

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

October 9, 2019

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, October 9, 2019, 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, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Any declaration of disqualification or disclosure statements?

Mr. English: I do, Madam Chairman. Just for the record, I have spoken to people for Westlake and we'd like to meet this week or next, and I'd like to know if you could make it... maybe help me meet with them?

Ms. Vanuch: I'm actually out of town starting tomorrow through Monday for a work conference, but then let's schedule a time maybe when I get back next week and we'll set up that meeting.

Mr. English: Okay, any time after Monday... okay, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Yep, perfect. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Madam Chairman, I've had some phone conversations with the applicant's representative for Vistas at Ferry Farm, and also with residents from the Chatham Heights... or Chatham Landing subdivision.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anyone else? Alright, seeing nothing, we'll move onto the public presentations part of tonight's meeting. This is when anyone can come forward to the podium. State your name, address, and the district that you reside. You'll have 3 minutes to speak on any topic outside of anything that's on the agenda for public hearing. So, if you're here to talk about anything except for the Vistas at Ferry Farm, this would be the time you can come down to the podium and speak. Anybody?

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I don't remember where I live. Oh, gerrymandered Rock Hill District. Waldo's on the hat here. He's just one of the people who doesn't get a County water and sewer bill. That's obviously authorized by Resolution 82-341. And, as you know, 4 weeks minus 1 day is Election Day. It's also the beginning of the lame duck session. But it might not apply, especially if you get a free ride if you live in the George Washington District. Next week Waldo will be out August 17th to the 20th at the, uh, Stafford County Fair. Uh, if you're a Republican, I'll be wearing a pirate's patch on my left eye and I'll play you in chess with only 1 eye. If you're a Democrat, I'll play you left-handed. Remember, Waldo always wears red, white, and blue; Republicans, you only wear red only. We know the Democrats are blue. Band Together is gonna be out on Monday, the day before Election Day. Of course, I can't campaign on school property, but

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Waldo will be in the audience so, if you want to take pictures, I'll be there. Ah, let's see ... gerrymandering's still working on the committee. I want to make sure that all the voters realize it's very important who you put in office on the Board of Supervisors, 'cause in 2021 we're gonna redistrict. And the gerrymandering committee has got a lot of models for me already, so, for those of you who don't know, Rock Hill used to be on Eustice Road in 1990. Now it's out on Dunroven Road and probably will go to Shelton Shop Road. I saw there's gonna be a town hall meeting in 2 weeks for the roads. For those of you who don't know, VDOT is responsible for roads. This is a Dillon Rule state. Richmond does aspects. They're trying to get a bond passed for 50 million dollars because they're gonna con you that they're a Triple A rated county and they're 1 of 47. But that just means that you're in debt. Also, next week if you come out, I'll teach you about tax assessments. I'm very good at math. I'll show you that you've been taxed too much. I'll show you the model. And I'll show you how to get on the website and prove that your own property, especially since 2000, the last 20 years we've only had 1 Commissioner of Revenue, and we've only had 3 of them in the last 100 years.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Would anyone else like to come down and speak? Okay, seeing none, we'll go ahead and move onto item number 1 on the agenda which is the Reclassification of the Vistas at Ferry Farm. And for this we'll recognize Mr. Mike Zuraf and he'll be presenting item number 1 and 2, which is the Conditional Use Permit. And, Mr. Zuraf, since we just talked about this a couple weeks ago and I know some of the same members of the public are here, you just want to hit some of the changes?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC18152428; Reclassification - Vistas at Ferry Farm - A proposed reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-5, Age-Restricted Housing Zoning District to allow for the development of up to 170 age-restricted multi-family dwelling units on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 54-79, 54-79A, 54-80, 54-80A, and 54-81 (Property). The Property consists of 7.118 acres, located on the south side of Kings Highway and north side of Naomi Road, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: October 18, 2019) (History: July 10, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to August 14, 2019; Continued to September 25, 2019) (Public Hearing Continued to October 9, 2019)**
2. CUP18152429; Conditional Use Permit - Vistas at Ferry Farm - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow increased residential density of up to 24.0 dwelling units per acre in the R-5, Age-Restricted Housing Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 54-79, 54-79A, 54-80, 54-80A, and 54-81 (Property). The increased residential density would allow up to 170 age-restricted multi-family dwelling units. The Property consists of 7.118 acres, located on the south side of Kings Highway and north side of Naomi Road, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: October 18, 2019) (History: July 10, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to August 14, 2019; Continued to September 25, 2019) (Public Hearing Continued to October 9, 2019)**

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Perfect.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Madam Chair and members of the Commission. If I could have the computer please? I do just have a brief update since the public hearing was held on July 10th and continued to September 25th, your last meeting, and then to this meeting. Going through the summary

*Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019*

of the project, so I'm gonna go through the... there are some latest changes to the application and questions raised by the Planning Commission. You did receive a packet of additional information that summarizes the questions and staff responses. You did also receive a revised General Development Plan this evening. Okay, so, there's a slight change to the General Development Plan. It was revised by shifting the western entrance and access drive farther to the west. The change is highlighted in red and it's reflected on the new General Development Plan that you have.

Mr. Randall: Excuse me, Mike. Did they say why they changed that? Was there a particular reason they stated to move that?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not certain why it was done. So, going now to the memo that outlines all the questions that were raised and new information. So, there are amended proffer... is an amended proffer statement that you received. The amendment that you have... or the changes to the proffer statement delete the proffers that limit the number of vehicles and residents per unit. So that's no longer a proffer. The amendment also adds a proffer to construct improvements to Dairy Lane, which would include necessary milling, pothole filling, and repaving up to \$30,000 in total costs. So, with that new proffer, the applicant has modified their application. They needed to modify that to opt in under the new proffer legislation. The application was originally submitted in 2018. At that time, the state proffer legislation considered offsite proffers as unreasonable. So, amending the application does allow the proffers to be considered under the newly adopted 2019 Proffer Legislation. And, in doing so, it allows the offsite proffers to be deemed reasonable if ratified by signature of the property owner. Right now, we have not received signed proffers yet. So, one of the questions raised previously from the Commission was questioning if VDOT has conducted any traffic counts at the intersections at each side of Naomi Road where it comes out to Route 3. Staff was able to obtain three different sets of studies with traffic count data from VDOT. That's included as attachments to what you received tonight. That includes peak hour vehicle trips for the two intersections in question, and then also a second study looked at... provided daily trips at the Route 3/Cool Spring Road/Jett Drive intersection only. And then the last set of data is more general, but it's the VDOT Daily Traffic Volume Estimates. That's an annual report that VDOT puts out that provides traffic volumes over segments of roads, so it's not as specific to individual intersections and the data doesn't drive down into as much detail. So, you've received all that information.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Zuraf, sorry. Does any of that information indicate the level of service of those intersections at Chatham Heights Road and Cool Spring Road?

Mr. Zuraf: No, when you're dealing with traffic counts...

Mr. Bain: Just counts?

Mr. Zuraf: ... it's just number of trips and it doesn't get into evaluating levels of service.

Mr. Bain: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So, one of the other questions staff was asked about, the proffer about limiting the number of vehicles a tenant could have on site per dwelling unit and whether that's legal and how the County would be able to enforce that, we had already noted that the applicant did delete that proffer. So, that is no longer an issue at this point. Staff was also asked how the project compares to the original concept that was presented in 2016, when it was initially presented to the Board. So, what you have on the screen here is an image of that original development proposal for the same site. In the original

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

concept, the building... there's still two residential buildings. The building and parking lot layout is a little different, including L-shaped buildings as opposed to two longer buildings. The site here did not include underground parking at the time, and now we have underground parking proposed. And the number of dwelling units on this plan was 160; now 170 is proposed. The project also did include an office use on the western end of the site which through zoning restrictions it was not able to fit in on this... in this location. So that was removed from the concept.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Zuraf, do you recall -- did that original concept plan have the retaining walls that are being considered under the current plan?

Mr. Zuraf: It didn't get in to that level of detail. I'm almost certain that they would have needed to include retaining walls to make this concept work, given the slope difference. So, also, staff was asked to provide some development density and building height information for some other apartment developments in Stafford County, and three were specifically requested. Those are on the screen; Stonegate Apartments, Stafford Lakes Apartments, and Ultris Courthouse Square Apartments. So, these three different projects, the first two... going through them is Stonegate is a 3-story, you know, all the buildings are 3 stories tall, approximately 36 feet in height. That was my best guess given the information I could provide. Dwelling unit density on this site equated to 14.4 dwelling units per acre. With Stafford Lakes Apartments, those also are 3-story apartment buildings, also 36 feet tall, and at a density of 13.46 dwelling units per acre. And the Courthouse Square project, those have different buildings, some 2 to 3 stories and some 3 to 4-story tall buildings. So, where you have 2-story façades, you have 26 feet of building height, going all the way up to 46 feet of building height where you have 4-story building façades. And that site equated to 10.8 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Apicella: So, Mike, the obvious point here is for all the 3-story apartments, they're average is 36 feet.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Bain: Do you know what the zoning reclassifications for those three are?

Mr. Zuraf: The first two are R... well, I know Stonegate is R-3; Stafford Lakes is either R-2 or R... I think Stafford Lakes is R-3; and Courthouse Square is, most of it is R-3, there's a small portion of it that is R-2. Staff was also asked to kind of look... reach out to Gardens of Stafford Senior Apartments and try to find out how that project might be designed, what kind of features they have to accommodate senior residents, including in-unit and complex amenities and activities. Staff was not able to connect with them prior to this meeting. I did notice on their website some of the amenities that they include. They include kind of a fitness room, media room, hair salon, game room, community room; they do have transportation via community bus also. Also, there was a question if there were any building illustrations with views from Route 3. The applicant did provide several views of the building, but all those views are generally from Naomi Road so you don't get that view from the Route 3 side. Also, staff was asked to kind of find out where building entrances and stairwells are located in this building for the kind of purpose of seeing how residents may be able to exit the site, or exit the buildings. So, just kind of... the print is very small so I'll try to highlight this. The main entrances to both of the buildings on the... this is the Route 3 side over here where I'm marking up. There are main entrances in this location and this location on that side of the building. Otherwise, entrances are also in this location, kind of central location within the underground parking area of each

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

building, where you have access to elevators. Then the stairwells, there are two stairwells in each building indicated here and here, and here and here. And where those stairwells are located, then you do have access or... it looks like emergency exit areas out of the building. And the applicant noted that this is not a final design; they're still working on a design. So, they may have to provide more or those stairwells in a modified location to meet the building code.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman?

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, so, looking at this GDP, if a resident was living on the upper floor of the apartment complex and they're parked in the lower level garage, they'd have to travel 4 floors to get to their vehicle. If they're parked inside the... if they're parked inside or under the building.

Mr. Zuraf: It'd be 3 flights of stairs. So, 4 to 3, 3 to 2, 2 to 1...

Mr. Apicella: And 1 to 0.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, no, it's 3 levels though. It's the third... there's 3 levels of... 3 stories.

Mr. Apicella: What I'm trying to say is there's an extra floor that they're going to have to traverse because the parking is below the first level of apartments.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. Apicella: That's what I'm trying to get at, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And... let's see... the other issue not on the screen is the issue previously discussed about, you know, the Commission questioned whether or not the proposed building elevations for the project constituted a 4-story building or are the buildings 3-stories on top of a basement. It's staff's opinion that the parking area below the building footprint is classified as a basement and does not constitute a story. Parking garage falls under the definition of a basement as it is located partially below grade. The parking garage cannot be a story since the definition explicitly excludes a basement. And we've provided the definitions in the staff report for you to see.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, since you brought it up I just have two questions on that.

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a definition of a private garage in the County code?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes there is.

Mr. Apicella: Can you... do you have it? Can you say it?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. A private garage is an accessory building or part of a principal building used for the storage of motor vehicles and other domestic goods and equipment.

***Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019***

Mr. Apicella: And that definition is not distinctly in the definition of a basement? It doesn't refer to a garage in that... the definition of a basement?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Apicella: And so, would the proposed parking level of the building meet the definition of a private garage?

Mr. Zuraf: The... it might. Yeah, I think it would.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And that's all I have and I'll take any questions if you have any.

Ms. Vanuch: Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Randall: So, you mentioned that the \$30,000 upgrade to Dairy Lane...

Mr. Zuraf: Dairy Lane.

Mr. Randall: ... how far... Dairy Lane, sorry. How far does that normally get us? How much work does that normally get us?

Ms. Vanuch: Two speedbumps.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, two speedbumps.

Ms. Vanuch: One pothole, maybe.

Mr. Randall: One pothole. So, do you think... now, and when they... the proffer... maybe this is for the applicant, is this the entire way or is it only until \$30,000 is expended and then we'll just stop right there? Do we know how long that'll... do you know how much of Dairy Lane that will fix based on the current status, based on the current condition of Dairy Lane?

Mr. Zuraf: I could not say. Maybe the applicant can add to that. I'm pretty certain it would not, you know, it wouldn't allow for a full repave of the entire length but I'm not certain.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And we don't know yet... I'll ask the applicant then... we don't know what part of Dairy Lane they've got identified for that \$30,000?

Mr. Zuraf: No, and it's not specified necessarily in the proffers either.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Alright, thank you Mr. Zuraf. Mr. Payne, would you like to come down?

Mr. Payne: Thank you Madam Chair and other members of the Planning Commission. Charlie Payne with the law firm Hirschler and I represent the applicant. I appreciate your time this evening. I think this is the third time we've talked about this project, so always good to talk about a good project in

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

south Stafford. So, I want to address to some of the questions that came up and just sort of backfill some of the comments from Mr. Zuraf's information that he provided you. We relocated the one entrance just to make sure it was out of the 100-year floodplain, so that's why the front entrance was moved further to the north, is that right? Yes. No, to the west... sorry, to the west. So that's why...

Mr. Randall: That's a 100-year floodplain we see?

Mr. Payne: When it was the prior location it was within the 100-year floodplain so went and moved it to make sure it was out, just as the building is as well. The original concept plan did include office, and the concern was with office there'd be more traffic, so we took that off the table, in addition to trying to configure the zoning as well. But that was the other concern in talking with folks. Dairy Lane, we are improving all of Dairy Lane. What we've estimated is that it is \$30,000 to mill it, fill the potholes, and then pave over the entire area. So, that will completely fix that road, so just to answer your question. So we did look at that.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Payne, is it going to do any wedge widening or safety widening or anything?

Mr. Payne: No widening.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Payne: At the last meeting, there were questions about lighting. So, just so folks know, we will be lighting obviously where the trail is going to be, our internal parking areas and drive aisles, so that area will be lit. So, just... it's not going to be a dark area coming into; it's going to be in the evening it will have proper lighting. In regards to the improvements out front of the project at our entrance, there will be curb and gutter. We will widen on our side of Naomi Road to obviously provide for the trail and the improvements on... for the entrance. So, those improvements will be in place as well. And just going through... retaining wall question -- folks are under the assumption we've got like really tall retaining walls here. We're talking 8 feet as our tallest retaining wall, so they're not very tall. So, I just want to make sure we address that issue. Underground parking -- I know Mr. Apicella's got some questions about how a story is defined and how a basement is defined. I would just remind him that a basement is... remind the Planning Commission... that a basement is not a story and you... there's no prohibition in parking in a basement. We see this as a real... very positive amenity, especially for seniors having to, you know, get out of the bad weather you get to an elevator. You don't have to walk up 3 flights of stairs. You actually go to an elevator to get up to the rooms. We see this as positive. So, I'm not sure what the negative interpretation is; maybe it's just the fact that it's 3 stories in the ordinance and that's not defined as to how tall that is. But at the end of the day, we are following the ordinance requirements and we do see this as a very positive thing for seniors to be able to utilize. I think that was all the questions and/or updates. If I missed anything, please let me know and I'll be happy to answer to the best I can.

Ms. Vanuch: Any questions?

Mr. Randall: I have a couple more questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead.

Mr. Randall: Why Dairy Lane and not Naomi Lane?

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Mr. Payne: Well, we're going to be, to the extent that we're, you know, the improvements that we're making on Naomi for our entrance and for purposes of the trail, we are making improvements in that particular area.

Mr. Randall: Right, but not repaving or potholes or anything...?

Mr. Payne: Naomi Lane is not in bad shape and it's, you know, it does have fairly, from a width perspective it actually is in pretty decent shape from that perspective. But Dairy Lane, from what we've seen, does need some improvements. It is the access for the folks at Chatham's Landing as well. So, when we went down to take a look at it, we saw several potholes, we saw that it could be improved. We understood there's no money to do that, so we thought it was a good off-site improvement that would benefit the entire area, including our project, that we'd go ahead and make that proffer.

Mr. Randall: Alright. What happens if that \$30,000 isn't enough to do what you need to do?

Mr. Payne: Yes.

Mr. Randall: We're sure of that?

Mr. Payne: That's our estimate. That is what we believe is going to work.

Mr. Randall: Would you be willing to change the proffer that says we're going to do it no matter the cost?

Mr. Payne: Uh...

Mr. Randall: Because I'm concerned that you're going to get to \$30,000 and it's going to be half done, and then you're going to say well the proffer was only for \$30,000 and so we're going to leave it the way it's at because our estimate, you know, for whatever the reason, was 20% off and the 20% that didn't get done is down on the very end, you know, so.

Mr. Payne: We are definitely going to mill it, fill the potholes, and pave over it. So, to your question, if it exceeds \$30,000, it's \$35,000 or \$40,000 or whatever the number is, that's what we have estimated. We will have to do it to get the road in pretty decent shape. So I... in answer to your question, yes. We're willing to not cap it but, those are the basic things that we're going to do to it. We're not going to widen it, we're not going to tear up the pavement.

Mr. Randall: I understand. I have one more question, Madam Chair, if you'll allow me.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure.

Mr. Randall: One of the major problems I have with the project is elevators and the fact that seniors living in a high rise having to deal with elevators in an emergency situation. We talk about they have emergency power; that's my life. Do they redundancy? What kind of redundancy do they have? How do we know these things are going to work? If they don't work, how do they... how to the residents on the third floor tend to get... how are they going to get down the stairs? Do we have the striker system available to give someone... to have them get down the stairs? Do they just on their own? You know, I know that this isn't going to fail. They never fail, we all know that. But that's not our

***Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019***

job. Our job is to ensure that there's a 100% reliable way for them to get down from the third floor to the first floor. Stairs are normally the way to do it.

Mr. Payne: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Now we say that we're going to have emergency power to the elevators and I'm not convinced. So, convince me that the elevator and the emergency power process and the redundancy power from an offsite source or from a, you know, however we're gonna make that work is going to be 100% fail-proof for them to get down from the third floor to the exit.

Mr. Payne: Well, we have to follow building code requirements and the Fire Marshal was here last meeting, and he was clear that what we were proposing was consistent with the ordinance and consistent with our discussions with him. In fact, I stated at the last meeting we met with him first when we... I shouldn't say first, but one of the first folks we met with before any submission to make sure he was comfortable and the fire department was comfortable with what we were designing and proposing. So, to answer your question, we've got to follow all the building code requirements, we've got to follow comments from the County including the Fire Marshal as to exactly your point as how folks are going to get out of the building if there was an emergency. We haven't designed it yet, but we're going to have to design it to meet those requirements. So, I... to answer your question, we're not gonna... we're gonna have to follow the building code requirements and we'll have to follow the County ordinance (*inaudible - several people talking*).

Mr. Randall: I guess I need the County to come back up and talk to me about how we're gonna use... how an elevator is allowed to be used in an emergency situation and what kind of power the County requires for those things to be available.

Ms. Vanuch: Probably none.

Mr. Randall: Well, I probably couldn't talk to it at the moment but, you know, that... if we have an ordinance about that, I would expect it to be fairly detailed.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Randall: But Jeff, do you... Mr. Harvey, do you know offhand if that's what that requirement is?

Ms. Vanuch: You guys can research it. Mr. Bain has a question for Mr. Payne.

Mr. Bain: Just a clarification. In each building, is there one elevator?

Mr. Payne: I believe there is. Two... two elevators in each...

Mr. Bain: There are two elevators, okay. I was wondering because the drawing said elevators, multiple, and I, up till tonight I thought it was just a single shaft. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: But only one of those elevators' will have emergency power, correct?

Mr. Payne: Whatever the building code requirements are. That's not something at this stage we would be designing. But if the building code requires us to have emergency power for the elevators,

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

alternative access during an emergency, whatever the Fire Marshal is going to require of us, we've got to construct and design the building for that purpose. But I can't answer your question.

From the audience: Back-up generators.

Mr. Randall: Yep, I know all about 'em. But they don't always work.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Just a quick one on the elevators, too. Do we know what the capacity of each elevator is? A 4-person, a 6-person?

Mr. Payne: I don't know if it's been designed for that. Do we know? Not at this stage.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Payne: I mean, those are typically questions when you get to the site plan and construction stage that you'll address, and you gotta deal with the Fire Marshal and the building code officials at that point. Not unlike any other building, multi-story building constructed in Stafford County.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just gonna... I feel I have to say it, so when this new zoning was approved by the Board, like I said, two weeks ago the County asked that we adopt specific design standards for senior apartments. We never got there. So we still don't know; maybe the minimum requirements are adequate. We don't know that because we didn't look at it. So that's why I think we're all asking questions about what's going to be in this building that's different from or better than the normal kind of building you would put up for a family. Because I think seniors have different needs and requirements. And we don't know what those are because we didn't evaluate it.

Mr. Payne: That is a fair question, except to the extent that we are following what the ordinance allows. And you had your Fire Marshal here last week who clearly said he did not have problems with what we were proposing. So, I would think if the Fire Marshal's comfortable with what we're proposing that the County (*inaudible - several people talking*).

Mr. Apicella: What I heard them say is they were meeting the minimum requirements. That's what I heard them say.

Mr. Randall: Right, but to your own point, you didn't have specifics of the building and the elevators and the back-up generators and the size and the power and the kilowatt, and you didn't have any of those things for the Fire Marshal to look at.

Mr. Payne: And we would not at this level.

Mr. Randall: Right. So, what he was approving was the fact that the 10,000-foot design seems to be reasonable, but he had no knowledge of the specifics of the actual design to be able to make a determination one way or the other, correct?

Mr. Payne: Right so... right, so this... but none of us could. I mean, you have to wait for the final designs of the project, it's got to follow the building code requirements, the building code officials, the

*Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019*

Fire Marshal have to approve it. We don't get to build what we want, right. We actually have to follow the requirements and those requirements are part of any construction in Stafford County.

Mr. Randall: Right. And that's what my question was to staff because, in most cases, nobody cares about elevators in emergency situations; we just turn them off and everybody uses the stairs. That's normally what we all do. In this case it's different. I don't know what the ordinance is specifically dealing with elevators as emergency egress, so I don't know and I don't know if the County can speak to that.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not certain of all the details, but I think the intent of the emergency back-up is if there's just a power outage, not necessarily dealing with emergency like if there's a fire. That might be a different situation where the elevators get turned off and there's a... they have to get out another way. But my understanding, I think the intent is just if there's a power outage and they just need that... the power to get down that way.

Mr. Randall: To my point, and that's not exactly the same as an emergency egress, power for an emergency egress in a casualty situation or a fire situation. That would be different than a standby generator when I lose power in a storm for example. So, that's my concern.

Mr. Payne: We want our residents to be safe. They will be safe and we'll following building code requirements and whatever the Fire Marshal tells us we gotta do.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Any other questions? We'll go ahead... thank you Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so at this point, we're gonna open up the public hearing. Actually it was continued so it stayed open. But if you guys are here to talk tonight about the Vistas at Ferry Farm, you can come down to the podium. State your name, your address, and the district that you reside. You'll have 3 minutes when the green light comes on, 1 minute remaining when the yellow comes on, and when the red light on please conclude your comments.

Ms. Partyke: Thank you. My name is Sue Partyke. I live in Chatham Landing and that is in the Washington District. We're here this evening to express the following concerns regarding the rezoning and development of the area along Naomi Road. The applicant states that there is a market and community need for 55+ age-restricted housing. Um, according to the Stafford County demographic stats for 2018-2019 of a total population of 128,961, only about 12,500 or 17% are 55 and older. The applicant restated at the last meeting they thought it would really be directed towards 65 year old people. That would take the number down to about 8% of the stated population. The Evergreen is an established age-restricted apartment complex; it's just 4.6 miles from the proposed Vistas at Ferry Farm site. They have 2 elevators in their building. They are ADA compliant, plus they have more amenities than this applicant stated they will provide. Evergreen is not backed by a noisy busy highway, nor does it sit on an unimproved country road that floods. The rents are less than \$1,500 to \$1,800 that was quoted by the applicant at the last meeting. With all of this in its favor, Evergreen still does not have 100% occupancy. Again, where is the need? I'd like to address the

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

parking and traffic. In the last meeting, the applicant increased the parking allotment to 2 spaces per unit. However, 170 units equals 340 spaces. At last count there were only 235 spaces, a shortfall of 105 spaces. That shortfall increases if there's an adult child living at home. It also provides no allowance for visitor parking. The parking density on this project is too tight. We cannot allow or accommodate any overflow parking in our neighborhood. The applicant believes out of 170 units, or 340 cars, there will be only 25 additional cars during the morning rush and 35 at the evening rush. These claims, as far as we know, are not supported by actual studies. We submit that the common sense tells us otherwise. An additional 340 cars in the area will increase the traffic. People just don't go to work; they shop, they go to the doctor, and run errands and have company. Quite a few people who are 55+ are still working full time jobs. Traffic flow at the intersection of Kings Highway and Naomi, along with Naomi and Jett Drive, will clearly back up at rush times. Jett Drive is blocked in both directions right now by a single car trying to make a left turn from Naomi onto Jett Drive to get to Kings Highway. Neither bus nor fire truck can make a right turn onto Kings Highway from the top of Naomi Road, and a ladder truck cannot get under the train bridge. They have now placed a crosswalk at Kings Highway that prevents having a right-turn lane coming off the Chatham Bridge onto Naomi. At this point, it's not just difficult getting out of our area, it's now difficult to get into our area. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you.

Mr. Freese: Hi, good evening. My name's George Freese, George Washington District. I'd like to talk about safety. The plan calls for two entrances onto Naomi Road for this project; however, no planned widening or improvement of Naomi Road. In case of emergency, evacuation will present a major traffic issue as the nursing home emergency vehicles try to get to... try to get in and out, as well as the homeowners, and potentially 200 to 300 more renters. A ladder truck would be needed to fight any fire or evacuate any rent... any rental residence. A ladder truck, which is 12 feet high, would clearly have only one way in and out because of the bridge is only 10 feet high. That's the railroad bridge that goes underneath. There is currently no clear plan for the future of the railroad bridge. If this project is built and this project is closed, the potential impact on Naomi traffic is significant. It also doubles the concerns for any evacuation plan. At this time, the walking trail seems to have only been proposed along Naomi Road; but it is not planned to go all the way to Ferry Farm. The sidewalk will not meet up with any existing or potential sidewalks, and the walking trail with not either. It will dead-end at Dairy Lane. The sidewalks sound great; however, even if there were a shoulder on which to build them, they cannot extend under the bridge. It is a half a mile from where the sidewalk will end in front of the pump station to the intersection of Jett Road and Kings Highway. There is no room to safely walk on the road and is a real danger to anyone walking under the train bridge along traffic. At the west end, it is slightly less than 1/3 of a mile where the proposed sidewalk would end before it could be connected to whatever they plan for the bridge. The area where the sidewalk ends at Kings Highway is uphill and, at some sections, has a sharp drop-off to the side. Sidewalks that don't go anywhere and a trail that doesn't connect with the other trails, and no public transportation, who gets the responsibility if someone is injured when trying to walk into town? Clearly our area is rural and not R-5. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else?

Mr. Christman: Good evening. My name is Vivian Christman and I want to state for the record that I am pro-development; however, I am opposed to the proposal that is suggested due to the density that is being proposed, the density going from an A-1 to an R-5 area and the proposed 24... I believe it's 24 residents per acre. It seems extreme for the area, for the geographic area. The road is not wide

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

enough. You've heard the description of the entrances off of Naomi Road on either end are very, very restricted because of curves, because of the position. It's difficult for a road... for trucks or cars to enter, and the increase in traffic that would be represented by such an increase in population density far exceeds, and I challenge the assumption that it would only be the 25 and 36 cars during rush hour traffic that were mentioned by the previous person. I also raise a question about the definition, and I understand we're talking about legal definitions and that doesn't necessarily include common sense or the way we would talk about things in a common way. This appears to be, by looking at their drawings that were... that are publicly available that we've received here, the renderings that we would call it a 4-story building in that the underbuilding parking is level entry on one side. In the back, the parking is underneath the grade level, but in the front on the entry it is at grade level. So, when you look at the building, the first visible level, whatever we call that, we would call it a first story. Where we are, many of our homes are... they're classified as 3-story but the first floor is a garage. You drive in and the back may be a hill, and so you, you know, if you're standing on the backside you'll only see 2 stories; but they're clearly seen as 3 stories from the road. And that's what you would be seeing from the road. On this side would be 4 stories, not 3 stories. And that's... that's a big concern. It's about the density. Again, I want to state that we are in favor of development. We think there's a lot of wonderful things that could be done but without going to the density that we're... we're... is being proposed in this. Thank you very much for your time.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? And if you guys wanna... as the speaker is wrapping up, if you want to start lining up and coming down, you can do that.

Speaker: I think I'm the last one.

Ms. Vanuch: I think there might be one more after you.

Ms. Moon: Oh, you think? Okay, good; I hate to be the last one. I'm Amonda Moon and I'm in the George Washington District. In the summary, let me make it clear that we are not against development in this small and unique portion of Falmouth. We would be in favor of even an age-restricted plan; in fact, we would welcome development similar to the townhouse community that has been there for more than 25 years; a community that has not shown any decline in 25 years. We would be cheerleaders for the owner occupied homes or townhomes that would contribute more tax dollars to the County coffers. A development that would allow both communities to complement each other, maintain the rural feeling outlined in the Healthy Growth Plan put forth by Stafford County which this plan, as presented, does not meet. I suggest that this is not a plan, this is an idea -- for the number of changes that have been made every time we come to a meeting. Also, a conditional use permit would be detrimental to the character in the development of adjacent land. It would not be in harmony with the purpose and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance; it does exceed the height of a 3-story building; it does not provide for adequate parking, for adequate ingress and egress to Kings Highway; nor does it provide evidence that it would not cause traffic congestion. And a possible 340 cars surely generate more than the 150 trips per day above the existing use and would meet the minimum thresholds for a TIA set forth in the CUP application. There are apartments going up at Lafayette and Route 3. They're still building apartments at South Point. Silver is looking at a 3,000 age-restricted units in Celebrate. Do we want Stafford County to be temporary dwellers? Or do we want homeowners that will bring stability diversity to our area? It could still be an age-restricted development, a development that would address the zoning, safety, traffic, and parking issues that we have just expressed. As the gentleman asked before me, why do we need this? Is this a precedent that the County wants to set? Would we then become like Fairfax with apartments going up willy-nilly? Every developer using this as the standard example? Traffic more like Northern Virginia? We welcome a plan that stays within

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

the proper zoning and does not create the concrete canyon feel of inner city apartments. Please consider the future impact of your vote. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you.

Ms. Wiley: Hello, my name is Connie Wiley. I ask you to use common sense when making your decision. This is not the right development for this plot of ground. Naomi Road is pitch dark at night. You said that you're going to light it; that's great. But my suspicion is that the lights are not going to extend the entire run of Naomi Road. Um... uh, there are no streetlights, no roadside reflectors; only a stripe down the middle. It also has no shoulders. Pedestrians risk serious injury after dark, even if they're carrying a light. During the day, pedestrians get a real treat when they're forced off the road into the weeds every time a car passes. There are no curbs, medians, or any other aids to vehicle travel. The narrow verges drop off on either side into gullies or swamp. In the winter, Naomi Road is typically plowed late or not at all, creating ice hazards. Since 1996, the land under this proposed complex has been under 2 to 4 feet of water on multiple occasions. If you approve this project to add 170 new households, with as many as 340 more cars, you must also ensure that enhancements to make the entire stretch of Naomi are... make the entire stretch of Naomi more navigable, safer for pedestrians, safer in the winter, and less prone to flooding. We're not opposed to development on this parcel, but we are opposed to such dense construction. A few patio homes or townhouses or a limited number of apartments is a much more sensible use of this space. I wasn't going to say this, but I'm going to go ahead with it. The lyrics to, um, the lyrics of Joanie Mitchell's Big Yellow Taxi come to mind; um, they paved paradise and put up a parking lot. Those lyrics keep going through my head. It's sad to know that if this intense development happens, we'll no longer see Claiborne Run's non-human residents -- the great blue herons that fish there, the deer that come to drink at sunset, and all the birds, turtles, and small animals that live in the trees and banks along Naomi. This project does not help them. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? It wasn't that bad; I thought it was going to be juicy.

Audience member: That's as juicy as we get (inaudible - not at microphone).

Ms. Sable: Okay. My name is Pam Sable. I've lived there forever; 29 years. The three comparisons that they gave, they all have major road structures, thoroughfares to where cars can move in and out. Naomi is super narrow. It can never be widened. We have the creek on one side, and swampy area, and they have the sewer pump station on the other. And they're right -- if you go out on Jett Street, my bus, I block all of traffic. Nobody can turn in; it blocks it. I can't go out on the other side because my bus cannot make the turn as sharp as a backwards turn is. I would put my back tires in the ditch. I have to take up all lanes of traffic to make the turn. I did it this past week, only to come here and say I can't do it in my own lane. If they put up that place, it's going to be very dangerous. Common sense -- turn it down. A couple single-family homes? Fine. It's the wildlife, everything. We don't need another big building. There's one stairwell for the whole building, one elevator per unit, from what he circled on that design. If an elderly person parks in the garage at the one end, they have to traverse the whole length of the building to get to the other end to go up the elevator, to go all the way back down the other side if they live on the other end. It's just not well designed. And I'm against it. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Ms. Sable, are you a Stafford County Public School bus driver?

Ms. Sable: I am.

*Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019*

Ms. Vanuch: Well, thank you. Considering some of our challenges in transportation right now, I just want to thank you for your service.

Ms. Sable: Oh, yeah, it sucks. It sucks.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you.

Ms. Sable: But I enjoy everything about that yellow bus, kids included.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else?

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, gerrymandered Rock Hill District. Everyone knows I am not a pro for development. This County has doubled in population every 20 years since 1960. You heard about the 128,961; 8% is over 10,000; 16% is 20,634. Now, let me give you some facts about horizontal property. He's building horizontal property... remember, a townhouse is vertical property. There used to be a Virginia Horizontal Property Act, which is now the Condominium Act, and you need to go through the ordinances and you'll see that. I've been fighting this for 29 years, because I don't get water and sewer, if you heard me earlier, and hopefully you'll get water and sewer but hopefully you will not build this aspect. The place where I own my apartment? It's not Stafford Meadows, I call it Stafford Ghetto. You can get Shank's Towing, too, and you can send him a, um, a real nice aspect so if he tries to ever tow my car or my tenant's, I'll have him in jail. You're in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. This is a floodplain. If you forget about 2018, 2018, you know, you're... you're just so naïve that the drought has been here the last 6 weeks and you forget about reality. Remember folks, you're in a Commonwealth where common sense is not common. I live across the street from Gardens of Stafford. I rescue shiatzus. The get waken up because all that happen all the time because there's a fire truck there all the time. Thank goodness that the YMCA didn't get built there and the people who are senior citizens, like me, who we have people who are millennials who are going to tell me where I'm going to live, who have no idea about property management, and it's just eerie to me about what goes on. When you have horizontal property, you bring crime; automatically bring crime. VDOT, in this case, is very dumb on transportation; that's just what it is. There are sidewalks to nowhere. People know that I know there are no issues; there's opportunities. But if you keep on electing people who think there's issues, then you're gonna get nowhere. Just like the sidewalks to nowhere. Oh, Falmouth -- remember, the Town of Falmouth was 1726. I'm working with a gerrymandering committee; I definitely want the Town of Falmouth back to where it was and put Stafford so we don't have 7 Boards of Supervisors, 7 Planning Commissioners. They all get \$10K a year folks, just so you know what there stipedend is. Remember, this is a different audience. We're seniors. We're the baby boomers. We created the iPhone.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you, Mr. Waldowski. Anyone else? Okay, seeing no one, I'm going to close the public hearing and, at this point, I will ask Mr. Payne to come back up and address any questions, either from the Planning Commission or anything that was mentioned in the public hearing that you feel you would like to address.

Mr. Payne: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Planning Commission. Again, Charlie Payne. Always appreciate comments from the public, many of which are... some are comments from prior meetings. And the reason that we come back and we have changes to our plan is not because we didn't think our plan was good, but because we're trying to address the concerns of the public. So... and for those who say they're not anti-development, I understand that when you've been living in a neighborhood for a very long time, let's not forget this is 72 units at Chatham Landing when it went

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

into this particular part of the County some 20+ years ago, maybe closer to 30 years ago. It was a significant development. And as you heard from these residents, they love living down there despite the challenges of flooding and roads not being cleared in time... a timely manner. There's a nursing home there. This is a part of the County that the County has encouraged for new development. This is a use that is very compatible with the landscape and with the area. This is something in South Stafford, from a marketing situation, where we do have a need not only to Stafford County but in the region for folks who want to age in place and live in affordable housing after they sold their house or while they're transitioning to somewhere else. They want to stay near their kids and their grandkids. They want to be near the city. They want to be near historical landmarks like Chatham and Ferry Farm and Belmont. Um, for those who are concerned about walking on Naomi Road, you don't have to do it anymore here in the near future; there'll be a nice trail. It doesn't end at Dairy Road, at least according to County Planning; it goes past our site. And we will be a good neighbor. This will be very high quality, nice amenities, senior project. And it will generate net positive revenue. With all due respect to those who want townhouses, townhouses don't always generate net positive revenue. This project will. It will have no impact on schools. It'll have minimum impact on County services. Um, and this is something that we should want in our community. And this is a particular area where I think that fits very well. I know Naomi Road well. I have an aunt who's in... at Woodmont. I go there quite often. It is not a busy road. The fact that people are questioning what our traffic numbers are, we don't make them up. This comes from VDOT. This is VDOT's numbers. And again, it doesn't really take into account the residents who will be living there. Most of them are gonna be retired. I'm sorry, they're not going to be travelling during peak hours. They just don't. But I don't make that... that argument based on what the VDOT numbers are. They are what they are. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. Again, we worked hard on trying to address the concerns from the community, from the Planning Commission, all of which were very good questions, very reasonable points. But saying just go away, you can't be here is not something we're willing to put on the table. But we are willing to work with the community to try to mitigate any alleged impacts or perceived impacts. But with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you, Mr. Payne. Anyone else? Alright, I think we're good. Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Thank you. Thank you very much for your patience.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure. Do you guys have any questions for staff? Anybody? Mr. Apicella? No? Okay. So, at this point I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Bain, this is in your district; what would you like to do?

Mr. Bain: I'd like to run and hide. No. This is a difficult project, a difficult site. I believe the applicant has worked in good faith to try and develop a plan that would meet a lot of the issues, but I think there are still many issues that remain. And the way that the plan has developed, it could go either way. I'm not happy with it because of the density. If it had been half that size, I think it would have been a beautiful fit for that site. But the density is... what he's proposing, our Zoning Ordinance under the R-5 allows that density. So, I think, bottom line is, for... with a lot of misgiving, I'm going to make a motion, if I could, to approve the R-5 zoning change application for Reclassification RC18152428.

Ms. Vanuch: So we have a motion on the floor to approve the reclassification for RC18152428. Do we have a second? No seconds? Going once, going twice... okay, motion dies for the lack of a second. Do we have another motion?

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, since that motion is dead, I'd like to take the obvious path to prevent confusion, make sure this is properly closed out. I'd like to recommend denial of RC18152428, Reclassification of Vistas at Ferry Farm.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so now we have a motion on the floor to deny the reclassification for RC18152428. Do we have a second for that?

Mr. English: I'll second just to get it on vote.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion and a second. Any discussion Mr. McPherson? You go first, you made the motion.

Mr. McPherson: I think it's just taking the obvious path to make sure that this is properly closed out.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Mr. English?

Mr. English: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? No? Well, I'll say one thing -- you guys are very, very good at public speaking. You're all very intellect and you spoke very well and you were very organized. I'm very impressed, honestly. Mr. Coen, your Supervisor, would be very proud. I... the big thing for me in turning this down is public safety. When I asked the Fire Marshal last week about if there was a fire, what's the closest ladder truck? And when he said we'd have to call mutual aid more than likely from Fredericksburg, that's a big problem for me. I know some of the staffing and volunteer challenges that we have in some of these stations and we've got to have long term solutions to that kind of stuff and making sure that our stations are adequately staffed for our current residents before we're building additional things. So, that's a big thing for me. Anybody else? Alright, go ahead and vote. Okay, motion carries 6-1 (Mr. Bain opposed). Would anyone like to make a motion on the conditional use permit?

Mr. Bain: Yes, Madam Chairman. I would like to make a motion to deny conditional use permit application CUP18152429 for Vistas at Ferry Farm.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so there's a motion on the floor to deny the CUP18152429. Do we have a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

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

Mr. Bain: No further comment.

Mr. Vanuch: Commissioner English?

Mr. English: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Mr. Apicella?

*Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019*

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'd like to make some comments. You know, as with any proposed rezoning, and in this case a CUP, we as Planning Commissioners need to evaluate whether the specific proposal meets the mandatory requirements, conforms to the Comp Plan, and is a good fit with the neighbors. On that side of Route 3, there's nothing even close to the size and scope of the proposed 24 units per acre multi-story apartment building. Even at 15 units per acre, I think the density would be exponentially greater than its immediate neighbors. We've asked, and the applicant hasn't limited the number of bedroom units, so there could actually be mostly 2-bedroom units in each of the apartment buildings or there could even be 3- and 4-bedroom units in the apartments... in the apartment buildings. We have also brought up the issue and concern that we have about differences between regular family style apartments and senior apartments. The applicant decided not to add any additional measures in the building that, in my opinion, would support senior living such as wider hallways, additional elevators, and other types of features that would help mitigate injuries. And while they've indicated that they're gonna meet the minimum requirements, I don't believe there's any stipulation that precludes them from exceeding those minimum requirements, which I think in this case might be necessary. Given the parcels' development limitations, the applicant chose to meet their desired maximum density by putting half of the allocated parking directly below the apartments. That's the choice that they made, but that solution pushes the building, in my opinion, an entire floor upwards. So, whether or not it meets the definition of a story of a building, the practical effect of this parking solution, for someone who's parked in a garage, if they live on the top floor, they're gonna have to travel an extra floor of the building just to get to their vehicle. Also, based on the examples that were provided tonight, the average size of a 3-story apartment building is 36 feet. The size of this building, albeit on the back end, is 55 feet. There was a lot of discussion when this original proposal came up to establish the R-5 zoning category about what the appropriate height would be. In my opinion, it's much taller than the Planning Commission and the Board wanted when they changed that maximum height from 65 feet to 3 stories. I think at the time, the then Commissioner Coen wanted it to be somewhere between 25 and 35 feet, and I think it was Mr. Harvey who recommended using story as the basis for measuring the height of the building because that would be an easier methodology to determine height and whether it had been exceeded. I do appreciate the applicant's vision. I just don't believe this is a great site for it, and especially at 24 units per acre. I think it would... it would be a giant in the middle of a rural area. So, for those reasons, Madam Chairman, I support the motion to deny the CUP as well as my same reasoning for denying the rezoning. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Anyone else? No? Okay, go ahead and vote. Motion carries 7 to 0. Thank you guys. Yep, Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Madam Chairman, now that that's behind us, it has raised a couple of issues concerning building heights as Mr. Apicella mentioned. I wonder if the Commission could take under advisement or do some investigation to try and clarify the issue as to whether underground parking should be considered...

Ms. Vanuch: So, it's not on the agenda, we can't really discuss it. But what we can do is add it to the Chairman's Report and then we can request an ordinance from the Board.

Mr. Bain: Okay, alright.

Ms. Vanuch: Yep, I know what you're saying.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Great, thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Ms. Vanuch: Just to keep it in order. Okay, very good. Thank you guys very much.

Audience: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, item number 3 was continued, which is bee apiaries, until October 23rd. Item number 4 and 5 will be discussed on October 23rd. There is no New Business. Planning Director's Report; Mr. Harvey?

3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O19-37 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms;" 28-35, "Table of uses and standards;" and Sec. 28-39, "Special regulations," to allow for the keeping of honeybees (apiaries) within the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District and establish regulations regarding the same. **(Time Limit: December 29, 2019) (Public Hearing continued to October 23, 2019)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O19-04 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 22-60, "Staff review;" Sec. 22-78, "Review and approval;" Sec. 22-89, "Review and Approval;" Sec. 28-185, "Conditional use permits;" Sec. 28-203, "Submission;" Sec. 28-204, "Review;" Sec. 28-251, "Review procedure;" and Sec. 28-252, "Approval or disapproval generally" to establish a time limit for planning applications and to amend the standard for revocation of a conditional use permit. **(Time Limit: December 20, 2019) (History: September 25, 2019 Discussion deferred to October 23, 2019)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: November 13, 2019)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: December 11, 2019)
5. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O19-40 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-59, "Highway Corridor Overlay District (HC)" to require turn lanes for new development at site entrances from corridor highways. **(Time Limit: December 20, 2019) (History: September 25, 2019 Discussion deferred to October 23, 2019)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: November 13, 2019)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: December 11, 2019)

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I do not have a report tonight.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Madam Chairman, I have no report. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. And we have no outstanding committees, and I have no Chairman's Report. Other Business -- we have the TRC on October 23rd. We have approval of minutes for September 11th. Does anyone want to make a motion for that, to approve the minutes?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

6. TRC Information - October 23, 2019
- ◆ Minnieland at South Campus - Aquia Election District
 - ◆ Potomac Church Apartments - Aquia Election District
 - ◆ The Hills at Big Springs - Aquia Election District
 - ◆ Patriots Crossing Car Wash - Garrisonville Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 11, 2019

Mr. Bain: I'll make a motion to approve...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, you weren't... it can only be somebody who was here.

Mr. Bain: Oh, that's right, that's the one I wasn't here.

Mr. Randall: So moved.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by I guess...

Mr. Apicella: Check the record and make sure he was here.

Ms. Vanuch: ... Commissioner Randall and then a second by Commissioner Boswell? Okay. So, everybody abstained who wasn't here.

Mr. Bain: Sorry about that.

Ms. Vanuch: It's okay. Okay, tally the vote. Motion carries 4 to 0 with 3 abstentions (*Mr. Bain, Mr. English, and Ms. Vanuch abstained*). And do we have a motion to approve the September 25th meeting minutes?

September 25, 2019

Mr. Bain: I'll make that motion... I'll do that one then.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, Commissioner Bain made the motion.

Planning Commission Minutes
October 9, 2019

Mr. English: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Second by Commissioner English. Any comment?

Mr. Bain: Nope.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, go ahead and vote. I was there for that one so I can vote. Motion carries 7 to 0.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman?

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, yes?

Mr. Apicella: This may be out of order. Go Nats!

Ms. Vanuch: Oh! Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.