alright. Any comments?

Mr. English: No ma'am. 2.5 please.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, do anybody else have any comments? Alright, so go ahead and vote to raise it to 2.5.

Ms. Hornung: And excuse me, that is for townhomes only, correct?

Mr. English: Townhomes only.

Ms. Vanuch: That is correct.

Ms. Hornung: Because multi-family is...

Mr. English: 2.5 townhouses.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Ms. Hornung: ... is agreeable...

Ms. Vanuch: Multi-family.

Ms. Hornung: ... to the Commission, 2.2?

Mr. English: Yes, multi-family, that is okay with me.

Mr. Boswell: (Inaudible, microphone not on) change my motion?

Mr. English: No, no, no I'm not.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, go ahead and vote.

Ms. Hornung: This is the culmination of what the Committee worked on, since last June. Prior to that the Board had sent the... sent it down for the Planning Commission to work on the parking, loading requirements. So whatever you want to put in here, now is the time to adjust any of those numbers by agreeing... and agreement from the Committee, so that staff can put them together and then you can see them and then you can forward them on to the Board and then the Board will decide... forward it back to you for a public hearing or they will make changes or whatever they decide to do. Then it will come back to you and that is when the public hearing process will begin.

Ms. Vanuch: Yep, okay. So we are ready to vote?

Mr. Bain: I am sorry, are we just voting on the townhouse?

Ms. Vanuch: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: We can vote on the other ones as well.

Ms. Vanuch: We can, so now that we understand the process of how this is going to go, so we are voting right now on increasing the townhomes from 2 to 2 and ½.

Mr. English: 2.5.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, 2.5.

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

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, you can have it, 2 Tahoes and mini-cooper. Alright, so that motion passes unanimously. Are that any other items that we would like to address?

Mr. Boswell: What was the multi-family?

Ms. Hornung: 2.2, and I never really explained the chart that you received, the highlighted chart, that's the chart the Committee worked on. When staff compared, Stafford, Henrico, Spotsylvania and Prince William, with all the uses, so some of them don't have anything in there because they might have been in general or we, Stafford County might have had it in general what the parking requirement was. In the highlighted items were requested from the Committee to see what items were more than 10% difference

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

than Stafford County. So that's the... that kind of explains the chart that you received... was the working char. Yes sir.

Mr. Bain: I have a question about the plant and tree nursery and screen house. There had been a typographical error previously that I pointed out and that has been corrected, but the response mentioned that greenhouses would be treated differently. And I am wondering, should we specify in there that greenhouses are based on square footage of the greenhouse and not on the overall land area?

Mr. Apicella: I just want to know how blue houses are...

*Laughter*

Mr. Bain: Well you know, any color house.

Ms. Hornung: We could and I will verify that with the Zoning Administrator to make sure if we need to say plant tree nursery are for land area and the greenhouse would be for GFA.

Mr. Bain: Right.

Ms. Hornung: Because I know there is some state regulations that apply to agricultural uses and how we are looking at things, if they can submit... if they are supposed to submit plans of development.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Hornung: And some of those have changed recently, and I am not up to speed on those specifics.

Mr. Bain: Alright.

Ms. Hornung: But we will get that corrected. It will say either land area... or we will just divide it out. We will have a line item for plant and tree nursery and then we'll put underneath and/or greenhouse and have that designated as well.

Mr. Bain: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella.

Mr. English: Go ahead, no go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: So, I brought this one up at the last meeting, looking at the background section in the report, the last couple of sentences. I am just going to read it out. And the Zoning Ordinance definition of a street creates some problems for commercial developments. This, the definition of a street is an access way that serves 3 or more properties. Imposing street construction standards within a commercial development maybe costly and overly burdensome. That's the words that were in the background section and I am not saying that I agree or disagree with that point, it's just still not clear to me if and how that was addressed.

Ms. Hornung: I don't believe it was specifically addressed. I now that information came from previous staff reports that were as a result of the Process Design Committee and then the Board staff report.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*March 28, 2018*

Mr. Harvey: I recall in the Committee meetings there was discussion about that, but my recollection was that the end result was to leave it as it is.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that's fine I just want to be sure that somehow somehow it was discussed.

Ms. Hornung: Sure.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. English: I guess I am okay with this, so would probably like to make a motion we move forward with this document that you gave us as far as parking with the changes that we asked for the townhouses. So I am making that a motion.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, that's a motion. Do we have a second so we can discuss?

Mr. Randall: I second that motion.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by Mr. English, a second by Mr. Randall. Any further comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: N, I think we have done the... we added what we wanted to townhouses. I think everything else looks fair.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: No other than just to identify this is Table 7.1 correct?

Ms. Hornung: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, point of discussion.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, Mr. McPherson.

Mr. McPherson: During our last meeting there was a comment that due to Stafford's location, I believe in the Chesapeake area development, I forget what exactly it was called. Do we need to incorporate maximum numbers of parking for some items? Has that been taken care of?

Mr. Harvey: No, we have not addressed that. I was reporting at the last Planning Commission meeting that we had our... we were in the process of having an audit from the Chesapeake Bay staff of the Department of Environmental Quality and that was one of the recommendations that they would likely make. We have not received that recommendation yet from them. So that may be something that we would need to address in the future. We would probably have to do some additional research to see how other jurisdictions have set maximums and how was structured.

Mr. McPherson: Okay it seems to me that we can, please correct me if I am wrong, your opinion, we can vote tonight on the minimums. The maximums can be added at a later time, they don't have to be incorporated into this vote this evening?

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Mr. McPherson: Okay, I just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure. Any other comments from the Commission?

Mr. Boswell: Call for the vote.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so a motion made by Mr. English to accept this and send this to the Board, second by Mr. Randall. We can take a vote. Okay, that motion passed 7-0. Okay we are finally done with parking and drive aisles subcommittee, please take that off the agenda.

Mr. English: Good job Andrea.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes thank you Ms. Hornung: We didn't recognize you, but you were fantastic...

Ms. Hornung: That's okay.

Ms. Vanuch: ... in helping us get to such a great end point.

Ms. Hornung: It was a joint effort of many people.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you so much.

Ms. Hornung: Planning Commission, because we had three members of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes we did.

Ms. Hornung: Two existing and one former.

Ms. Vanuch: That's right.

Ms. Hornung: So there were a lot of people involved in getting all this information.

Ms. Vanuch: So thank you very much.

Ms. Hornung: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: So A-1 Uses Subcommittee, do you have an update? That's right you deferred it.

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

Mr. English: I do, no their next meeting is tentatively scheduled for April the 10<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we are reconvening.

Mr. English: Is that good for you Steven?

Mr. Apicella: April the 10<sup>th</sup>, what day is that?

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Mr. English: It's a Tuesday.

Mr. Apicella: Is the Board not meeting that day?

Mr. English: No.

Ms. Vanuch: No we have our meeting the next night, the 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. English: Thank you. Is that okay? Alright.

Ms. Vanuch: At 6:30 you said?

Mr. English: Yes ma'am

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

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. Okay, Cemetery Ordinance Subcommittee. Staff is still working on the report. We are hoping to have that at one of the... either the first or the second April meeting, to move forward to with that.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Ms. Vanuch: Chairman's Report, I have no report at this time. Other business, just of note TRC in the Aquia District and in the Garrisonville District.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

7. TRC Information - April 11, 2018
  - SAFSTOR Acquisitions - Aquia Election District
  - Patriot's Crossing Multi-Tenant Bldg - Garrisonville Election District

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Vanuch: And we do actually have some minutes to approve tonight for February 28, 2018. And before we do that, I just want to make a note that the December and the January meetings were outsourced, right?

Ms. Stinnette: This one.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh this one was outsourced, so the other ones Stacie is working on and that is why it is taking so long because those meetings were extremely long and she's been working really hard. December was a long meeting. So she has been working really hard to get those.

Mr. Boswell: Can we outsource them all?

Ms. Vanuch: To Mr. Boswell.

Mr. English: Put it in the budget Jeff.

***Planning Commission Minutes***  
***March 28, 2018***

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I have some minor changes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, to February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright.

Mr. Apicella: On page 40, line 1939, where it says probably would please add the word not. I am very sure I said would not have that big of an impact.

Mr. Boswell: Are you sure?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Stinnette: Which line?

Mr. Apicella: Line 1939. On the next page, line 1963, I think there should be a dollar sign there, \$525,000. On page 65, line 3154 about the middle of the line as one speaker, e-r. And on line 3158 a little bit past midway, so for those reasons, add an s. That is it Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we've got those changes on page 40, 41, 65 and 65. So we have a motion?

February 28, 2018

Mr. English: I'll make a motion to accept the changes and accept the minutes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we have a motion by Mr. English, do we have a second?

Mr. Apicella: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, second by Mr. Apicella. Any discussion?

Mr. English: Nope.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, so let's take a vote. Alright, motion passes 7-0. Meeting adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.