

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
August 29, 2018

The special meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, August 29, 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, Rysheda McClendon, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Any declarations of disqualification or disclosure anyone would like to make this evening? Okay seeing none. Any changes to the agenda?

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, I move that we alter the agenda adding a closed session with counsel before we move onto the New Business part of the agenda.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so the motion... do I have a second?

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, a motion by Mr. McPherson, second by Commissioner Boswell. Any discussion? Okay, we can vote on the agenda change. Okay motion pass... Well, I did vote yes. So I don't know why my thing is not working. Okay so motion carries 7-0. Thank you and before we move into public presentations this evening I would just like to reintroduce Mr. Connor Merk, the Youth Engaged in Stafford student. He was with us last year from January through June and was a tremendous asset to the Planning Commission. So he's going to join us now through December or ... okay so from now through December. So, welcome back Mr. Merk. Would you like to say anything?

Mr. Merk: I'm happy to be back and with this great opportunity, so thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: You're very welcome. Thank you Mr. Merk

Mr. Apicella: Do we get his certificate back?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, or do we have to give you another one?

Mr. Merk: I think I'm good with one.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Vanuch: This time you want us to get a present or something. Alright, well we're very happy to have you back. So now, moving onto the Public Presentations portion of tonight's meeting, this is where any member of the public can come down to the podium and speak for three minutes. But just a reminder and when you come down to the podium to speak it can't be on tonight's public hearing which is on adding the Amendment to the Piedmont Groundwater Plan to the Comprehensive Plan. And also,

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

if you're here to talk about the Cluster Development work session, we've actually built in a public comment period there. So if you'd like to comment on those two items that is... there'll be time for you later in the meeting. So, would anyone like to come down and speak on anything other than that this evening? Okay, seeing no one rushing the podium, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting and move onto the first public hearing this evening. And for this we recognize Mr. Mike Zuraf.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan – Piedmont Groundwater Plan - A proposal to amend the Stafford County Virginia Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036, adopted on August 16, 2016, to incorporate the Groundwater Resources Evaluation for the Piedmont Aquifer (Piedmont Plan) as a component to the Groundwater Management Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Piedmont Plan evaluates the sustainability of the groundwater supply in the Piedmont Aquifer. Well record data was utilized to determine how well yields relate to different geologic characteristics and the age of wells. The Piedmont Plan includes information about establishing groundwater monitoring wells and examples from other Virginia jurisdictions that regulate groundwater withdrawals from new development. **(Time Limit: September 3, 2018)**

Mr. Zuraf: If I can have the computer please? Good evening Madam Chairman and members of the Commission, Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. This item is a Comprehensive Plan amendment to adopt a Groundwater Resources Evaluation for the Piedmont aquifer otherwise known as the Piedmont Plan, as an element of the Comprehensive Plan. So this would amend the comp plan to incorporate the Piedmont Plan as a component actually of the groundwater management plan element of the comp plan. The Piedmont Plan is focused on the Piedmont aquifer area. This map helps to define the area. The map identifies the two primary physiographic regions or geologic zones in the county. The Piedmont province and coastal plain province also referred to as aquifers. The zones are divided by the fall line which generally runs north/south in the vicinity of Interstate 95, that's the red line on the map. The Piedmont aquifer consists of hard resistant igneous rock; groundwater flow is affected by fractures in the rock formations and at various locations and depths. The coastal plain consists of sand and gravel with a more consistent groundwater table. As a result water wells are more reliable in the coastal plain than in the Piedmont aquifer. The study further subdivides the Piedmont aquifer into geologic units as the type and characteristics of rock across the region varies. This map helps to further define the affected areas of the plan, it overlays the Urban Services Area from the Comprehensive Plan, which is the pink hatching. These areas are planned to be served by public water in addition the study area excludes Quantico that's in the yellow shading at the top of the screen. The evaluation is focused on the remaining area and light brown where the majority of wells exist in future wells are planned. So for some history on this issue, in 2005 the first Groundwater Management Plan was adopted. The impetus for that plan was experienced of prolonged drought conditions during the years of 2001 and 2002, when a number of wells experienced low or no water yield conditions. The study evaluated wells across the county in both the Piedmont and Coastal Plain areas. The plan document concluded that there was an adequate groundwater capacity for the future planned growth in the county. Strategies were recommended for protection of the aquifer recharge area and wellhead protections were recommended as well. In 2017 there were concerns expressed by citizens in the Hartwood and Rock Hill Districts of no or low yield conditions in existing wells being impacted by new adjacent developments. Both the Hartwood and Rock Hill District Districts comprise the majority of the Piedmont aquifer located outside of the Urban Service Area. Since 2005 there have been substantial development of new homes with private wells in the Piedmont aquifer. The Board of Supervisors had concerns about the sustainability of the groundwater supply in the Piedmont region and authorized the development of new groundwater

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

resources evaluation for this area. The plan was prepared by geotechnical consultant, ECS Mid-Atlantic. So the Piedmont plan provides several key findings and I'll go through those. First the Piedmont aquifer has a capacity for 6,500 new household wells as an average across the area without causing significant negative impacts to the Piedmont areas hydrologic system. The comp plan projects 200 new dwellings per year outside of the Urban Service Area with most of these homes withdrawing groundwater from private wells. The 200 new dwellings include all the areas of the county outside of the Urban Service Area in both the Piedmont and Coastal Plain areas. The 200 dwellings per year amount to 3,600 total units during the 2036 planning horizon in within the comprehensive plan and as a result of groundwater aquifer capacity for the Piedmont aquifer would be adequate over the next 18 years of projected growth. Even though the aquifer has overall adequate ground water capacity low yielding well still have been observed, well records were catalogued and mapped in the study correlated low yields with the varying geologic rock strata for the Piedmont area. The study also found that newer wells have a slightly higher yield than older wells, those being drilled prior to year 2000. Finding that increased well development generally does not adversely impact recently installed well yields. And then the report does include a map that classifies well yield potential for each geologic unit as low moderate or high yield. This is the map of the well yield classifications, it is an informative map for existing landowners, developers and prospective residents, identifying where conditions may be less conducive to additional development. The plan notes that these yield classifications are averages across each geologic unit and does not guarantee the yield variations likely exist within each of these areas. The version of the map, this version has roadways superimposed on them in order for public to gain a better understanding of the location. This was one of the recommendations from the town-hall meeting held on the study. Initially the map was placed at the end of the document and upon request by the Commission at the last meeting the map has been moved to a more prominent location in the document. Staff replaced the original version of the map on page 108 where all the other map exhibits are located. So the plan does include recommendations and best management practices. The first, it recommends the establishment of groundwater monitoring wells. Using monitoring wells to measure long term groundwater levels is an effective way to differentiate short-term fluctuations from long-term trends. The report identifies potential sites where wells may be located and provides estimated costs for the installation and ongoing data collection. And specifically in the plan it notes that it would cost approximately \$41,000 for monitoring well equipment and installation. And then \$12,900 dollars is an annual monitoring and reporting cost if the county was to go ahead and implement one of these measures. These have been adopted by... sorry, and then the next recommendation as information is provided in the plan about hydrologic testing standards and groundwater regulations. These have been adopted by several counties in the Piedmont region as a land use tool. This level of evaluation exceeds the current requirements for the approval of new residential wells. Staff does support the amendments for the comp plan and I would note that the Commission has a time limit of September 3rd to make a recommendation. I'll take any questions at this time.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Any questions on the Commission? Alright, thank you very much. Okay, at this time I'd like to open up the public hearing. So if anyone is here to talk about the Piedmont Groundwater Plan, you have 3 minutes when the green light comes on. When the yellow light comes on you have 60 seconds. And when the red light starts blinking please conclude your comments.

Ms. Carlone: Ruth Carlone. I'm not dressed in my usual sartorial elegance because we just drove 100 miles from Tyson's Corner, from Kaiser. Very quickly, of course I left my notes home and I forgot a bunch of other garbage, but one of the important things to all of us I don't think anybody really, really, really took a look at Saratoga Woods or Kellogg Mill, at the lots, to be able to come up with those figures. No one really looked, I believe I don't want to say something isn't true but, looked at the soil composition. We have several lots and Saratoga Woods that should not have basements, their composition is such and in Saratoga Woods to come up with their 58 numbers they put 6 that have...

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

wait a minute, 5 on Saratoga that have double RPAs running through them. Believe it or not 16, 17, 18 and 19 and number 50 all have these 1.5 acres that have unusable property put into... I mean property in there that they can't use because it's either RPAs or wetlands. The same for Kellogg Mill Road, there's about 7 that have streams going through them. Now you know they can't use it to either develop, they can't build it on anything, they have to put up a sign on RPAs. These are some of the things we've been running into. But as far as the Piedmont, the groundwater plan, I have a question. Quite a few years ago when Supervisor Gibbons was here, we went over some of the... I'm gonna run out at time, oh shoot. On the abandoned wells that they could use those to monitor levels, I don't know if you've heard of that or not. And also private wells... to go to people with private wells to see if you could save money to use various wells on private properties. Oh, there's a lot more; I've got a hundred and sixty... three hundred sixty-five pages there I haven't read yet. But what kind of protection is there for all the people surrounding? Right now we're getting very low on our little 65-foot well. But anyway, what kind of legal protection? Also, Delegate Cole said that we could have developers for a subdivision to drill a well first even though our topography is so different all around. At least if a well or two were sunk on those properties... oh, time's up. We don't have any kind of protection is what I'm going to say and this isn't ready... when does it... Jeff, if you could just say when the Supervisors have to be through with theirs because there are some important issues here. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Ms. Carlone. Anyone else?

Ms. Muller: Good evening, my name is Linda Muller. I live in the Aquia District and I live in the Coastal Plain Province, the other side of the water management area. But I did... I do recall attending a public hearing given by Supervisor Snellings and it was all about the well issues and the problems that were happening in that part of the county. And I actually found and kind of breezed through the groundwater resource evaluation that was provided online. It's very comprehensive and the geological information shared goes way beyond my college class that I took on geology. But it is comprehensive, and I believe adopting well monitoring is something that's long overdue here in Stafford County, as it was pointed out in the study that there currently is no active well monitoring program, in this case in the Piedmont. And just to reconfirm, what is stated on page 47 of the study, you know, where it states long term groundwater monitoring using monitoring wells to measure long-term groundwater levels can be an effective way to differentiate between short-term weather induced ground weather... groundwater level fluctuations from long-term trends. It really, really makes sense to find ways to protect, preserve, and maintain a very healthy and safe water resource for residents. And I am also on a private well. And I get my well tested. I participate in the Virginia Tech well testing program. So it's very important that we do what we can to protect and preserve our groundwater resources. We might have a lot of water this year from the rain but that's not guaranteed for future times. So, thank you for your time.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you very much Ms. Muller.

Ms. Callander: Good evening, I'm Alane Callander. I'm on public water; however, I've been following the issues out in Hartwood particularly with the developments going in and well water not being adequate to provide service to some of the large new homes going into the county. I'd like to congratulate you for your efforts in... with this study and in trying to get to the answers that we need. The report does recommend the monitoring of wells and some other testing which must be a good thing. Better to be proactive in that way. Obviously I'm not an expert in this field; I just know that the county needs to do more to protect our water supply. So, thank you for your efforts.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Ms. Callander. Seeing no one else in the audience, I'm assuming nobody else wants to come down and talk so I'm gonna go ahead and close the public hearing this evening and bring

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

it back to the Planning Commission to ask any questions of staff. Does anybody have any questions they would like to ask? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: I have one for Mike. Can you bring up the slide about the cost for the monitoring well?

Mr. Zuraf: It wasn't in the slide, but it was...

Ms. Vanuch: Forty-one thousand.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, 41,000 for installation and...

Ms. Vanuch: Twelve thousand a year.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, 12,000 for...

Mr. Bain: I don't get that number when I look at the report for the installation.

Mr. Zuraf: It was... it amounted to that total, in total. It was the well installation and then the equipment. It added up to 41.

Mr. Bain: No, I don't get that total. When I look at that table, the total is 22,150, clearly stated in the table. The 41 is if you add the 19,050 -- I'm on page C-1.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, and it's the... so there's the task 1. The task 1 is actually drilling the well.

Mr. Bain: Right, \$19,050.

Mr. Zuraf: Nineteen thousand, and then the equipment is 22,000.

Mr. Bain: No sir. The equipment is 3,100.

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, for a total of 22,000. Okay.

Mr. Bain: Of the total of 22. So, one well would be 22,150 to install and then 12,900 a year for maintenance. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Zuraf: Thanks.

Mr. Bain: Sorry. And it's only one well, and so I think they were recommending more than one well in or suggesting that there should be more than one well.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Bain: So it's a significant budget item. Thank you. Sorry.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

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

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. English: Yeah, I got a question for the... not you Jeff... I mean not you Mike, but the lady back here, the last one who spoke. Ma'am?

Ms. Vanuch: Are you talking about Ms. Callander?

Mr. English: Not Ms. Callander, the other lady.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, Ms. Muller?

Mr. English: Ms. Muller.

Ms. Vanuch: Ms. Muller? Do you want to...

Mr. English: I've got a question...

Ms. Vanuch: He has a question for you. It's a little bit out of ordinary but we're not that busy tonight.

Mr. English: The question with the Virginia Tech -- you say you've got in that program. What do they do? They just monitor? What do they do?

Ms. Muller: They do... they provide...

Ms. Vanuch: Hang on before you... just get to the microphone. That way the people who are watching us on TV; we have a lot of followers.

Ms. Muller: Hello. It's really nice and cool in here; everybody's missing a great location on this hot afternoon or evening. It's actually offered through the Virginia Extension Cooperative, so our local office here in Stafford. They provide private well testing for persons with private wells. You pay a fee of \$55 which is an extraordinary deal considering how much it may cost through a commercial tester. They'll take samples of your water; actually, you provide the samples, they'll give you the bottles. You drop them off... you drop the sample waters... the samples off and then they will go through the testing. And they'll come back in September in this case with results. So you'll get to see, you know, what's going on with your water including any E-coli.

Mr. English: What you're drinking, okay, so it doesn't kind of monitor... they don't monitor their levels and let them know.

Ms. Muller: No. This is just strictly...

Mr. English: Just strictly what's in your water.

Ms. Muller: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Muller: Yes, yes. And it's an excellent program and a reasonable price. So I just advertised for them free.

Mr. English: Well, that's good. I didn't know that, but that was good information. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Any other questions on the Commission?

Mr. English: I didn't mean to get out of order.

Ms. Vanuch: No, you're fine. Okay, so I just had... I jotted down a few notes as people were talking. So, Mr. Zuraf, if you'll just oblige me. I'm just gonna ask a few questions that I think Ms. Carlone had brought up. How do we test the soil composition when a house is building a basement? I mean, do they have to bring anything to the county to say the ground has to be X, Y, or Z compaction level to be able to build a basement? Or maybe that's a Jeff Harvey question.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, the county reviews foundation permit applications pursuant to the Virginia Building Code. The Virginia Building Code requires certain certifications and we also require a shrink swell test. So, if it's a clay soil or a hydric soil that will be part of the report. That has an influence on how the foundation for the home is built, including drainage and/or the extent in which there has to be concrete within the foundation and the footers.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, thank you. Hopefully that might answer your question, I'm not sure. I think the gentleman who presented this when we had the big community meeting regarding they did talk a little bit about monitoring abandoned wells and whether or not they could be used and if we could use private wells. Do you guys know the answer to that? Because I'm going on my memory and I want to say that they brought up in opposition that we could not do that, but I don't remember the reason why. I think it was maybe like they couldn't monitor something that was in daily use or something, I'm not sure.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, you are correct. The recommendation was that we monitor a well that's inactive, so... and also that we monitor wells that are on public land so we don't have an issue with negotiating access onto someone's private property. Plus usually a private property owner is using the well, it's not sitting there just for monitoring purposes. If a well has been capped, there's some questions to whether it can be reused again for that purpose, because usually the Health Department doesn't allow you to just abandon a well in place; you have to go through additional steps to formally fill it in and close it out so it's not a safety hazard for either one, physical safety or two, allowing undesirable groundwater to actually seep back into the system. So they try to close off the actual well itself.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Maybe that would be helpful if we could just have a solid answer on whether or not we could use abandoned wells even if they haven't been capped off for some reason; that might be helpful for the Board as they review this. And then, I guess I know this is not... we can't give legal advice regarding protection of a development that comes in and maybe makes your well go dry, but I can tell you from the planning perspective we look at this very seriously. And I think to me all the areas in red on the map are areas where we want to try to limit the amount of development there. And so I do think this kind of ties in with what we'll talk about probably a little later on regarding the cluster development. So, I just want to let you know that I feel your pain on that. And then the last one, the last question was regarding adopting well monitoring is long overdue when the report states that. Has the Board made any inclinations as to whether or not they're going to move forward with doing any of these test sites?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, this overall plan has not been presented to the Board yet, so that would be one of the things that would probably come as a follow-up discussion beyond the public hearing for the Comp Plan amendment is it does have a number of recommended actions, some of which is monitoring, which based on the cost and staffing issues will have a budgetary impact. So I'll probably have to be part of a budget process, more than likely I'm guessing with the Public Works Department to move forward with a program if that's something the Board desires.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so, helpful for the public to hear that I think and know the next steps going forward.
Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I'm just wondering whether the utilities fund could help support that. I mean, they do pump and haul through the utilities fund, right? Those folks aren't necessarily paying into a system so they're getting some help. Just throwing it out there as maybe one option.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that's what we can look into if that moves forward.

Ms. Vanuch: Good idea. Yeah, absolutely. One more question?

Mr. Bain: Not a question, but a comment. In the appendices of the report there were excerpts from ordinances of adjacent or nearby counties in Virginia, and I found it very interesting that several counties require hydro geologic testing of groundwater prior to being given a building permit. And I'm wondering if that's something that Stafford should implement, especially for multi-family developments. I can understand not needing it for a single-family residence on a 5-acre ground you know for a single-family well, but perhaps that something should be looked into.

Mr. Zuraf: Well we're not gonna likely see wells, private wells for a multi-family type of development because those are only recommended inside the Urban Service Area and they'd be served by public water. So, the recommendations to do the hydrologic testing... geologic testing is typically for single-family detached neighborhoods that would have private wells.

Ms. Vanuch: Could we make that a point I guess for cluster developments? Could we possibly look at adding that in on the policy committee, you know, that that kind of testing needs to be done before cluster developments can be...?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, similar types of ordinances could be part of...

Ms. Vanuch: And then any other ordinance so it's all equal.

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

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, great. Any other questions? Okay, seeing none, bring it back to the Commission. Does anyone want to make a motion? Anybody?

Mr. English: I'll make a motion to approve this groundwater, Piedmont Groundwater Plan.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so there's a motion to approve the ground... Piedmont Groundwater Plan into the Comp Plan, right?

Mr. English: Yes ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, is there a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Motion by Commissioner English, second by Commissioner Bain; any discussion Commissioner English?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. English: No, I just believe that this is just a good start where we need to go and I think it was a good report. It was a lot and very lengthy and we have a lot of questions that need to be answered too. But I think doing a time limit thing like that so I agree we go ahead and pass it.

Ms. Vanuch: Great. Commissioner Bain?

Mr. Bain: No, no further comment.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anyone else? Mr. Apicella? No? I thought I saw you were going for your mic. Okay, the only comment I have to make is ladies, don't stop here. Make sure you go to the Board of Supervisors as well and share your comments to get those next steps worked on. So, go ahead and take a vote to approve this. Okay, it passes 7-0. Okay.

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, I would like to make a motion and move that we move the Planning Commission into a closed meeting. Whereas, the Commission desires to hold a closed meeting for consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding cluster subdivision provisions which is a specific legal matter requiring the provision of legal advice by counsel and whereas pursuant to Virginia Code 2.2-3711(A)(8) such discussion may occur in closed meeting.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Commissioner McPherson. And do we have a second?

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so motion Mr. McPherson, second by Mr. Randall; any discussion?

Mr. McPherson: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, let's vote. Okay, motion carries 7-0. We'll be back shortly.

Closed Meeting from 7:01 p.m. to 7:22 p.m.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we're back. Anyone want to certify closed session?

Mr. Bain: I make a motion to certify closed session.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, motion by Commissioner Bain. Do I have a second?

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, second by Mr. Randall; any discussion? Alright, let's vote to certify closed session. Okay, motion passes 7-0. Now, moving on to New Business. The new business that we have this evening is the cluster development work session and this is going to be a presentation led by Mr. Zuraf.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Cluster Development Work Session
 - A. Status Update of Cluster Regulations and Request from the Board of Supervisors
 - B. Cluster Subdivision Area Mapping

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

- State Code Criteria
 - Definition of Unimproved Property
 - Potential Exclusion of Parcels less than 2 acres
 - Minimum 40% Criteria
 - Review of Cluster Approved Area Map
 - USA Boundary
 - Review of Previous Option Maps
 - Development Factor Overlays
 - Location of Low Water Well Yield Areas
 - Location of existing public sewer and water utilities
 - Location of Military Impact Area
 - Fire Station Response Areas
 - Fire Station Response Times
- C. Review of Previous Cluster Concerns to determine validity
- Subdivisions are configured such that lots front on existing roads giving the perception of over-crowding in rural areas
 - Open space configured such that it is not visible by the public creating a perception overcrowding and loss of rural character
 - Use of community drainfields increases lot yield for properties with substantial environmental constraints that would normally not support that level of development
 - Community drainfields being located outside of the subdivision they serve
 - Use of community drainfields and long-term maintenance concerns with those systems
 - Open space areas not suitable for farming or forestry due to configuration
 - Open Space is not contiguous with other open space areas within the subdivision or adjacent open space areas outside of the subdivision
 - Open space is configured such that there are no usable areas or usable areas that can be accessed without crossing a stream
 - Lack of recreational amenities being placed in open space areas for the community.
 - Open space can be sold off to lot owners or other parties
 - Lack of specific standards for the various forms of open space – observed small remnant open space parcels that are not useable or functional
- D. Next Steps
- Future Meetings (Sub-committee, Special Planning Commission Meetings, and/or Community Meetings)
 - Summary of future tasks
- E. Public Comments

Mr. Zuraf: If I could have the computer please again, thank you. Good evening again, Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. So, I'm going to work through a few slides as we work on this issue of discussing cluster development. You received a memo with a bunch of attachment so here's kind of an outline of how I saw we might work through this is first going through just this background. I'll go through and summarize all the information that was provided to you and then that includes going through timeline what the Board has requested; the current guidelines and ordinances that we have now; and I'm just gonna kind of quickly go through these. I'm not gonna bore everybody with all the gory details but some of the talk a little bit about the state code criteria, look at the cluster subdivision area

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

maps, some new development factor maps that you received. You received larger paper copies of those maps and then some of the previous cluster concerns that have been discussed in previous meetings. And then turn it back over for Planning Commission discussion where you may want to talk about some of the goals, expected outcome, some of the topic areas you may want to discuss, and next steps and then as was kind of mentioned we would allow for additional public comment after all of this discussion. So, first going through the timeline of how we how we got here, and you probably saw this slide before; this kind of effort up to this point has kind of been addressed in different phases, three different phases. The first phase back on March 20th the zoning ordinance was amended to adopt a cluster subdivision area map. That was Ordinance O18-13 and that essentially limited the area where a landowner could develop under the cluster subdivision standards that are in place in the zoning ordinance. And we'll get into that in more detail later. So, the area of where somebody could cluster was limited at that point. Then at the same meeting a second phase of the effort of looking at cluster development was initiated by the Board. They did refer to the Planning Commission some limited amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance. And those amendments were considered over a few months and on July 10th the Board adopted amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and that was essentially adopting that same cluster subdivision area map as part of the Comp Plan. And so that was one action because the Planning Commission did separate out those actions to first recommend adopting that map and then, in addition, at that same time, there was an additional resolution for text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to adjust and relocate specific cluster subdivision recommendations and design criteria, move them from Chapter 2 where you have goals and objectives, and we basically created a new section of the land use chapter section 3.9 where all the recommended guidelines are now located. And then there's a written discussion on an explanation of the cluster subdivision area map as well. And then, there was the amendment then to the zoning ordinance at the same time looked at some minor amendments to cluster subdivision regulations. This included basically creating a new table 3.1 B in the zoning ordinance where all the open space lot area and setback requirements, as it pertained to cluster, was located and kind of separated them out from all the conventional setback requirements. And then it did establish some new design standards that essentially restricted what areas would count towards the minimum open space requirement. And that included certain easement areas and then above and below-ground stormwater management areas were essentially excluded from counting towards; they required open space and some exceptions to that were written in as well to address some logical situations that would still allow some of these areas to account towards open space. So then, the third phase of this effort, on April 17th the Board adopted a resolution to refer to the Planning Commission an effort to conduct a comprehensive review of cluster development regulations. This included reviewing both the Comprehensive Plan and the county code, the zoning and subdivision ordinances, and then work to develop some modifications to the regulations that you might suggest. And then, as part of it, consider adjusting to the cluster subdivision area map. And the resolution suggests providing recommendations to the Board by March 31st of next year. The resolution does not ask the Planning Commission to conduct a public hearing by this deadline. So the idea is you send on your suggested changes and the Board will consider those and then decide whether to initiate the hearing process after they review those suggestions. So, in the information we provided to you, just for background information, we included an attachment to the latest Comprehensive Plan sections that pertain to clusters that I just summarized, including the map and new text language. And then also we included a single document that includes all the latest subdivision ordinance and zoning ordinance regulations that pertain to cluster subdivisions that incorporate all the latest changes that have been adopted, so it's all in in one place for you to refer to as you go through this process. So Attachment 3 in your information received does include the state code provision pertaining to cluster subdivisions. The state code establishes minimum standards that require localities to permit cluster development. So I want to highlight some of the key points of that state code provision. The code establishes that a set amount of area in the county needs to have the potential of the ability to develop as a cluster subdivision. So I highlighted kind of one of the key kind of sections that talk about how you establish the area. Reading the area underlined in red, it's basically a requirement

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

that cluster regulations apply to a minimum of 40% of the unimproved land contained in Residential and Agricultural zoning district classifications. So from this, we need to be clear as to what unimproved land means. And so there's not necessarily a complete definition of what unimproved land means as it stated in this section of the state code. The state code does say that unimproved land shall not include land owned or controlled by the locality, Commonwealth, or federal government or any instrumentality thereof -- that's basically public land -- or land subject to conservation easement. So, we know those areas are not... it would not be included. So then, from that we used our best judgment to define what counts as... what else would count as unimproved land, and this we've determined to include land that does not have a dwelling or improved structure. So that's something that is defined through the Commissioner of Revenue system because they define when land has improvements, so we can kind of go to that resource to determine what property has improvements and what is unimproved. So then, also Residential and Agricultural zoning districts, that would include land that's zoned A-1, Agricultural, A-2, Rural Residential, and R-1, Suburban Residential. These are the three zoning districts that allow for cluster development in the county. So we would limit those three zoning districts to what we consider the Agricultural and Residential districts. So these parameters were utilized in helping us determine what counted as unimproved land as we worked through this process, when determining the cluster area that was mapped. On the last point, an area, as we move forward, an area that includes at least 40% will need to be maintained. So, if conditions change in the future and land becomes improved, and the area falls below 40% as it is as the you know it meets as we define unimproved, the map will need to be adjusted to be compliant with the state code. So, you know, due to this and to avoid conflict with the state code the Planning Commission may want to consider increasing the percentage of area that we have in the area we designate on the cluster subdivision area maps. Also, the state code does allow a locality to exempt parcels 2 acres or less from being able to develop as a cluster. Stafford does not utilize this exemption. It does allow cluster development on properties of any size that is zoned A-1, A-2, and R-1. So, we note that you know if the county did choose to adopt this exemption which would be to not permit clusters on 2 acres or smaller, there would be less land eligible to cluster and a larger area would need to be designated on the map. So, this is the cluster area... cluster subdivision area I guess currently exists and has been adopted as part of the zoning ordinance and in the Comprehensive Plan as well. This was the map approved on March 20 in 2018. Again, the cluster area as we've kind of discussed before includes the all the shaded areas, both the yellow and orange shaded areas combined. The yellow area is the area within the cluster area that's within also the Urban Service Area, and then the orange area is the cluster area outside of the Urban Service Area. So the rationale kind of for the designation of this map, it you know one of the rationales to include all the land within the Urban Service Area. So, that was accomplished, but also to include areas adjacent to or near the Urban Service Area. So, essentially not to just leap frog, but designate areas way out on the edges of the county. And then with the areas just adjacent to the Urban Service Area, if there was ever a need to extend water and sewer the cost may not be as excessive to the county. And then also to avoid to the greatest extent possible military impact areas. This... in this designation the western part of the county has some military impact zones with as it relates to noise and overflight areas. So those areas... a lot of those areas were avoided to a lesser degree. Some of the cluster area does encroach up in the Widewater area into some of those military impact areas. So, initially when this map was adopted, we had determined the percent of unimproved land at 47.6%. We later realized that there was some double counting of properties, and so in some other you know just a few errors into that regard and so we worked to kind of readjust the figures to get an accurate reading of the amount of unimproved area and found that actually the amount of unimproved area is 41½%. So that's the area within... the amount of unimproved land within the cluster subdivision area is 41½% of all unimproved land across the county. So, the next two maps, just for reference, were two of the other maps that were considered at the time when the last map was adopted. This was Option One map. This... as far as a rationale for the designation, it's a similar rationale to the map option, Option Three that we just looked at, where we're designating land in the USA and then land adjacent to... in close proximity to the Urban Service Area. But more of the area

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

outside of the Urban Service Area, it was included more to the southeast and southwest. So less of the land it actually avoids expanding into the areas on the Widewater peninsula.

Mr. Boswell: What was the rationale for doing that? What was the discussion on that? Stretching it out that far in the Widewater area.

Mr. Zuraf: There were just some options provided. It was you know different alternatives for the Board to consider. It wasn't necessarily recommendations on one map over the other, just providing the three different options. And so here, at the time also when this was on March 20th... at the time of the decision of the March 20th mapping, the unimproved land covered 42.9%. We did not re-evaluate the areas on this map as this map was not selected. And then the other map Option Two again expanding outside of the Urban Service Area on land adjacent to the USA, but it includes more of an expansion to the east of the Urban Service Area than the last map.

Mr. Randall: Mike, I have a quick question, if I may Madam Chair.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure, go ahead.

Mr. Randall: Sorry. What was the rationale for the different areas in the different maps? Rather than having a, you know, a 38% the same amount on... the same location on every map and then just adding to different areas. It looks like there's a large... there's probably a lot that's the same but, was there any rationale as to what went into map 2 or what went into map 1 versus map 3 that was eventually approved?

Mr. Zuraf: The main thing was, of all the maps, was to kind of... the greatest amount as far as the impacts to the military over military impact zones was to the areas in the western part of the county where you have a lot more of the noise impact zones. And then you have a military overflight area so the idea was just to kind of really avoid that and all the options which we essentially did. But then, in the remaining area, provide different options and it's kind of you go basically from a map that this being the first map, the majority of your expansion is to the southern part of the county, the second map it kind of starts to spread a little bit to the north, and then the third map it was you know most of the expansion (inaudible).

Mr. Randall: So, really the reason for the different maps was just to give more of an option of whether we want to stay to the north, the south, or kind of...

Mr. Zuraf: The middle.

Mr. Randall: ... the middle and do a little of each.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, do you have an analysis of certain areas being a certain amount, you know, this area from here to here? For example, the farthest south area, if you go to map 2 I believe in the farthest south area, do we have an idea what the landmass is? I'm sorry, yes, that one right there.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. Randall: That farthest southwest area, do you have an idea of how big that area is as far as if we wanted to add that for example to map 1... I'm sorry, map 3, which we have approved, what would that do to our percentage type answers? And maybe we wouldn't be able to do that tonight.

Mr. Zuraf: Not tonight, yeah. We'd have to go back in and evaluate that.

Mr. Randall: Okay, okay.

Mr. Harvey: And Madam Chairman and Commissioner Randall, you've probably heard the old adage sometimes you squeeze the balloon to see where it's going to go out somewhere else and that's kind of a little bit of what this exercise ends up doing is if you're going to shrink it in one area it's going to expand probably in another area. But we still have to keep into consideration that 40%. So, some areas have maybe more developed land so the map looks bigger if you exclude that area or smaller depending upon what the existing ground conditions are. So, the map in one regard is just an area where they can do the cluster; it doesn't really give you a good distribution of which are the vacant parcels to qualify.

Mr. Randall: Right. No, if you go to map three... if I could get you to go to map three... and we see it's a 41.5% I was just looking at if all I do to map three is add that southwest section that's already been identified in maps one and two, if all I did was add that to map three, that's already been approved, we're just going to add that little section, what the percentage would have... what would the percentage would do, where would it go, and that would alleviate somewhat having to redraw an entire new map and redo an entire new analysis because the analysis has already been done for map one and two, we already have three that's approved, and if we just added that section to three, what would it do for us. That's all I was getting at.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Boswell: Madam Chair, it just looks like to me that a lot of the Urban Service Area and the south end was left out and the, I guess you'd say the west end was left out, and it was all dumped in the swamp area of or down near the parking Widewater. It got really wide down there and I don't understand why they wouldn't want to hug this Urban Service Area over in the south end and maybe a little out to the west and you know bump it back a little bit and not dump it so wide down in the Widewater area. It just doesn't... I'm trying to figure out the rationale on that but maybe we can get into that in the future.

Mr. McPherson: And I'm looking at the map on option two, that part that a Commissioner Randall was referring to, that disappeared from option two and appeared in option three is directly over the red section of the groundwater issues.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. McPherson: So that's probably something we need to be looking at per the...

Mr. Boswell: Yeah, we definitely don't want to put anything in the red.

Mr. McPherson: Right, well that that whole chunk was right there in the red.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, and one of the issues with, you know, why it's so much of a larger area is when we're mapping out these locations we generally try to follow known markers of railroads, roads and you know in that area you don't have a whole lot of roads to kind of they could follow. So, from that one point you

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

know you basically jump almost to the river to capture... to hit the next road and so that's kind of why that much larger jump happened.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'm looking at the agenda for the Board meeting back in March and one of the pieces of information that the staff provided to the Board was sort of an analysis of by zoning district how much land, cluster proposed land was inside the USA and outside the USA. And depending on which option you go from 50... like a 50/50 split to a 60/40 split. And I think our current analysis is that the growth is slower outside the USA than it is inside the USA. So, one of the things I think we have to take into consideration is I think there's been a lot of approved growth or at least the potential for a lot of growth inside the USA that could impact that bottom line number, the 40%. So, going back to the discussion point about what is an unimproved land. So you've got a subdivision that's been approved and is only partially built. Is the part that's not partially built considered unimproved land?

Mr. Zuraf: If it hasn't been built yet...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, like did you take out all the approved subdivisions?

Mr. Zuraf: We did not. If it was still undeveloped and that hasn't been developed yet...

Mr. Apicella: The portion of that subdivision that's not yet developed.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: So again, I think that is something we have to factor into that bottom line number and where we want to get to if we want to provide some kind of flexibility. Again, I think the USA portion is going to be eaten up quicker than the rural parts of the County.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair? I have another question.

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead.

Mr. Randall: So Mike, do you have an idea of how many approved developments we have currently? And what...

Ms. Vanuch: Eight thousand houses.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, but how many develop...

Mr. Zuraf: Actual number of developments.

Mr. Randall: Actual developments.

Mr. Zuraf: I'm thinking somewhere in the range of a little over a hundred from my recollections, right?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Randall, on our department's web page we have a map that shows all the active residential developments. And it tracks how many units have been approved, how many have been recorded, how many are yet to be recorded, and how many have been built on. So we can get you more discrete numbers as we start through this exercise.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

Mr. Randall: Okay, I was just trying to go to the points that have been made. I was just trying to look at, and again I didn't even look at the groundwater; to your point is I just was picking a spot so. We obviously would take that into consideration. I'm just looking at you know do we add something to the map that has so many developments on it that once it gets developed in three or four years it completely blows our numbers out of the water, and at least have that information to be able to take into consideration when we're looking at particular areas that we may want to add to the current matter.

Ms. Vanuch: Hopefully by then the state legislature gets it together. We can dream, right.

Mr. Zuraf: And one way to maybe look at it is maybe looking at what the known kind of near-term developments are. You have a lot of some... some developments have just are out there and nothing's happening. So maybe if you do focus on okay what's actively happening and is likely going to affect the map in the next five years, kind of thinking about you know okay we could re-evaluate this 40% number during a five-year Comp Plan update.

Mr. Randall: No, that would be... I think that would be a great help.

Mr. Zuraf: So, you know, those older developments that some might be approved but not developing they may change and become something else or lose their vesting and you know so.

Mr. Apicella: And just as another data point, where are we in terms of building permits per year?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm thinking somewhere in the range of and don't quote me, 900 to 1,000 might be this year is where we're tracking.

Mr. Apicella: And you're seeing an upward trend though because of the change in the economy?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And what was the kind of the high-water mark, do you remember?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, back in the 2000s I believe it was somewhere around 2,000; correct me if I'm wrong Jeff, but yeah 2,000 per year.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Bain: Mike, excuse me. Can you tell us how many acres of undeveloped land are inside the Urban Service Area and outside of the Urban Service Area that you evaluated?

Mr. Zuraf: Roughly, for the option three map, the for the you know the reevaluated the 41½%, it's roughly thirteen... let's see, one moment, let me write this...

Ms. Vanuch: You should have brought your calculator.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just going to go back to this chart which I think would be helpful, on all three options it says inside the USA. It doesn't change for... it changes for outside the USA, but inside is the same number under all three options. It's 8,617 acres. So that's a constant, right, that's not going to change.

Mr. Bain: Until the next development comes.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions on this one? We can keep going.

Mr. Zuraf: The issue on that chart, those were... the issue was that that included some duplication, a lot of duplications of parcels, so it's... it is smaller.

Mr. Apicella: (Inaudible - microphone not on) but I guess the bottom line point is it's not... the USA is the USA.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, yeah.

Mr. Apicella: So, whatever number it is, that's what it will be (inaudible - microphone not on) similar option. We can't retarget inside the USA. Now whatever we want to do in terms of adding to or shrinking the map, it's all (inaudible - microphone not on).

Ms. Vanuch: I think we're ready to move forward. Forward or backward, we're not sure but.

Mr. Zuraf: So, you know just to quickly summarize, we provided you a series of development factor maps and you received paper copies of these maps; designate the locations of necessary infrastructure; well yield conditions; public utilities; and also fire response areas. And then also we've included a quality of life factors as it relates to kind of military noise impact zones. So I'll just kind of quickly go through these maps and we'll have them here if you want to refer to them for discussion purposes.

Ms. Vanuch: I get to be lucky enough to be in the red, in the water, and then military impact area zone. I'm a double beneficiary.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so, yeah, if you've seen this we discussed this map during the Piedmont plan. This came out of that so you can see where low moderate or high well yields are in that Piedmont area so that can help inform us in our decisions on new cluster areas.

Ms. Vanuch: Hang on one second, I think Mr. Randall had a question.

Mr. Randall: Can you go back to that? So, this is pretty much the Piedmont water map, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Do we have a map for the coastal area that talks to the same level of fidelity with the green and the yellow and the red, or does it not have an issue as the Piedmont area currently does?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the issue with generally the coastal plain, the well water groundwater conditions are good. But...

Mr. Randall: And the yield is satisfactory then? The yield would be maybe in the green in this area?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to... I can't confirm that but...

Mr. Randall: Would it be possible to get that map moved over so that we can see a full yield for the entire areas?

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. Zuraf: I'll look to see what we have.

Mr. Randall: Yes please don't yeah partition a new study just for this. Give us what you have if that'll work.

Mr. Apicella: Can I ask a question about this map? So I understand the groundwater issue for folks who have private wells, but what I see in part in this map is that at least some of the red is inside the USA, right? So it's not, I mean, what real impact would that have? Presumably those folks are on well... I'm sorry, on public water so is it really an issue there? Is water an issue there in that area that's inside the USA?

Mr. Zuraf: Right. So yeah, that's...

Mr. Apicella: Well, I mean we could certainly... we could get another piece of information, a data point that says on that area that's in red that's in the USA what is not on public water.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. So, that I'm kind of highlighting in blue the areas inside the Urban Service Area, kind of in that zone.

Ms. Vanuch: That brings up an interesting question. So let's say, and I don't know if we're allowed to do this and maybe this will be for the policy committee working on the cluster ordinance, so let's say that they want to build a cluster subdivision inside the red area inside the USA, but they don't want to hook up to water and sewer. Can we make that a requirement or is that already a requirement that they have to hook up if they're inside the Urban Service Area?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, the County Code requires for new subdivisions or major site plans that are inside the Urban Service Area, there is a mandatory connection requirement. Now if you had an existing lot that had been vacant and you're building one house on it, you don't have to connect unless you're within 300 feet of the line and meet a certain cost threshold.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: But for new developments like new subdivisions, there's a mandatory connection requirement.

Ms. Vanuch: And it doesn't matter the size as long as it's just not one house. Go ahead Mr. English.

Mr. English: I kind of know for a fact that there's a subdivision on Brooke Road just past that high school. The hydrant stops just right there where that new subdivision is and it's all wells in there.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir, that's outside the Urban Services Area.

Mr. English: It is outside.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. English: Just barely though, right?

Mr. Harvey: Well, actually, the Urban Services Area stops a little bit past Dent Road.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. English: Wow, then they just did...

Mr. Harvey: The County extended sewer and water to both of the schools back in the 90's, but that's never been in Urban Services Area.

Mr. English: But even if... but Jeff, even if the water... I think the water stopped right just below the hill before, you know, you know on Brooke Road where the road starts to bottleneck into two lanes?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. English: And then right there I think there's a fire hydrant right there. So, that subdivision's right just on this side of that fire hydrant. They're not required to hook up to the water?

Mr. Harvey: If they don't meet the... well, our Comp Plan says you're not allowed to extend public utilities outside the Urban Services Area.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, we don't want to do that because then they just build on and then on and then on.

Mr. English: Okay, alright.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, any other question... okay, go ahead, I'm sorry.

Mr. Zuraf: Well just back to Mr. Randall's question/comments about the well yields in the coastal plain. Generally wells... groundwater is better in that situation but, on the flip side drainfields are more of a concern with the... in the coastal plain where the soils are not conducive to that.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So, this map is the... identifies the location of all the public sewer lines in the county. Those are all the little purple lines that you can kind of generally see that where public sewer is pretty much located within the Urban Service Area in the southern part of the county and northern part of the county and does not really extend too much outside of the that line with few exceptions. And then, the same for public water lines; again, concentrated in the northern and southern growth areas in the county. With water lines you do have some areas where those water lines extend out, especially out to the west along Stefaniga Road and in that area and Poplar Road. Some of those neighborhoods all have public water and then some of the areas down in White Oak; water lines run down there. This is the military impact areas highlighting noise contours around ammunition ranges on Marine Corps Base Quantico. And then, also related, military aircraft overflight areas which are more of the red shaded areas in the western part of the county in Hartwood. So you can see the relation of the cluster area to that military impact area zone. And then this map identifies fire station response areas. They represent the first due limits for each fire station in the county. And then all these maps you see overlaid is the Urban Service Area and current cluster subdivision area. And then from that, with this map GIS analyzed drive times to dwellings from each fire station to help determine what areas can offer the best response time. So, you have three different color codings within five minutes, within 10 minutes, or within a 15-minute drive time.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I just want to give a shout out to our GIS folks for all these great maps. I know this takes a lot of work to pull this together and it's very helpful.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

Mr. Zuraf: They do a great job. So those are the maps that you received.

Mr. McPherson: Mike, I have a quick question; sorry to interrupt. Could you go back to the Quantico zone map please? Are there any laws or ordinances in the state regarding the effect of a military, you know, the noise zones and the effect that that would have on unimproved land? Does that in any way decrease the acreage of land that can be built on? Because you can see that some of those very loud noise zones go outside of the Quantico boundaries.

Mr. Zuraf: The county does have an overlay for a military impact overlay zone within the zoning ordinance but the actual limits are not defined. So, there's not actual boundaries identified and that would allow for more I believe, and correct if I'm wrong Jeff, but more notification of you know somebody coming in to purchase property or they could kind of... notification would be required of what they're buying into.

Mr. McPherson: But it doesn't affect the acreage count in any way.

Mr. Zuraf: No, no.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So also, the agenda kind of highlights some of those previous cluster concerns. We provided that list and you've probably saw the list before. Those issues that were expressed previously have to do with site design, concerns with lots fronting on the rural roads, and in effect open space that's being provided not being visible so you kind of, you know, it creates perception of the loss of rural character. Also, several concerns relating to community drainfields and several concerns with the form that open space is taking with the plans. The open space areas not being suitable for farming and forestry, they're not contiguous with other open space on a site so it ends up all being fragmented, and then the lack of recreation amenities being provided, and then the ability where that open space pieces can be sold off to individuals in many different pieces and so you kind of lose the idea of a larger single open space parcel. At this point, that's kind of a quick summary of all the information received and maybe turn it back now for more discussion on with the Planning Commission.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Does anybody have any comments they'd like to make? I think we had a lot of good discussion, a little bit of follow-up from our discussion on the maps, and some of the questions that we had. I do think this was a good start to what is probably going to be several meetings on identifying the map and then also any policy changes to the cluster ordinance that the Board has sent down. Does anybody have any opposition if we create maybe a map subcommittee? You know, a couple people to do some community meetings, look at the maps, and then we could reinstitute the policy cluster subcommittee that was already created the last go-round. Does anybody have objection to that? Okay. So, as a follow-up, what we'll do is I think, Commissioner Apicella would you like to be on the maps committee with me? We can set up some public input meetings kind of like we did with the Comp Plan. I know we did those, one in the north, one in the south, and we can look at some map changes and kind of flush through some of the questions that we heard today and bring back some options for the Commission. And then I think it was Mr. McPherson, Mr. Bain, and Mr. Randall, you guys were on the policy subcommittee. And then obviously if you guys want to join in on any of those meetings you're more than welcome to attend all of them if you want to. Anything else in the short-term? Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I would just ask for the folks working on the policy to potentially again look at the cluster provisions implemented by other localities to see how they've tackled it. I mean, it's not every single

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

locality that's got this requirement and maybe they've got some gold nuggets that we might want to consider for Stafford County. I think there's also that magazine that we get, the APA; I think they have a model residential cluster development ordinance that might be informative as well. And I think another thing in terms of process is looking at what we actually get in terms of a cluster proposal and how that's reviewed and approved. Right now I think it's just a concept plan. I'm not sure, you know, it could be as small as a two-page cluster concept plan; is that enough to really decide whether or not the cluster package should move forward? I don't know. Again, that's something I think we ought to maybe revisit. Just some thoughts Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, and I just want to share with the Commission a couple of notes that I did take. So, I know Steven and I are going to follow-up to figure out if the subdivisions are approved but not yet built, you know, where are they and if they are built how does that impact the percentages. And then I know Commissioner Boswell has expressed some dis-gratitude of having so much cluster up in the northern part of Widewater, so really taking a quick close look at that area and trying to see where maybe there's an area for a little bit of give and take on that. I don't think... I think then the maps will probably move a little faster just because the policy is, you know, it's pretty extensive. But we'll have it and then we'll bring it back and I do believe these are separate orders, so we can vote on one prior to the other; so if one got finished prior to the other we could always vote it to send it to the Board for review or we would maybe decide to hold onto it. And so, yeah, yeah. Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair? To the point we're making, we don't... there wasn't anything given to us that said the policy was wrong; we're just looking at it again based on a new...

Ms. Vanuch: For additional changes. So some of the things that Mr. Zuraf had mentioned, some of the other changes... what was the one I had mentioned?

Mr. Zuraf: Hydrologic testing?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, hydrologic testing for cluster subdivisions. I'm glad you remembered because I forgot already. I didn't write it down. So things like that.

Mr. Apicella: If you look at the agenda, you'll see a list of cluster concerns. And so the question would be, were those fully addressed and/or is there another way of tackling them if they were addressed? So, I think that also there was some information provided to the CDEC that may not have made its way into this document that might be helpful. I think they had some potential solutions to some of these issues that again you might want to consider.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, does the Commission have any other concerns or comments? Do we feel comfortable with our summary of future tasks for right now and break it into the subcommittees and we're going to really dig deep into that.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair, what's our timeline to return to the Board with something? Or, I'm sorry, to return to the Commission with something so we can have something, we can discuss it, we can look at it, and...?

Ms. Vanuch: When is our timeline for the Board on this? Like March or May?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, it's March of 2019.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018

Ms. Vanuch: So maybe before the end of the year at the latest, you know, just to have a draft and that way we can workshop it because we get into the holiday meetings and then that gets more scarce. So, if nobody has anything, I'd love to be able to open it up for a public comment at this point. But I want to make sure we're all finished. Okay. So would anyone from the public like to come down and address the Commission? This isn't a typical public hearing so we don't need to really run the light but if you want to talk for twenty minutes maybe we'll come to a subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Callander: Alane Callander. I just have like a sentence or two. I'm glad you brought up about Widewater. I think that needs to be looked at very carefully; make sure that we protect that very precious part of the county from too much development. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, thank you. Anyone else? Ms. Carlone? That's the worst. I love going to Tyson's Corner for shopping but I hate sitting in traffic.

Mr. English: I thought you had two and a half hours from your house because I'd believe that.

Ms. Vanuch: She was coming down Courthouse.

Mr. English: I'd by that one.

Ms. Carlone: Oh gosh. Oh, hey, Ruth Carlone. I was looking at all this from a standpoint of the actual old restrictions or possibilities within a cluster development. And by that I mean I started to mention it earlier that wasn't... it was not the right time to be discussing it, but this is about full disclosure. When you buy a piece of property and you're told you have 1.5 acres in this cluster, and I wrote this to the... well anyway I won't... I already sent one in about this, but that with that 1.5 acres okay we know that the RPAs cannot be built upon and wetlands you can't build upon. Okay. And then you take out the footprint of the house, the driveway, the garage, the primary, and the hundred percent septic field backup, setbacks, property setbacks, and back to the RPAs; what is left of that 1.5 acres for the owner to build a deck, a patio, swimming pool, and sheds. Now, I mentioned before in the Saratoga Woods there was about five lots that had... one even had two RPAs running through it out of that 1.5 acres for what was left to be built on. Then for Kellogg Mill it's the same people again, the same builders, the same individual that started that area, too. Okay. There's about seven to eight lots that have wetlands going through that 1.5 and then after you take out these other, the footprints and (inaudible), what in the heck do you have left to be able to build a deck, a swimming pool, or a shed? I believe in full disclosure. Now, I haven't seen anything and maybe this isn't the appropriate place to put it or maybe it's at the time of sales to let people know exactly what they have left. You tell me what's left of 1.5 acres after you take all these... the footprints and the driveways and etcetera. There has to be something. It's not fair to these people to know that they've got a wetlands going through their property where they can't build, they can't use, an RPA they have to put a sign up saying no construction beyond that point. This is what I was looking at more from this terms and a full disclosure. Also, back with other discussions with Delegate Cole that we had, we had a small meeting at the library with him and he told us that if you look you could go ahead and amend and this... I don't know if this is the fact... but he mentioned that we could amend if we had the guts to do it to amend the state mandate to go and maybe make some adjustments to that. This isn't fair to people the way this is set up. And I may be rambling here but it's an injustice to the people. Why don't some of you give me some figures of what's left over that they can build on at that 1.5 acres after these other things are taken out and the RPAs. Also, another thing with the state mandate. They're getting off scot-free, the builders and the land speculators. They're not paying anything for a swimming pool, even a gosh darn tot lot they don't even have to do that they don't have to do anything. Like I said they're really getting away with a lot on this. The wells... now also he mentioned at the meeting that we could request a test well... a test well be drilled when there's a

*Planning Commission Minutes
July 18, 2018*

subdivision or several of them. I think that should be something that we should try. I don't know if we can, if it could be changed or not. But our topography is such with the fractured strata and various slopes and such, but at least it would give the people in that subdivision that about possibility of having water enough to sustain them. Now within the Saratoga and the Kellogg LLC, there is what 36 and 58 lots. When you figure 5,000 gallons a month for a single-family home that's about what I was told that they would use, so you multiply that by each unit and see what that comes out to. What's happening to our water table? Right now we're getting some very murky looking water. We just have a very shallow well, 65 feet, but we don't know what's going to happen. We had almost dry wells several years ago during the drought period. And we have to look at that and you have to look at that to protect us. You have to come up with something to protect us and that's just common sense. There's a lot more but I was looking at from another side I just don't believe and...

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

Ms. Carlone: Oh sure, oh I didn't see the light go on. Okay, okay.

Ms. Muller: Good evening again, my name is Linda Muller. I appreciate the information provided by all of you this evening and I also appreciate the overlay maps as well. One of the things that has been obvious to me, because I live on the east side of Route 1 off of 630 near the high school, is that there is quite a bit of development currently in progress. And probably what is most concerning is the fact that there's several smaller cluster developments that literally encase or circle both the middle school and soon-to-be encasing around the Blackhawk high school. I recently attended the public gathering meeting with the Pedestrian Bike Path Plan with the Planning Commission and it was a good meeting. And I'm hoping that, number one, that if we're going to be doing developments around high schools or middle schools or grade schools that the planning also includes safe insane pathways or sidewalks or through ways for the residents who are now actually going to be co-mingling with school traffic, because that's what's going to happen shortly. I think that's... and as well as take into consideration the pedestrian bicycle walk plan that they're currently working on. I don't know how the two... how this coordinates with that planning. I know there's a lot of segmentation because you have transportation planning, you have infrastructure planning, but I know in Stafford we live actually in little communities of developments. And it would be beneficial I think, you talked about quality of life, to have you know a continuous or at least the ability for citizens, residents to be able to move around not just by car but also by bike if they choose or to walk and also be able to get to some of the commuter lots or even the VRE. So, that's all I have to share this evening. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Vanuch: So I had that one, just add requirement of sidewalks and paths for the policy committee. Alright, any other questions from the Planning Commission? Okay, no other questions; thank you all for coming and sticking it out with us this evening so now the meeting's adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.