

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
December 11, 2019

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, December 11, 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, Mr. English, Fillmore McPherson, Barton Randall

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Eva Campbell, Amy Taylor, LeAnn Ennis

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Before we move onto Declarations of Disqualification, I would like to introduce a special guest this evening who will be with us until late May. This is Rebecca Chung who is a Youth Engaged in Stafford Program student. She is a senior at Colonial Forge High School and she will be sitting on the Planning Commission and engaging with us and the public to bring her expertise as a student to the Planning Commission. So, thank you very much Miss Chung for joining us this evening, and I hope that you'll get a lot of value out of this in the next year. Moving on -- Declarations of Disqualification; anybody from the Planning Commission have any items on the agenda that they would like to declare or see to?

Mr. English: No ma'am. I'd like to make a motion at this time to make an adjustment to the agenda, if that's possible now.

Ms. Vanuch: Sure.

Mr. English: I'd like to ask that we move number 7 up to number 1.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. So, we have a motion on the floor to move item, under New Business, item number 7 which is the Potomac Church Preliminary Subdivision Plan item to item number 1 on the agenda. Does anybody want to second that?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion and a second. Any discussion gentlemen? Okay, if we want to go ahead and vote. Okay, motion carries 7-0. So, thank you very much on that one. So, now we'll move onto Public Presentations. So, now is the point in time where if anyone from the public would like to come down and speak to the Planning Commission about any item outside of the items that are going up for public hearing. So, if you are here for Westlake or you are here for the Retail at Garrisonville in the Griffis-Widewater District, this is not the time to speak. But if you'd like to come down and speak about anything else outside of those two items, this would be your time to come down. State your name, address, and the district that you reside and you'll get 3 minutes to address the Commission. Anybody? Okay, seeing no one come down, I'm gonna move on to the first item on the agenda, which is now item number 7, if you're following along, which is the New Business item, Potomac Church Farms Preliminary Subdivision Plan. And for this we recognize Ms. LeAnn Ennis, and today is her birthday which is why we cut her some slack and moved her up on the agenda today. So, Ms. Ennis, go ahead.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

NONE

7. SUB18152473; Potomac Church Farms Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan utilizing Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) to create 212 single-family detached lots on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-54, 39-55, and 39-17F, zoned A-1, Agricultural Zoning District, located at the end of Old Potomac Church Road off of Jefferson Davis Highway, within the Aquia Election District. (**Time Limit: February 9, 2020**)

Ms. Ennis: That's funny. Thank you. Madam Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, item number 7 is a preliminary subdivision plan for Potomac Church Farms. It's on Assessor's Parcel... thanks, I forgot to say computer... it's on Assessor's Parcels 39-54, 55, and 17F. It's located at the end of Potomac Church Road. It's approximately 94 acres, and it's currently zoned A-1. It lies within the Aquia Election District. And they are proposing 212 single-family houses. This is the area on the map that... where it's located behind Stafford Hospital and down the road from Abberly. Again, this is the aerial site. It's the 3 parcels right here. The property is located within the TDR, Transfer of Development Rights receiving area of the Comp Plan. TDR for A-1 zoning allows a minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet and a density of 2.25 dwelling units per acre. There'll be 181 development rights that will be obtained from the Crow's Nest Harbour area, a designated sending area on the Comp... from the Comp Plan. The preliminary plan is proposing a total of 212 lots with a minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet. There's 50 acres of open space. All the lots will be served by public water and sewer. There's two stormwater filtration system devices. There's wetland and RPA will remain undisturbed north of the property. So, the RPA is right here, and this is all the open space area. There's some through here, too. The property is to be served by roads that will be built to VDOT standards; so they'll be state-maintained roads, including curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The development requires four points of access based on the number of units. An exception was granted due to environmental constraints and topography. VDOT also granted a waiver of the SSAR for the same reason. The Fire Marshal's Office has put a restriction on the number of OP's, occupancy permits, permitted until the secondary access is constructed. The secondary access point is right here. Staff believes the plan meets all the applicable code requirements, and a typo, and recommends approval for this preliminary plan approval. Any questions?

Mr. English: LeAnn, where's Courthouse Road in connection with this?

Ms. Ennis: Courthouse Road is over this area. This is Potomac... this is Potomac Church Road. So, it's up off the screen.

Mr. English: Okay, so it's running off Potomac... okay.

Ms. Ennis: Mm-hmm. This is at the very end, so Abberly is here and it's at the very end of it.

Mr. English: You don't know what kind of houses they're going to be? You don't have any rendering of what they'll look like?

Ms. Ennis: Just single-family rambler... I mean, single-family houses is all I know. The developer here and I can defer it to him if you'd like.

Mr. English: Okay, that's fine, that's fine, yep.

Mr. Bain: LeAnn, are there any tot lots or recreational areas proposed? I see nothing on the diagram you have up. Two hundred and twelve units is a lot.

Ms. Ennis: Yeah, there's no amenities that I remember seeing on the plan. They do... they are proposing an easement for a bike trail through this area here. This is a waterline easement that they have, and they're going to put the bike trail... or proposing an easement to put it there.

Mr. Bain: If there's already a waterline there, that doesn't seem to me to be much of a improvement or offer for recreational activities. The waterline is going to be maintained by the County water company, so it just seems to me 212 units with no recreational... no tot lots, seems very minimalistic and I think that...

Ms. Ennis: I will defer that to the developer as well.

Mr. Bain: Thank you.

Ms. Ennis: Mm-hmm. Any other questions?

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? No?

Mr. McPherson: Just to clarify, the waterline is not there right now, right?

Ms. Ennis: No. Utilities has... yeah, I don't think the... it's not in yet. I think it's under construction or proposed.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. Madam Chairman, Ms. Ennis is correct that it's a sewer that's being constructed...

Ms. Ennis: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Harvey: ... through that area. It's currently been... bidding is under construction.

Mr. McPherson: So, there's a sewer line there now and they're putting in another line?

Mr. Harvey: It's being installed now.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: And there'll be two sewer lines; one is a gravity line that goes to a pump station that's also being constructed, and then there'll be a force main which would send the sewer back towards the courthouse area.

Ms. Ennis: It was... on the bike trail, there were meetings just to let you know. There were meetings with Parks and Rec and stuff on the maintenance and construction of that. So there is some coordination going on... ongoing and maintenance of that bike, you know, bicycle trail easement and the connection.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman?

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Sherman is, I see the email address so does that mean he's with Tricord Homes?

Ms. Ennis: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Do we know if they're going to phase the development over some period of time, or is it going to be built out in a year, year and a half?

Ms. Ennis: No, there's six sections of it and that usually takes, you know, they'll do sections at a time so. But I will let Mr. ... Mr. Hall is here representing Tricord so I will let him tell you their timeframe.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Ms. Vanuch: Any more questions for Ms. Ennis?

Mr. Randall: I have one more question, and I'm not sure... so, for TDR... transfer of TDR rights, would they still be following the same subdivision requirements as far as setbacks, as far as distance from homes and all those things?

Ms. Ennis: Yes, they do have requirements and we'll catch that on the construction plan and the plats of what their setbacks -- I don't know what they are right off the top of my head, but they do have zoning setback requirements, just like any other zoning does.

Mr. Randall: Did they say why there was such a reason why they wanted to I guess stuff as many homes as possible into this area? It doesn't look like there's a whole lot of room to do much of anything other than...

Ms. Ennis: Well, this is a receiving area. This is in the area...

Mr. Randall: I understand.

Ms. Ennis: ... so I will defer that to Mr. Hall as well.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Ms. Ennis: But it is a receiving area for the... from the Comp Plan.

Mr. Randall: No, I recognize that, I understand that. But it's their site plan, right? They don't have to have 212 homes. They could have as minimum as, you know, 50, right?

Ms. Ennis: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: But they put 212, they stuffed them in it looks like pretty clearly with no recreational amenities, no tot lots, no play areas. You know, I don't know how wide the roads are going to be. Probably not wide enough to park on the side of the road and get two cars between the roads... between the cars. It doesn't look like this is pretty advantageous to the County if we're looking at having family... family oriented developments; this surely doesn't look like one of 'em, in my opinion. So, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, can I just piggyback off that question?

Ms. Vanuch: Of course.

Mr. Apicella: I mean, this is all very informative as the County may move forward on future TDR changes and switches between certain areas. I'm curious -- what's the average lot size?

Ms. Ennis: Sixty-five hundred square feet.

Mr. Apicella: Is... okay, well, that says that's the minimum. But what is the actual...

Ms. Ennis: I think they're...

Mr. Apicella: So, they're just doing the minimum?

Ms. Ennis: Yeah. Yes, according to the preliminary plan.

Mr. Apicella: And help me understand, what is that in terms of point-something-something per acre? Number of units?

Ms. Ennis: It's 2.25.

Mr. Apicella: What's that?

Ms. Ennis: 2.25 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Apicella: But there's obviously going to be more than 2.25 units per acre if it's 65... I mean, an acre's 40,000, about 40,000 square feet, right? So, if it's 6,500 square feet, what's the math there?

Ms. Ennis: I need to look at the preliminary and look at that. That was all in the table there.

Mr. Apicella: I see Jeff with his handy calculator over there.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, Commissioner Apicella, the... if you're looking for the proportion of an acre, that's 6,500 square feet. Comprised, it's approximately .149 acres.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Unknown speaker - microphone not on: Per lot.

Mr. Harvey: Per lot, correct.

Ms. Vanuch: Any more questions for Ms. Ennis? Oh, go ahead.

Mr. Bain: Well, just a comment. So, there's 50 acres of open space; I presume it's all that perimeter land.

Ms. Ennis: The majority of it is.

Mr. Bain: I haven't been to the site. I apologize for that. But I assume that's too steep to develop or else they would've put more or done something out there. But it just seems to me that that might be an area where they could consider some recreational activities. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anybody else? Okay, thank you. Would the applicant like to come up and speak?

Mr. King: Good evening Madam Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. I'm Mark King with Bowman Consulting. We're the Civil Engineer. Tim Hall is here from Tricord. Trying to answer some of these questions here, the project site's a little over 94 acres. Based on the County Ordinance, you're allowed 2.25 units per acre, which is exactly what this works out to be is 2.25 units per acre. So, we're right at what is allowed. Answer Mr. Bain's question, the property is surrounded on the east side and on the south by Black Run Creek and Accokeek Creek. And both of those contain wetlands, RPA, there are steep slopes out there, as you can imagine. On the west side of the property it's bordered by an overhead transmission line for Dominion Power. So, we're kind of putting the lots kind of outside of the critical areas of slopes, wetlands, RPAs, power easements, and all. We also, as we went through this and as Jeff has explained, there is a pump station that the County designed with gravity sewer and a force main. Part of the reason with some of the recreational areas, we worked with the County to help relocate that pump station to this site when they were having issues with some property owners and acquisition of easements and the ability to put that in. So, we shifted the pump station; they were a little bit further west towards Route 1. And so we actually worked together. It was very, you know, very good teaming effort with the County, with their engineer and Tricord and Bowman. And we just kind of off of the property where you can see the pump station, but it's in a like a logical place to put some recreational amenities. And you've got a bunch of sewer lines, we've got stormwater management ponds down in that neck of the woods so. There's no, as Mr. Randall had asked, it's, you know, trying to manage what we can do, how do you make this work with the dirt balance with water and sewer and, you know, just trying to hit all the minimum standards for these TDRs. There are very few TDR areas in the County. Most of them are here in the Aquia District. This happens to be one of them; there's another one... two other ones just north of here. One of them has an apartment complex that we were processing 144 unit apartment complex that's under the same TDR Ordinance and, you know, just the math happened to work out and it just... it really has been very little room on here with the constraints of a pump station and the wetlands and the floodplains and everything else that's associated with it. I think Mr. Apicella had asked, this plan that was up here on the screen, it actually shows 5 phases, roughly 40 to 50 lots per phase. We can only do up to 199 units until we have the secondary access in place. And we've been working with an offsite property owner, the Butler property, for the easements that we need to put in this access road, as well as Germanna Community College. And both of them are on board; Tricord is finalizing the agreements and the documentation for it. So, this will be developed with 199 units until we get everything squared away. And it's an emergency access, so you're talking about a gravel... a gravel road, compacted gravel road that'll carry a fire engine, ladder truck, emergency vehicles. And so it's not going to be a road that's accessed on a... on a daily basis; this is going to be a temporary... not temporary but an access for emergency vehicles only, in case there's an emergency and Old Potomac Church Road is blocked. I think I've got everybody's question; I may be missing one.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. English, go ahead.

Mr. English: So, Mark, what you're telling... I mean, this is going to be past Marion Manor?

Mr. King: Yes, this is to the south of it, it goes down.

Mr. English: You go past Marion Manor on the other side of Marion Manor.

Mr. King: Yes, and this will be also south of Abberly apartments.

Mr. English: Yeah, there are some deep slopes over in there.

Mr. King: Yeah, yeah, it is. I mean, we're actually building on top of the hill...

Mr. English: Oh, I know you are.

Mr. King: ... to make this thing work and, you know, believe it or not, we only have one... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. English: So, is it gonna like... if you build it, is it gonna go around those apartments, too, or is it just gonna go...?

Mr. King: It's gonna go straight past the apartments.

Mr. English: So, you're not gonna be able to... I guess my question is, you go down there to the Marion Manor, go all the way to the end, and you're not going to be able to cut up and come through the apartment complex at all. There's not going to be any access there at all.

Mr. King: The only access we have is you go all the way out to Hospital Boulevard or we can come up and turn left on South Campus.

Mr. English: Okay, so it's... alright.

Mr. King: So, we're not going to go through the apartments there.

Mr. English: No, I mean, no, but I mean is it gonna I guess meet up with that road I guess is what I...

Mr. King: It does in kind of a roundabout way. You know, the apartments can use South Campus Boulevard as well.

Mr. English: So, that pump station you're talking about, it's almost at the end of Potomac Run...

Mr. King: Yeah, it's right at the confluence of Accokeek Creek and there was a, I guess, access at one point to the historic park at the end down there. We found, when we were doing some survey work out there, there was some, looks like some old abutments to a bridge at one point.

Mr. English: Has the cemetery people looked at that?

Mr. King: Yes. There is actually a cemetery that's onsite; it's up in the northeastern corner of it. Anita Dodd went out. And we discovered it when we were doing our environmental work. Our environmental group kinda found something that looked like footstones and headstones, you know, actual stones. So, Anita went out and looked at it and she marked the limits of the cemetery and then we went out and physically located it on the ground, so we knew exactly where it was. It has a 30... we have a 35-foot buffer, you know, around it so.

Ms. Vanuch: You done? Mr. McPherson, I know you had some questions.

Mr. McPherson: Yes. Regarding that easement that Ms. Ennis has talked about for the water lines, can you tell me what coordination you've done with the County and what that easement is supporting and what's underneath that easement?

Mr. King: The, uh... you're talking about the sewer line?

Mr. McPherson: Is it a sewer or water line?

Mr. King: It's sewer.

Mr. McPherson: Sewer only.

Mr. King: It's sewer, it's sewer only. There's a gravity sewer, I think it's a 15 or 18-inch gravity sewer. It comes in two different ways. It comes from north to south through the pump station and from west to east. This is... this is going to replace a pump station, an existing pump station that's currently down at Route 1 by the Rowser Building.

Mr. McPherson: Right.

Mr. King: So, that's going to come offline and the County has worked on this for a number of years to obtain the easements. It's under construction; Kelvic Construction actually won that award. And, if I understand it correctly, I think WC Spratt was the pump station. At least they were the low bidder. I don't think it's been awarded yet, but they've been out there working on this since September 3rd.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. King: At least the gravity and the force main. But it's a combination, about a 30-foot wide easement that goes down there along the creek.

Mr. McPherson: Are you paying for the sewer lines?

Mr. King: No. That is something the County is doing. It's a Capital Improvement Project that they're doing. I mean, we're going to tie into... we're going to pay for it one way or the other. We've gotta pay pro rata share.

Ms. Vanuch: Well, you have to do that.

Mr. King: Yeah, yeah, we have to pay pro...

Ms. Vanuch: It's not optional.

Mr. King: Yeah, we have to pay pro rata share and, yeah, you've got tap fees, water and sewer tap fees so. In a roundabout way, yes, we pay for it just like everybody else would pay for it.

Mr. McPherson: Okay. So, now on top of those sewer lines, there have been discussions about our pedestrian trails.

Mr. King: Mm-hmm.

Mr. McPherson: What are you willing to do to support the County in creating a pedestrian trail across that easement, since it's already an easement, it can't be used for anything else anyway because there's sewer line under it.

Mr. King: We... we were... we had been working as LeAnn had mentioned, we had several meetings. We had one big meeting here at the County; Jeff was a part of that and LeAnn was a part of it. I think everybody in the County was a part of it, and Utilities, etcetera. There was discussion about a Comp Plan improvement that showed up in September, I guess, approval for a bike path. And I think it was determined by the County Attorney that based on State Code, it wasn't something that could be required to be built by the property owner. So, the County Planning staff had asked and requested could we at least give them an easement where, at some point in the future through grants or what have you for the County, that that could be built and Tricord agreed to that.

Mr. McPherson: Isn't it the same easement where the sewer line runs though?

Mr. King: It's, uh, yes.

Mr. McPherson: So, it's the same easement. The easement would have to be there anyway.

Mr. King: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Okay. So, that easement would have had to happen in the first place regardless.

Mr. King: It would not be for a trail. This would be an ingress/egress easement for a bike path. It'll be specified on the construction plan and on the plat. You know, the easement was a sewer easement.

Mr. McPherson: Right.

Mr. King: And the Utilities Department said that, you know, they would allow, you know, any type of a bike path to be placed in the outer portions of the easement.

Mr. McPherson: Right, so...

Mr. King: It's a 16-foot easement.

Mr. McPherson: My point being though is there's already sewer lines on the easement; there's not a whole lot you can do there building anyway, so, you know, my ask is were you willing to do any contributions towards the building of this path, bicycle, pedestrian, or otherwise, since as you talked about it's the TDR rights, you don't have a lot of options as far as tot lots, dog parks, and anything else. That could be something that would definitely offset that.

Mr. King: Well, I understand the question. We are also being asked to extend waterline, about 900 feet of waterline that is not necessarily our need, which would be about a hundred grand. Because County Utilities asked for it, Tricord said fine, we'll do it. It's our opinion we have the fire flows, we have the pressures; we don't have to do that. Tricord said sure, we can do it. It's along Old Potomac Church Road by the water tank. We're also having to improve Old Potomac Church Road near the... where the Germanna Community College, the nursing school program, and I guess in a convoluted

way at one point there was no right-of-way that was dedicated there, so Germanna, Don Hart I think was the developer on that, did not have to bring that Potomac... Old Potomac Church Road up to standards. So, last man in, now we're being asked by VDOT and the County that you gotta bring it up to standards, so there's another large cost. I have no idea what the cost would be to do this bike trail; it would be expensive. And I don't think it's something that... I don't want to speak for Tim, he's here... but it was discussed and their preference was not to go and spend more money on something that is not... cannot be required at this point. I'm saying that in a nice way. I don't want it to be taken that, you know... I think Tricord has done what they feel they can do to spend additional monies where those things could be handled by VDOT, it could be handled by the County, and they're willing to spend, you know, probably a quarter of a million dollars of their own money to improve... you know, add an additional water line that we don't really need. And they've even said, we can't...

Mr. McPherson: Was it a hundred thousand or a quarter million? You said a hundred thousand.

Mr. King: The road, as well. The road is going to be somewhere around 150,000 to improve it; add curb and gutter. The road was built incorrectly. It wasn't built in the center of the right-of-way, so there's... we've got to kinda shift things around on the road. There's a storm sewer that'll have to be added because...

Ms. Vanuch: These are all things that every developer has to... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Mr. King: Absolutely.

Ms. Vanuch: So it's not like you're going above and beyond.

Mr. King: No, no, we're not.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella, do you have a question?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Kinda piggybacking off of Mr. Bain's question, I think probably Mr. Randall's concern that he's raised a couple times about developments not providing recreational amenities. So, what's the average cost of a tot lot?

Mr. King: Maybe... this is a guess on my part, anywhere... somewhere I'd say between 50-60 grand.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And how big would a tot lot be? The average size?

Mr. King: Depends on what you put in it. It's usually... we usually do it and show it kind of is a circled area and really, off the top of my head, I don't know what the radius of that would be.

Mr. Apicella: And... I mean, my sense is that having a tot lot or something like that in a community is... has some market value when you're trying to sell houses, given that there's nothing else close by.

Mr. King: Yeah, it could, yes.

Mr. Apicella: So... can we get the GDP back up?

Mr. King: It's up, it's up.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so, it doesn't... it's not showing up on here, but I'm looking at my Attachment 2, page 1 of 1, I'm looking at the area under Sheet 8. I see where the RPA and the wetlands are, but I see a big swath of land that doesn't have anything on it. And then I'm looking at what, again, on my sheet of paper it says Sheet 10, certainly a tot lot smaller than it could be, smaller than the size of one of these lots for these houses. You're telling me that you can't find any place anywhere on this property for a tot lot?

Mr. King: It would take... it would take some grading...

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. King: ... to be able to flatten out a place. One thing I was pointing out to Mr. Hall was, if you look, uh, look down to where LeAnn has drawn the red lines, there's a kind of a stub road that kinda goes to the west. There could be some grading that is done in that general area behind those lots that could be made big enough for a tot lot.

Mr. Apicella: Well, again, I know it's not something... this is effectively a by-right development since it's a TDR transfer, but I think it's to your advantage, it's to the residents advantage, I think it's to the County's advantage for you to put some sort of recreational amenity there. And I, again, can't require you to do it but I would ask you to strongly try to. And I think that's a view shared by other Planning Commissioners as well. Yes? No?

Mr. Randall: To piggyback on that...

Mr. King: Go ahead, Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: I guess the answer I have is... I guess the question I have for you is, your job is to build as many homes as possible on a piece of property to increase your value. And our job is to make sure that we make it right for Stafford County. And I'm not sure at this point in time that we're even on the same page, you know. The answer would be to take 3 or 4 houses right out of the middle of this and put a recreational area right in the middle of it that would be accessible to every person that's in that community without having to leave the community to go somewhere else for recreation, you know. How much of the 50 acres that we say is open space is gonna be available for the community to use for recreation? I would submit probably very few... very little of it is actually gonna be available for kids to go out and play, throw a football, throw a baseball, in that open space because it's gonna be not cleared, it's gonna be steep, it's gonna have issues; that looking at it now, there's absolutely no place for kids to go play -- none. And I find that really hard to imagine to come into Stafford County, try to keep Stafford County a friendly... family friendly community, and you present to us. It is by-right; I grant you, it is by-right. But this is... this is not taking the Stafford County residents into any consideration at all. And I have a big problem with that, you know. We're supposed to work together, you and us, together, work together to make what's best for Stafford County. And this is not what's best for Stafford County. The lots are small, the houses are gonna be small, we stuffed them in as much as possible to get to right to our 2.25 units per acre. Really? Is that all we're here for? That doesn't seem like it's a very good benefit to Stafford County, right? I can't stop you from doing it. I can't change this. But this is a problem. This is why we have such a problem we have in Stafford County. They're all jammed in together and there's no open space to play, there's no place to go inside the community to go do anything. You have to go out... you have to get on the roads, you have to impact traffic to take your kids to the park, to take your kids to go play. Because, when these are built, there's nothing there and I find that reprehensible. So, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. So, any other questions or comments? Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: I just do have one other thing. So, back to the point maybe for the road improvements and this water line which, you know, obviously benefits you as something that you'd probably be doing anyway, so I would like to go back and, regarding the path you said that yes, it'd be very expensive, what about a connection from your neighborhood to the pedestrian path, the bicycle pedestrian path? Would you be willing to make a connection so the people could easily get to it without having to walk across, you know, RPA or something of that nature?

Mr. King: We are, with that same 16-foot easement, we are bringing... I hope this thing's still working... um, we are bringing the path up through here to get to the road. And this area is clear and it goes over top of a stormwater... a dam for a stormwater management pond that's about a 12-foot wide flat area on top. So, we are providing the same access, you know, easement that runs all along here, all the way down... this kind of goes off... this property extends...

Mr. McPherson: Which... you're not drawing.

Mr. King: Well, the property keeps going this way.

Mr. McPherson: That's a sewer line.

Mr. King: It is a sewer line, but the property itself goes way down much further than what's being shown on here. And we're providing that same easement from one end of the property to the other end. Unless I'm misunderstanding your question. And just to say, on the water line, it is not required by this developer. We meet all the requirements the Utilities Department asked us to do it, even though it should be a Capital Improvements project which we pay pro rata share to go in to do these type of things. They asked Tricord to do it and they said we would do it. It's not a...

Mr. McPherson: You also benefit from it, too.

Mr. King: We do not.

Mr. McPherson: You do not benefit from the water line.

Mr. King: No. We don't need it. It's got plenty of pressure, there's plenty of flow.

Ms. Vanuch: Are they asking you to do it just because they're asking you? Or are they asking you because they've deemed the way that they read the regulations that you should upgrade it based on the requirements that the County would need to service your project and others?

Mr. King: The problem that you get into is, as people come in and out of the County and reviewers, everybody looks at things differently.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, just answer the question yes or no. I mean, are they asking you to do it for the goodness of their heart for you to do it or are they asking you because they're reading the regulations that your... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. King: They're asking us to do it and we're... Tricord is going to do it out of the goodness of their heart if that's how you want to put it.

Ms. Vanuch: I would love to confirm that with Jason Towery in Public Works.

Mr. King: Please do, because we sat in a meeting with 25 people and they said you're right, you don't have to do it, we would like for it to be done.

Ms. Vanuch: Because I just sat in a TRC meeting today and the developer said they don't have to put in a dry hydrant. I called the Fire Marshal and he said no, we asked them to because they're required to.

Mr. King: No, you are with a dry hydrant.

Ms. Vanuch: Because it's the way that they read the ordinance differently. So, I want to make sure it's not one of these situations.

Mr. King: It's not. We've had that. Aref was the representative from the Utilities Department in that meeting. Mr. Harvey was in that meeting; he can attest to it. It's not something we need to do. And in their defense, they have not seen the... *inaudible*... flow and the water analysis because we don't do that until we get to the construction plan. So, we confirmed that with him and sent him a copy of it. So, at that meeting, he said you don't have to do it. Tricord said we committed to do it so we're going to do it. You know, does it help everybody there, going back to Mr. Randall's thing, make it better for Stafford County? It does. Do we need it? No.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anybody... Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I guess I still didn't... I heard you sort of nodding it's possible, but I really didn't hear yeah, I think we can do it, on the tot lot. So, where are we on it?

Mr. King: Mr. Hall said he would do that at the end of that where we circled on the other map.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. King: And we would do that and show that on the construction plan.

Mr. Apicella: Great, thanks so much.

Mr. King: That'll work.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Anybody else? Alright, thank you.

Mr. King: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anybody else have any questions for staff? Okay. Mr. McPherson, this is in your district and this is not a public hearing.

Mr. McPherson: Madam Chair, I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SUB18152473, the Potomac Church Farms Preliminary Subdivision Plan, with the addition that was verbally said that they would add the tot lot where they drew it. And since it's not on the subdivision plan, please note this is being recorded...

Mr. King: We will do it, no problem.

Mr. McPherson: ... I move to recommend approval.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'll second that.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion on the floor to approve the preliminary plan with the amendment to add the tot lot; motion by Mr. McPherson, second by Commissioner Apicella. Any comments Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: No more.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Again, I appreciate that you're adding a tot lot. I think that's going to be good for everybody and, you didn't have to do it but you did. So, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Okay, go ahead and vote. The motion carries 4-3 (*Ms. Vanuch, Mr. Randall, and Mr. English opposed*). Okay, Ms. Ennis, have a wonderful birthday. Sorry that took a little longer than we thought it was going to. See you guys later. Okay, now moving on to item number 1 on the agenda, it's labeled number 1 which is the Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan for Westlake. And this is going to be a presentation by Mr. Mike Zuraf and it will be all 3 items, number 1, 2, and 3, presented together. And just before you start, I just want to kinda... because I'm sure that some people in the audience are here for Westlake. The developer has asked for a deferral until the end of January, our second meeting there. The intent is to do a community meeting, and I'm going to let Commissioner English speak about that.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. COM17151763; Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan - Westlake - A proposal to amend the "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036," adopted on August 16, 2016, regarding future land use designations that would support higher density residential development on a portion of the proposed Westlake development. The proposed amendment would modify Chapter 3, "The Land Use Plan," to amend the maps entitled Figure 3.1, "Urban Services Areas" and Figure 3.6, "Future Land Use" (collectively, the "Maps"). The proposed changes would amend the Maps by changing the future land use designation on Tax Map Parcel No. 35-22 (Property) from Agricultural/Rural to Suburban and amending the Urban Services Area limits to incorporate the Property into the Urban Services Area. The Property consists of 87.6 acres, located at the terminus of Jack Ellington Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of Richards Ferry Road, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: January 31, 2020) (History: October 23, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to December 11, 2019)**
2. RC17151895; Reclassification - Westlake Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 35-20, 35-20A, 35-21, 35K-1A-1, 35K-1A-2, 35K-1A-3, 35K-1A-4, 35K-1A-5, 35K-1A-6, 35K-1A-7, 35K-1A-8, 35K-1A-9, 35K-1A-10, 35K-1A-11, 35K-1A-12, 35K-1A-13, 35K-1A-14, 35K-1A-15, 35K-1A-16, 35K-1A-17, 35K-1A-18, 35K-1A-19, 35K-1A-20, 35K-1A-21, 35K-1A-22, 35K-1A-23, 35K-1A-24, 35K-1A-25, 35K-1A-26, 35K-1A-A, 35K-1A-A1, and 35K-1A-B, 35K-1A-CC, 35K-1A-JJ, and 35K-1A-KK

(Property), zoned R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District and R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density Zoning District, to remove site dedication and improvement requirements and update the terms for the development of the project. The Property consists of approximately 482.01 acres and is located at the southern terminus of Cedar Grove Road, along planned Brigade Boulevard, approximately 3,200 feet west of Warrenton Road, and along the west side of Horsepen Run, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: January 31, 2020)**
(History: October 23, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to December 11, 2019)

3. RC17151764; Reclassification - Westlake - A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the R-3, Urban Residential – High Density Zoning District, on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 35-31 (Westlake Parcel) consisting of 65.0 acres, to allow for the development of 280 townhouse dwelling units; and from the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District to the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 35-22 (Crucible Parcel) consisting of 87.6 acres, to allow for the development of 120 single-family dwelling units. The Westlake Parcel and the Crucible Parcel are hereinafter collectively referred to as “the Property.” The Westlake Parcel is located at the southern terminus of Cedar Grove Road, approximately 1,500 feet south of Warrenton Road. The Crucible Parcel is located at the terminus of Jack Ellington Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of Richards Ferry Road. The Property is located within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: January 31, 2020)**
(History: October 23, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to December 11, 2019)

Mr. English: Yeah, anybody that’s here for Westlake, they’re more than glad to speak tonight. But I am going to have a community meeting on this on January the 13th at 7 o’clock at Hartwood Elementary School. So, you can make comments tonight but I am going to have another meeting for that, open to the community with staff there to explain everything. And also with... the Westlake people are going to be there also to answer questions, okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so with that being said, Mr. Zuraf is gonna hit high level some of the items and then we’re gonna still have the public hearing. So, if you feel compelled to speak, you’re more than welcome to speak and take your 3 minutes, but we intend to keep this public hearing open, like Commissioner English said, all the way through January and you’ll have another chance to speak then. But the developer won’t be here tonight to answer any questions. So, if you don’t want to talk, you don’t have to and you can express it. The reason we do these community meetings is that it gives you a much easier time to go back and forth with the developer instead of this very formal setting where you only get 3 minutes; you have to say your comments and then we have to ask your questions for you. A community meeting allows you to touch and feel the maps, ask the developer questions directly, talk about the impacts to your subdivisions, to your homes, to your roads and the things that you care about, more on a one-to-one ratio. And then your Planning Commissioner is there as well to kinda help you through the process. So it’s a little more informal and I’ve really found them to be very much more educational so that way it’s not like a public hearing here in front of the Planning Commission. So, with all of that said, Mr. Zuraf, go ahead.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. Good evening Madam Chairman, members of the Planning Commission; Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. And to provide a brief summary of the first three items on the agenda relating to Westlake. So, going through a quick summary of the three requests, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment would amend the Future Land Use Map designation on the Crucible parcel from Agricultural and Rural to Suburban, and also amend the Urban Services Area map to expand the Urban Services Area to include that same parcel. The rezoning request would

rezone the Westlake parcel from M-1, Light Industrial and B-2, Urban Commercial zoning to R-3, Urban Residential zoning for up to 280 townhomes. Then a second part of that same rezoning is to rezone the Crucible parcel from M-1, Light Industrial to R-1, Suburban Residential for up to 120 single-family detached units. And then there's the last item, the Proffer Amendment request would amend proffered conditions on properties that are zoned R-1, Suburban, and R-2, Urban Residential, to remove site dedication and improvement requirements and update some of the other terms of the development of the project. So, this map helps to kind of describe the location of all these actions and I'll help to point them out. So, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment would apply to the Crucible parcel alone, that's in this lower corner and highlighted in blue and then I'm circling in red; that's the Crucible parcel that's subject to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The rezoning request that I mentioned, there's two separate areas that also includes that Crucible property where the 120 single-family detached homes are proposed. That property covers 87.6 acres. And then the second part is the other Westlake parcel in the other upper corner in this location. This is where the 280 townhomes would be proposed and that area covers 65 acres. The... as far as location, Warrenton Road is in this location. You have Cedar Grove Road in this location, and Jack Ellington Road off of Richards Ferry is over here. So, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, you have... this is an image of the Future Land Use Map in its current state. The site's highlighted... the Crucible site is highlighted in blue, and that light green reflects Agricultural/Rural future land use. The red line surrounding the yellow area is the Urban Services Area boundary. And this is the current situation. So, the proposal would change that site to Suburban and expand the Urban Services Area to include the Crucible parcel. So, the rezoning, again, two pieces of land that are subject to this. So, again, you have the... so the Westlake parcel in the upper right corner, that is currently zoned B-2; that's red shading. And the light blue is the M-1, Light Industrial shading on the current zoning map. In 2006, that site was part of a proffer amendment that relocated a 55-acre public land dedication requirement in Westlake to this site. And the Crucible parcel property was zoned to M-1, Light Industrial, as part of a County-initiated Comp Plan rezoning in 1978 and that, as you can see in light blue, is Light Industrial. The General Development... this is the General Development Plan for the 280 single-family attached townhouse units on the Westlake parcel. Access is off of two entrances from future Brigade Boulevard, and then an additional gated access for emergency access off of Clark Patton Road. The 280 lots are equivalent to a density of 4.3 dwelling units per acre overall on the site. There's also a planned water tank that is required with the overall development of all the homes that are proposed, and that would be located on the eastern side of the site in this location. Here's the General Development Plan for the 120 single-family detached units on the Crucible parcel. Access to the property would be provided through two inter-parcel street connections into the already approved Westlake subdivision in that location. There's also a potential connection point off of Jack Ellington Road in that location. The applicant is looking into the potential of not providing any connection or access via Jack Ellington, and the proposed 120 lots is equivalent to a density of 1.37 units per acre. So, in the last part, the Proffer Amendment, this is the zoning map of the original Westlake residential development site, zoned R-1. That's the yellow shaded area and R-2 is the orange shaded area. This was zoned back in 1989 as part of the larger Westlake development site. I had mentioned in 2006 the... originally there was a 55-acre public use site in this corner and then in 2006 that was through a proffer amendment relocated and increased to 65 acres in this area. This is the approved preliminary subdivision plan that already permits 701 single-family residential lots on that property. A section of the subdivision has been platted and construction infrastructure plans are nearing approval. To date, there's no development on the site. I already summarized the proposed proffer amendments at the last public hearing, but I'll point out the main amendment proposed is to delete the requirement to dedicate that 65-acre site to the County for public use or a school. This is then also tied with an amendment that would tie it to the concurrent rezoning of that site to the R-3 zone for the 280 townhomes. And then, also, another amendment would provide a million dollars in cash contribution to offset the removal of the public dedication and public use site.

And timing of the payment would be within 30 days of Community Development Authority financing or prior to the 350th dwelling unit in this 700-lot section. So, at the last public hearing on October 23rd, there were some requests for additional information and questions raised. I'll quickly go through those near the end of my presentation. The first point or core request was where the location of the Crucible site sits in relation to the Piedmont Groundwater Study well yield maps. I'll just point, the study did identify... so, for background, the study identifies where well yields are high, moderate, or low in the Piedmont Aquifer region of the County. And, according to the map, the Crucible site is located in an area with high well yield potential. On the second point, there was a request for the Commissioner of Revenue's office to review and get comments of the applicant's appraisal of the Westlake public use school site. We did send you a separate email with their comments on that and, according to the Commissioner of Revenue's office, they believe that the appraisal does appear to produce a reasonable value with thought out reasonable adjustments based on the subject's location and lack of utilities at this time. They do point out that the appraisal values are on an as is basis with its current M-1 zoning in place and they do note that if the zoning was to change to a residential use, that would produce a higher value on the property based on the current demand in Stafford County for residential. On the third point, there was a question if the schools division had an idea of what it would cost them to purchase a similar size parcel. They do not have an anticipated cost figure at this time. They did point out that they'd have a better idea next year as they begin work with a land consultant to help identify potential school sites in this care of the County. And the fourth point, there was a request for prior noise studies on the Crucible site. During the review of the previous Crucible conditional use permit, there were three different noise studies prepared; one initially by the applicant, then the County went out and measured... did noise readings, and then Westlake property owners as well prepared a noise study. And we did provide those different studies as attachments to the rezoning staff report. On the fifth point, a request for an explanation of the variation in school proffers between the Crucible site and the Westlake site. To remind you, the applicant had proposed cash proffers for school impacts of approximately \$7,500 per townhouse unit, but \$28,000 per single-family detached unit. There are two factors that cause that difference; first, the townhouse units are found to generate fewer students per unit compared to single-family units and so that results in a lower cost per unit. And then, to add on top of that, the project is mitigating for the number of students in excess of the available capacity; because there is capacity, some capacity at the available schools where this project would feed into. So, that available capacity is discounted from the townhouse units first. And so this further reduction in the number of students per townhouse... you know, this further reduces the number of students in the townhouse units. And since all the available capacity is discounted from the townhouse units, there's no further reduction from the single-family units, so that further creates that difference. On the last point, after the last public hearing on October 3rd, updated school attendance data was released by the school division. This resulted in new capacity numbers at the receiving schools and changed the impact, and would require reasonable cash proffer amounts to be adjusted. I provided that information to the applicant, and I understand they are working on revising their reasonable cash proffer amounts to follow the latest data provided by the schools. And this concludes my presentation.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Zuraf? Remembering that we're deferring this till January.

Mr. Randall: Really? I haven't heard that before. Is there a particular reason why that land that was dedicated and then proffer changed in 2006 has not been dedicated to the County so far?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, my understanding is just because that site, it basically is an undeveloped state and really there's limited access to there now, and also limited utilities. That site's really going to rely on

the developer in that area getting the utilities out. As mentioned in the last meeting, there are more than 2 miles of improvements of sewer line and water line improvements, so.

Mr. Randall: Right, but that's already going in because they're building the Westlake development, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Randall: And those lines would go right by this new property.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. Randall: Correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right.

Mr. Randall: Would that, with building the new lines, would that increase the value of the property? The property value that... assessment that we had was based on the fact that there was no water and sewer. They're building the lines... next year the lines will be built, you know. Would that increase the value of that property?

Mr. Zuraf: Not with the current restriction of it being a public use site. If it was changed to residential or some other use, some other commercial use, then yes, it would increase the value.

Mr. Randall: So, hypothetically, if the County had that land and the County decided to rezone that land to residential and sell it to somebody, do you think we would get more than a million dollars?

Mr. Zuraf: I would think you would.

Mr. Randall: Oh yeah, for sure, for sure.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: The question I have is why hasn't the County done that? I mean, I know they're not in the business of gaining land and selling land, but you would think if they're dedicating 65 acres to us that we would take that acreage for sure, in the Urban Services Area in Stafford County, and do what we would need to do to it to make that valuable property, and then sell it to somebody and take that money for, you know, roads, for... to help build a new school.

Mr. Zuraf: I don't know why that hasn't been done.

Mr. Randall: No, it hasn't been done, true. I got that. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall, I think it's a great idea. So that 65-acre site, that's for a high school or was it supposed to be for a high school?

Mr. Zuraf: I think that was the intent at the time.

Mr. Apicella: What's the current plan for having the next high school built?

Mr. Zuraf: I think the... from my understanding is they're looking at a site that's over a hundred acres. Actually 75 acres is what I think their target is.

Mr. Apicella: So, this site isn't even big enough for a high school.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Putting that aside, I had a kinda back and forth with Mr. Payne about the limitation on the use of that proffer money for schools and, again, not knowing when we're gonna need that million dollars for a high school or some other school. I asked whether or not there could be some flexibility in the proffers to utilize that million dollars for other... some other public use. We never really came to some conclusion. It's still kind of an issue for me. You know, a million dollars today is worth more than a million dollars tomorrow just on the value of money. So, if we can consider not limiting that million dollars to just a public school use, I think that would be helpful to the County. It doesn't preclude us from using it for that purpose, but it still gives us some flexibility if the County decides it wants to use that money for something else in the nearer term. So, can you kind of revisit that issue with the applicant and Mr. Payne?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Okay, thank you. And no one from the applicants are here, right? Okay, just wanted to make sure they didn't sneak in. Okay, so we're gonna have the public hearing now. So, if you guys want to speak on this, you can. And, like I said, we're gonna keep it open for January so you'd have another opportunity after there's been more negotiations and conversations within the community meeting. So, at this point in time, if anyone would like to come down and address the Planning Commission on either items 1, 2, or 3 on the agenda, please come on down to the podium. And please state your name, your address, the district that you reside, and when the green light comes on, you'll have 3 minutes. When the yellow light comes on you'll have 60 seconds. And the red light means your time is up. Anybody else?

Ms. Berger: Hi, I'm Joanna Berger. I live in the Hartwood District. I am here tonight and I'm 8 months pregnant. I'm due in January; my due date's January 15th so I probably won't be able to make it to the community meeting because I'll probably be in labor.

Ms. Vanuch: At least you hope, right.

Ms. Berger: So, one main concern of mine is protecting the trees that are on the Westlake property, including... and the trees that are on the Crucible and the other Westlake parcel... and the native plants that are there. They provide us with fresh air. And with all the development going on, it's concerning to me that our children have clean, fresh air to breathe and that we're not really taking that into consideration. And also we've been talking about homeschooling our child because we don't know whether there will be room for our child in Stafford County schools since they are already quite overcrowded and we still don't know what the plan would be for this high school situation if all these houses are built and there's no, as of yet, no clear plan for the school situation. And I'd like... to what you said earlier about children having space to play in Stafford County and making Stafford County family friendly. A lot of, like... well, we love where we live and we moved here because... we moved here from... we lived in Fairfax then we lived in Manassas then we moved out here so that we could be

out in the country where we have space and we have quiet and we really like our lifestyle in a rural south Stafford area in Hartwood. And we like our quiet road which is Clark Patton and we like that kids can ride their bicycles safely and they can play and we can walk our dog easily up and down that road. And we're concerned with that road being turned into an access road for emergency vehicles that it might not be as safe for our child to play there. So, those are some of my concerns. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else?

Mr. Lafferty: Hi, I'm James Lafferty. And I wonder why we would need an access road off of... an access gate off of Clark Patton into this Westlake. The road is hardly adequate for the traffic that's on it now, and they're talking about putting in a gated... a gate there. But that doesn't stop people... somebody from having access. So, I would definitely be opposed to having access from Clark Patton Road into Westlake. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else?

Mr. Phipps: Good afternoon. Jason Phipps, in the Hartwood District; just recently purchased property at the end of Richards Ferry in the new Stafford Estates. So, one of the things I haven't heard brought up is this light that's going to go in at Cedar Grove. And we've got trucks that travel a lot on 17. And putting a stoplight there, I've actually measured the mileage and they would be turned loose basically at Poplar Road and they're traversing downhill at which should be 55 miles an hour; we know that they're not running 55 most of the time, they're running 60-65. And now they're getting stopped at a light. And vice versa coming the other direction. They're going down that big hill. We've had people die already at the light at Hartwood Elementary. I believe that light is going to propose a large problem there and definitely a safety issue. Also, at the last meeting I brought up school sites and asked what size a typical school site was in Stafford County. And I since went and did some research, and there are schools on 65-acre sites; more current schools than what you may imagine. There's also double schools. So, Margaret Brent with, um, Mountain View is on 110-ish or it was somewhere in that neighborhood. So, 65 acres not qualifying for a school site would be something new, because right now they're on 65 acres. And I thought that was a great dedication of it, and a million dollars is nowhere near what that piece of property would be worth. And the other thing is, is I was in a meeting today for Economic Growth with Mr. John Holden. I don't know if any of you know John Holden, but he was talking about Downtown Stafford and building, you know, the new way or trying to make us a progressive county and not fall into some of the traps that Spotsylvania, Fairfax, Prince William County has fallen into. And by just taking a parcel and just boop, sticking townhouses on it, single-family dwelling units, you know, you're not really... that's not really good, I don't think, for the residents that are here. I thought the things he was talking about, you know, mixed use, multi-family, retail space, those types of things, and this stuff just really doesn't fit in Richards Ferry. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else?

Mr. Steiner: How you guys doin'? Chris Steiner, Hartwood District. Um, sorry, I'm a little nervous.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, don't be.

Mr. Steiner: So, we had a petition going. We have about 398 signatures...

Ms. Vanuch: I saw it on Facebook.

Mr. Steiner: ... okay, thanks... of people not, or they're completely against the Westlake development. I would urge you guys to vote no on the amendment proffer D-1-1, D-1-3, D-1-4, the school site, to delete that. I think that 65-acre property is perfect for that. Rezoning it to R-3 and sticking big townhomes there is not something I or anybody else wants to look at nor deal with. As it is, on my property I get to look at that lovely water tower now that will inevitably be going in there, so.

Ms. Vanuch: Is that it?

Mr. Steiner: Yep.

Ms. Vanuch: Thanks. Do you want to give her a copy of the petition?

Mr. Steiner: Oh, I do.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. And she can put it into the record. Ms. Stinnette can grab that from you.

Ms. Roberts: Dale Roberts. And I just have... I travel for a living, so I'm not absolutely certain I'll be able to come to the other meeting in January, so. A couple of points that I wanted to bring up. Mr. Payne stated in the last meeting on October 23rd that the Crucible was a small arms fire training area and for other weapons training, and was not compatible with Westlake development. What I would like to argue is that Westlake development is not compatible with Hartwood. Hartwood has been known to be an area that you pass through the strip malls, the shopping centers, the subdivisions, and you finally get to a country area that is less crowded, has scenery, and becomes more historic. By changing that, by putting 280 townhomes in and another 400 homes in total to the additional 701 homes that have already been approved, we are changing what Hartwood looks like. We're changing its background. We're rewriting history. This is all right adjacent to the Hartwood House. The Hartwood House almost lost its existence in Hartwood back in 1972 when they were gonna tear it down to widen 17. They fought against it and Hartwood House still exists. It is now no longer on the 500 acres... 5,000 acres that it once was; it's now on 10 acres and is a wedding venue. Mr. Payne also suggested that transportation would be minimally impacted. He suggested that 94 vehicles would travel in the AM; for this there would be 94 trips was what his slide said in the morning, from 400 additional homes. Now, I don't know about you, but most people go to work every day. And if you have 400 new homes, that means 400 new cars on the road. The math is pretty simple. Um, he said that that would be an additional 124 vehicles in the afternoon. Well, I disagree again. I would double that because you know now we're picking up kids and we're taking them to ball games and we're running them to the shopping malls. And so I think you can pretty much triple that. In addition to that, none of that took the additional 701 homes that have already been approved. Already now, to go from Clark Patton Road to I95, it takes approximately 30 minutes is what you have to plan on. Thirty minutes to travel approximately 4 miles. And you're going to add all these vehicles to those roads. The school impact. I don't know where he got his school figures. You're adding 400 homes, the average home has 2 kids in the family. Yeah, not every home is gonna have 2 kids, but not every home is going to have only 1 or none either. So, I think that those numbers are way off. I'd like to see all of these numbers read...

Ms. Vanuch: Your red light's been blinking for a while, so you want to wrap it up?

Ms. Roberts: Okay, sorry. Okay, last statement is about the noise impact. You don't hear the Crucible because you hear Quantico. Quantico thumps, the windows vibrate; you can't do a noise

impact with any kind of really substantial, um, results because you're being... it's being shadowed by Quantico. And we don't mind it.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? And I can assure you Mr. English is dutifully writing everything down so he can cover that at the community meeting with you, even if you're not there. Go ahead.

Mr. Berger: Thanks. Hi, I'm Joseph Berger, Hartwood District. You already heard my wife so, for similar reasons, I might not be there on the 13th as well. Um, a few things; a touch on the traffic issue that she brought up. That 30 minutes, if it's a Friday especially, you're lucky if it's 30 minutes. You're looking at an hour. And if you want to get into Fredericksburg, yeah, it's not gonna happen.

Ms. Vanuch: Don't do that on Friday nights, you should know better.

Mr. Berger: No. Unfortunately that's when we finish work, so. Yeah, the traffic is gonna be a lot worse. I mean, coming onto that road, we already have a very small turn area to get onto Clark Patton. You start adding... honestly the 94 is a very low number for vehicles because most people work, a lot of houses have both people are working. It's just going to be a lot more dangerous on there. I've already had one truck totaled just waiting in that turn lane because tractor-trailers come flying down there; they don't wait for that 55 mile an hour sign. They're doing 70 by the time they get there. So people are trying to get into there before you get pushed off the road. You start adding more cars to that it's just going to get worse and worse and have a bigger safety issue. Um, as for the access road that they're talking about off of Clark Patton Road for emergency access, I know the developer is not here. The question I would have is, is that road also going to be used for... during the construction of this parcel, if we can expect construction vehicles coming up and down Clark Patton Road to build this access road or even just the townhouses. Are they going to use that as an access point? The road's already really narrow and, quite frankly, not the best of condition as is. Start adding more traffic for that, it's... it's just gonna be bad for everyone. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? Not seeing anybody get up, so again, I'm not going to close the public hearing because we're going to keep it open so that way you guys can come and speak again. So, at this point, I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission, if they have any questions additionally for staff before we move on. Does anybody have... Mr. Bain? Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Bain: I had just one. Yeah, sorry Mike. The water tank. Is that going to be an elevated tower for pressure or it just a storage tank and therefore would it be, you know, 20 feet high, 30 feet high, or is it going to be a hundred feet high?

Mr. Zuraf: It's my understanding it's an elevated tank for pressure.

Mr. Bain: It is an elevated... okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Mm-hmm.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else on my left? My right, any questions? Mr. English? No? Okay, so Mr. English, this is in your district. What would you like to do?

Mr. English: Of course, I'm going to leave the public hearing open and ask for a deferment I guess to the end of... what's our next January meeting?

Ms. Vanuch: So, we haven't set our official calendar yet so technically it's either... it's gonna... technically on the draft calendar it's the 22nd, but the Board is meeting on the 21st so it may get deferred to the 29th. So, would it be appropriate, Ms. Lucian, for a motion to say the 22nd or the 29th, whichever meeting date is set by the Planning Commission in January?

Ms. Lucian: I think that's fine.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. English: Alright, then that's my motion, just to defer it to the 22nd or 29th, January 2020. That will be after our community meeting. That's my motion.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Do we have a second?

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, second. Mr. English, do you have any further comment?

Mr. English: No, just like you said, Chairman, I have been keeping notes and again it's going to be a better opportunity on the 13th, it's going to be a better forum that you can address these issues with the developer and if you have more questions for staff. And we'll have maps there and things like that, so I think that'll be a better time to do this. Okay? And if you have questions and you can't make it, please email me and then I can bring your questions to the meeting. Yes sir?

From the audience: Where would it be posted at so we know time and... you said Hartwood Elementary, but where would we find... *inaudible*?

Mr. English: How are we going to that?

Ms. Vanuch: It'll be on the County website.

Mr. English: The County website?

Ms. Vanuch: But are you... how are you gonna do notices? Because I know when I did mine, I did a notice within 5 miles. Are you gonna do like all the subdivisions? Have you talked about that?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, we haven't got into the details on how to put out notice.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: Normally, for a community meeting, we don't send individual letters.

Ms. Vanuch: I know we did for Amyclae and Berkshire and Augustine and Rock Hill, remember? We sent out that letter. So, maybe you could meet with Commissioner English to see at least... because it sounds like you guys are all in one main subdivision, at least notifying that subdivision.

Mr. English: Please put it on the Hartwood website, I mean the talk... I know you have a website, I mean, not a website...

Ms. Vanuch: A Facebook page.

Mr. English: ... but a Facebook page, I know you following that but if somebody wants to put it out there. I don't have Facebook so if you could do that, it'd be great. January the 19th... 13th, I'm sorry, 2020 at 7 o'clock at Hartwood Elementary. Okay? And we'll work on trying to get some more information out there, okay?

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, Commissioner Randall? Okay. Anybody else? Alright, go ahead and vote. This is on the deferral. Motion carries 7-0. Okay, moving onto items number 4 and 5, which will be presented together. And for this we recognize Ms. Eva Campbell. This is for the Retail at the Garrisonville.

4. RC19152631; Reclassification - Retail at Garrisonville - A proposed reclassification, with proffers, from the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, to allow for the development of a commercial business with a drive-through on Tax Map Parcel No. 20-35A (Property). The Property consists of 0.82 acres and is located on the north side of Garrisonville Road, approximately 230 feet east of Kingsland Drive, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: March 20, 2020)**
5. CUP19152632; Conditional Use Permit - Retail at Garrisonville - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow one single-lane drive-through facility in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on Tax Map Parcel No. 20-35A (Property). The property consists of 0.82 acres and is located on the north side of Garrisonville Road, approximately 230 feet east of Kingsland Drive, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: March 20, 2020)**

Ms. Campbell: Good evening Madam Chairman and Planning Commissioners, I'm Eva Campbell with Planning and Zoning. I'm here to present items number 4 and 5 on the agenda, which is a rezoning and conditional use permit application for Retail at Garrisonville. The Planning Commission is to consider a request for a reclassification from the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to allow for the development of a commercial business with a drive-through on approximately 0.8 acres known as Tax Map Parcel Number 20-35A. The property is subject to a concurrent request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a drive-through in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District and Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District. The site is located on the north side of Garrisonville Road, east of Kingsland Drive. The parcel outlined in blue comprises the site and is subject to the reclassification from R-1 to B-2 and to the conditional use permit for a drive-through. There are no existing proffers on the property. The site is located within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. Surrounding uses include the B-1 zoned medical office to the west, the R-1 zoned single-family homes to the north, a B-3 zoned vacant parcel to the east, and a B-2 zoned home and garden center to the south across Garrisonville Road. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property within the Suburban land use designation and the Garrisonville Road Commercial Corridor. Design criteria outlined in the Comprehensive Plan for commercial development along major roadways includes shared access for site entrances, inter-parcel access between uses, adequate lighting, and sidewalks along street fronts. The Comprehensive Plan also recommends that drive-through uses adjacent to residential development should be limited. Staff believes that the proposed use of a commercial business with a drive-through will fit for the area with the proposed proffers and recommended conditions. The property is currently developed with one single-family detached home which was constructed in the 1950s. There is a shed in the rear of the property and it's slightly wooded. It has been purchased by the prospective developer, who also owns

the medical office building to the west, and the existing residence is currently unoccupied. The property has no sensitive environmental resources. And here is just a view of the site from Garrisonville Road looking northwest. The Generalized Development Plan illustrates the site layout for the proposed B-2 commercial use. A single one-story building is proposed, 1,790 square feet in size with a single drive-through. Parking areas are proposed to the south and east of the building and a loading space is located northeast of the proposed building and an enclosed dumpster is located at the northwest end of the property. Per the requirements for development within the Highway Corridor Overlay District, a sidewalk would be provided along the frontage of the development on Garrisonville Road. No architectural drawings were submitted since a use has not been determined. The applicants are not proffering conformance with the Generalized Development Plan other than the entrance points. If a use without a drive-through is decided on then the general layout is subject to change. The drive-through window is located on the western side of the building, with the stacking lane circling the northern and western sides of the building. And a by-pass lane is also provided. Vehicles utilizing the drive-through would be required to circle the building in a counterclockwise direction. And proposed proffers do not address the hours of operation. Potential 24-hour use of the site may create noise impacts on the residential uses to the north. This is addressed in the concurrent CUP with a recommendation limiting the hours of operation. The proffers submitted by the applicant would: require that the property be accessed by sharing the existing entrance to the west and that such entrance be converted to a right-in/right-out configuration as generally shown on the Generalized Development Plan. It would require inter-parcel connections to provide access to the parcels to the east and west of the property. It would require dedication of right-of-way in order to facilitate future construction of a 6-lane divided highway along Garrisonville Road. It would require construction of a sidewalk as generally shown on the Generalized Development Plan. It would be a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees in any screening areas with a minimum of 50% evergreens and prohibit several uses that are normally permitted in the B-2 Zoning District, and prohibit any building on the property from exceeding 40 feet in height. It would require the architectural design of the buildings to include specified materials with coordinated signage and dumpster screening. It would require the removal of the existing residence, well, and septic system on the property. And it would prohibit truck deliveries between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. on the property. The transportation proffer requires that the proposed use will not generate more than a thousand vehicle trips per day without performing a Traffic Impact Analysis. And if the proposed use exceeds 1,000 vehicle trips per day at the time of site plan application, the applicant shall provide a TIA and implement the recommended improvements. Some examples of B-2 uses with a drive-through that would generate over a thousand vehicle trips per day are fast food with drive-through, which generate 471 per 1,000 square feet during the weekdays, so that wouldn't exceed but on weekends it does. And the most intensive use would be a coffee/donut shop with drive-through, which would generate 820 trips per thousand square feet. And this is... would be over that. Staff is proposing several conditions to help offset any potential impacts the drive-through facility might have within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. The proposed conditions are: development of the property shall occur in general accordance with the GDP; direct access to the property from Garrisonville Road shall be prohibited and access shall be through the adjacent properties; the 25-foot width transitional buffer along the northern property line shall include a minimum of 50% evergreens; a sidewalk and crosswalk shall be provided between the proposed building and sidewalk along Garrisonville Road; the pick-up window shall be located on the west side of the building; a drive-through loud speaker shall utilize an automatic volume control system to reduce the speaker volume when there is a low level of ambient noise; illuminated signage shall not be permitted on any building façade facing an adjacent residential use; and the dumpster enclosure shall consist of masonry materials, with type and color similar to the primary building. Staff feels that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for commercial development along commercial corridors. It is also consistent with established development patterns and the

proffers mitigate transportation impacts. Staff finds that with no decided use for the property at this time, we are unable to determine all potential impacts of converting the property to a commercial use. Staff is supportive of the application with proffered conditions proposed by the applicant. Staff suggests that the Planning Commission consider a condition which limits hours of operation to reduce potential noise impacts on nearby residential properties. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Any questions for Ms. Campbell? I know you have questions, Steven.

Mr. Apicella: I'm gonna ask you about the proffer number 1e; it's on Attachment 3, page 1. So, help me understand the process here. If conceivably this is approved, they haven't done a TIA at this point because they're saying that they're proffering that they won't... they will keep the number of vehicle trips per day no more than a thousand per day. But, there's a caveat here that says if it does go over a thousand, presumably after this has gone through the Planning Commission, after it's gone through the Board of Supervisors and is approved, they can conceivably change the use that would have greater than a thousand vehicles per day. Is that how I'm reading this proffer?

Ms. Campbell: Yes. They haven't decided a use that protects them that if they do decide a use that's greater than a thousand vehicle trips per day then, at that point, they would perform the TIA.

Mr. Apicella: So, as this is going through the political process of approval, maybe it's a bank with a drive-through that doesn't have a lot of vehicles per day. Again, after this is approved, this could turn into a Dunkin' Donuts with a drive-through with, I think you said, maybe 1,600 vehicles per day using the...

Ms. Campbell: Something along that...

Mr. Apicella: ... by the square-footage that you mentioned? Or more?

Ms. Campbell: Yeah, that would be the most intensive use that they could possibly... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Apicella: And the County wouldn't be able to...

Ms. Vanuch: Chick-Fil-A has the most intensive use.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. I'm just saying, the Chick-Fil-A on 17; boy, that place is (inaudible). And the County wouldn't be able to say, hey, that's going to work here. We haven't really considered the implications of putting something with that level of intensity on this parcel and/or come up with conditions that deal with that specific use as it might impact the neighbors, because it wasn't even talked about, it wasn't even thought about, it was below a thousand vehicles per day when this went through the process of approval.

Ms. Campbell: It would be by-right at that point and they would have to do the TIA and any recommended improvements that were... did not degrade the entrance any further.

Mr. Apicella: Again, so we might not necessarily have dealt with the issues. So, the TIA really just deals with vehicles, so there might be some improvements associated with vehicle impacts, but not necessarily impacts of something with that intensity as it might impact the neighbors nearby.

Ms. Campbell: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Like, I remember when we were looking at the Dunkin' Donuts on Route 17. The loudspeaker was going to be really close to somebody's bedroom window. And so we had that redone so that it wouldn't be that way. Also, lighting could be an impact; the location of a dumpster could also be an impact. And I do believe there's a house right behind this particular property.

Mr. English: There's a subdivision.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah. So, that's kind of I think what Mr. Apicella is saying...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, and I guess... I've been on here, what, 9 years, I've never seen hey, we're not going to do a TIA but we reserve the right to do the TIA differently or do a TIA downstream after this has already been approved with a different use. Are you aware of us doing that in the past?

Ms. Campbell: I'm not.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions on my left here? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Can you go back to the Generalized Development Plan please? As I see it, there's no deceleration lane on Garrisonville Road or right turn lane to get into the development proposed?

Ms. Campbell: There's not a right turn lane. It definitely dips in a little there; it like tapers.

Mr. Bain: Not very much. Not enough for vehicles.

Ms. Campbell: It's not a right turn lane.

Mr. Bain: What I'm concerned with, and let me try and explain this -- you've got the medical center there. They've got traffic coming out. You've got this proposed facility. They're going to have traffic coming out and turning left to get into the exit line to get onto Garrisonville Road. I can easily see cars stacking there and thereby blocking cars that are turning right into the property from Garrisonville Road, and those cars can't get anywhere because the other cars are blocking the entrance.

Mr. English: Mr. Bain, can I chime in with you? Because I know, there was supposed to be a Steak N' Shake just down almost like a stone's throw from this also and I don't know if that's what's going with the statuses. I know they're clearing land.

Ms. Vanuch: No, they're belly up.

Mr. English: Okay, so, again going on what Mr. Bain said, there's going to be added... I don't know what they're putting in there now, so there's going to be some more added traffic issues.

Mr. Bain: And that could happen with just a few cars. I mean, it wouldn't take 1,600 cars.

Mr. English: Exactly.

Ms. Vanuch: Perhaps the applicant might have the answer to that, so I see them nodding their heads so. Are you guys done with staff? Can we bring up the applicant?

Mr. Bain: Okay, yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Let's bring up the applicant and then if we want to go back to Ms. En... Ms. Campbell we can. Come on up.

Ms. Foroughi: Good evening Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I'm Angela Foroughi of Bagby, Foroughi and Goodpasture, the civil engineer on the project. I am also a citizen of our great community in Mr. Bain's district off of New Hope Church Road. I'd like to thank you guys for hearing us this evening. I'd like to thank Eva for her very detailed and thorough presentation and staff report. As Eva has mentioned, Dr. Amir does own the property directly adjacent to this property to the west, and he has purchased this property next to him. As a business owner in this community, he has a vested interest in making sure that this is a successful project. He wanted to be here this evening; the only reason he is not here this evening is he is home with his wife and newborn child. So he asked if we could handle it on his behalf and I said of course we could. So, I can touch on some other items but I can go ahead and touch on the questions that you guys had to get right to the point so. There is a deceleration lane, there is not a turn lane; there is a taper. There is not a turn lane on 610. It will be evaluated at the time of site plan. Part of the reason that it's not... we don't have any sort of dimensions on it is because we don't do... it is a speculative rezoning and we are not sure what the use will be. Because of the small size of the parcel, it is highly unlikely that this will exceed a thousand vehicles per day. We spent a lot of time talking with staff, we consulted with a traffic consultant on this project. The largest issue is traffic studies... what would the result of the traffic study be? We are sharing an existing entrance, by-right... in a former like I was an executive at VDOT and the Director of Transportation... by law we have to give every parcel an entrance off of a state maintained roadway. This applicant is willing to give up that right and share this existing entrance. He's upgrading and converting the existing entrance to a right-in/right-out to make it safer out there. VDOT is looking to do... or is currently partially funded to do the... perhaps fully funded, I'm not sure... to do the 610 project which will be divided, so there will be no lefts in and out of this development. So, really, the applicant, at the end of the day, we were left looking at it going what would a Traffic Impact Analysis show? What improvements could even be made to the roadway in order to improve either operations or safety? And the answer was that there isn't any. And that's what we consulted with our traffic consultant on. And that's kind of where we are, and that's why we put that as a proffer, because we're not trying to hide from it, we're not trying to run away from it; we just don't want to spend a lot of unnecessary money for the traffic study to say there's nothing you can do to improve the existing situation.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chairman?

Mr. English: Do you know what the... I'm sorry, Bart.

Mr. Randall: No, go ahead.

Mr. English: Do you know what the property next to the... what's going next to the, used to be the...?

Ms. Foroughi: Yes, we're the engineer of record on that as well. And it's actually owned by Amish by Design, which they own and operate the... off of Route 1 just... what's that industrial park's name?

Unknown from audience: Centreport Parkway.

Ms. Foroughi: Yes, just north of the Centreport Parkway exit, which they sell, umm, high-end sheds as well as the play centers.

Mr. English: So, that's what it's going to be right there?

Ms. Foroughi: Yes.

Mr. English: So, that's not gonna be... okay, alright.

Ms. Foroughi: Significantly less intense, yeah.

Mr. English: Yeah, that's why I was curious.

Ms. Foroughi: It's mainly... which is really cool that that client wants to do... have a bunch of play sets on display so kids can come and try before you buy and play on them.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: That's where they'll have to play according to these TDRs.

Ms. Foroughi: I know, fortunately. The parents will have to buy their own play sets.

Mr. Randall: Okay, what's the rush for the rezoning? If we're not really sure what we're going to do on it, we're not really sure of the impacts, we're not really sure how it could potentially impact traffic, why now? Why wouldn't it be better to identify what you're going to do on it and then be able to bring that to the Commission and be able then to clarify exactly what you're doing, clarify what all the impacts will be, clarify how that will change or not change, and then we can be able to make a better decision. Why now?

Ms. Foroughi: Yeah, I understand your question and appreciate your question. Our client, Dr. Amir, is not a developer. This is not something he runs around and does. When this property went on the market, it's directly adjacent to his building. His wife is a... she's also in the medical field, I'm struggling to remember exactly what it is, but she... they talked about maybe putting a lab on this but they'd have to go through loans and ascertain all that, but putting a lab that would support his doctor's office there. They also talked about, you know, maybe it would be good for a pharmacy. But that's the only reason they're kinda looking at the drive-through is just to keep all of their options open. But, if none of that stuff works out or they can't get the funding or they can't get a loan for that, then they would look to perhaps market it and sell it. So, that's why they're looking to do it at this time. It was a good opportunity. The guy next door wanted to sell it. He would rather be able to purchase it as opposed to have who knows what come in next to him, a competitor or who knows what. And he just went ahead and said okay, let's go ahead and see if we can get it zoned. Because it is, I mean, we all know it's R-1 along an entire commercial corridor completely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Sure, there's residential behind it, but it is really truly infill development and only makes sense. It doesn't make sense from a planning perspective for that to be a single-family residential home.

Mr. Randall: No, I agree. I just wondered if there was some benefit to waiting until you knew exactly what it was so we then could have, you know, all the information and be able to do all the traffic

analysis or whatever, other things that we needed to do as per as mentioned before so that, you know, you know what you're gonna do. The other question I had is, you know, we do know that 610 right there is going to be widened.

Ms. Foroughi: Yes.

Mr. Randall: It's going to be widened to 3 lanes...

Ms. Foroughi: Yes.

Mr. Randall: ... a 6-lane divided highway. I'm really concerned that as they widen that, you're little taper lane is going to go away and you're now going to be stopping traffic in and out on a 3-lane divided highway, specifically designed to maintain traffic and to keep traffic flowing all the way through, all the way out to Shelton Shop. I'm concerned that if you don't have a dedicated... have a dedicated, you know, a hundred feet in and a hundred feet out, that you're gonna potentially destroy... not destroy, but impact the reason why they would go to a 3-lane, you know, 6-lane divided highway. So, it looks like to me that you have plenty of room there that you may want to consider at least, no matter what you put there, the idea of having a full lane in and a full lane out for at least a hundred feet to make sure that those cars, who are stopping to make that turn or coming out and accelerating, are not trying to do so right into traffic. Because, you know, 4 o'clock on a Friday, there is no taper, there is no... alright, anyway, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Boswell, it's your district.

Mr. Boswell: I think the apprehension here is going from zero vehicles today right now on this site to a possible, as Ms. Campbell said, 800 vehicles per day if it was to go to something like a Dunkin' Donuts or something.

Mr. Apicella: Sixteen hundred.

Mr. Boswell: Oh, it was 1,600? I'm sorry. So, I think the unknown is where the apprehension is coming from.

Ms. Foroughi: I understand that, yeah.

Mr. Boswell: But, what I'm gonna do tonight...

Ms. Vanuch: Hold on, we haven't done the public hearing yet.

Mr. Boswell: Huh?

Ms. Vanuch: We haven't done the public hearing yet.

Mr. Boswell: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought they were joined.

Ms. Vanuch: No, but we haven't opened it up for public hearing yet. Go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'm just gonna keep pushing this issue because, I got to tell you, along the lines that Mr. Boswell was speaking of, I have grave concern about the... I appreciate that

you want flexibility and you guys have a speculative project and want to maximize your opportunities over there at that site. You wouldn't be the first project where I raised concerns about, I'll call it a general rezoning without knowing what the specific uses are. You haven't proffered out any uses, so again...

Ms. Foroughi: Yeah, we have.

Mr. Apicella: What uses have you proffered out?

Ms. Foroughi: Let me grab the proffers. Because we actually were... we're prohibiting a couple of extra ones and then staff said well, you really don't need to do that because it's actually on the... you'd have to get a conditional use permit for that use anyway so you can actually take those out. I said sure. Let me find the proffers. I'll get there eventually.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, I see a couple, but...

Ms. Foroughi: I mean, we'd be willing to prof... if there were others that cause the Commission concern, I think the applicant would be...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, fast food restaurants cause me concern because I don't know that that site's going to appropriate for a... I don't know. You haven't done a traffic study and we won't see what the results are after this goes through the process and gets approved. So, you know, when you don't have assurance on what can go there and that maximum impact, then the other way of dealing with it is limiting the vehicles per day. So, you've done that...

Ms. Foroughi: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... but you have a caveat that says well, we can change our minds and we could still do a TIA and have a different use in there. So, you said, and I'm gonna quote you, it's highly unlikely that this will be a use or uses that will generate more than a thousand vehicles per day.

Ms. Foroughi: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: So then, why are you hedging your bets and including that additional language in there to give you that, you know, get out of jail free card?

Ms. Foroughi: I think the applicant just wants to be able to keep his options open if his loan falls through. I'll be honest, a Dunkin' Donuts is about the only thing that would trip at the size of this parcel because the size of the parcel obviously dictates how large the building can be. The building square-footage is what dictates the trips per day. So, the size of the building is restricted based on the size of the parcel, therefore the trips per day are as well. A coffee shop with a drive-through is about the only thing that would trip that. A fast food restaurant slightly does; it comes out to be like 1,040 trips per day. But technically it's over a thousand trips per day. The coffee shop is frankly on the wrong side of 610. It's... with a right-in/right-out entrance, people are going to work in the morning, they are not going to figure out a way to turn around to come back to turn in a right... it's, that's why I said, it's highly unlikely that it would turn over a thousand vehicles per day.

Mr. Apicella: It's highly unlikely to you at this point in time...

Ms. Foroughi: Yes, it is.

Mr. Apicella: ... but you did say that the owner of the property, if he can't do what he wants to do or something happens and he changes his mind, he gonna sell that property. So once we... once we do a rezoning here, any future owner of that parcel could do whatever they want as they long as it's one of the allowable uses. Is that not true?

Ms. Foroughi: That is true. A by-right use, you would have to have 5,000 trips per day before it generated a TIA in accordance with VDOT's regulations. Stafford County asks for a thousand vehicles per day for that reason to say, okay, a thousand vehicles per day. But that is... that is a number that was set by local ordinance and it seems to be something that made sense. This says if it's over that so that's why the applicant is saying hey, I want to proffer this because I don't want to just say approve me and you approve them and then it's like oh, it's under 5,000 so I don't have to do a traffic study at all.

Mr. Apicella: From my vantage point as a planner, you talk about good planning, this is not a real proffer. By saying you're going to do a thousand vehicles per day, but we can change our minds, that's... that's not a real proffer. It's a stealth proffer, it can change. It's not something that goes through the normal process of approval where the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors some assurance that that number is not going to be exceeded. And the only... and the only way that we'll have any input on it is through the staff after it's already gone through the final approval process. So, again, as a Planning Commissioner, and I don't think I'm the only one, I have a great problem with that caveat in the proffer language. And the other thing that causes me concern is in the CUP; staff recommended that the hours of operation be limited to the hours of 7 AM and 12 AM, and you all disagree with that. So, at the current point in time, there is no hours of operation limitation in the CUP. So, again, it causes me concern that we have less assurance about what this project is going to be and its impact on the neighbors. And that's what I'm worried about. Even if we deal with the traffic issues, not knowing what the uses are or that it wouldn't be the maximum uses, we have no way that we've dealt with the potential implications for the people who live close to the project, not knowing what the project's going to be.

Mr. Bain: I have a question to raise maybe for staff. Since it does require a CUP, could we not legally impose the proffer of limiting it to a thousand vehicles per day and set hours of usage that we feel would be appropriate for the area?

Ms. Foroughi: I don't want to speak for staff. I think...

Mr. Bain: No, I'm not asking you, I'm sorry.

Ms. Foroughi: Okay.

Mr. Bain: No, you're welcome to respond, but I was... I figured Mr. Harvey would be able to straighten me out if I'm wrong there.

Mr. Harvey: Well, Madam Chairman and Commissioner Bain, with a conditional use permit, that's generally considered to be a use that's allowed in the zoning district under certain circumstances. You have standards of issuance in your ordinance that dictate what those circumstances are. But in order for that to be mitigated, as far as concerns and meeting those standards of issuance, you can impose limitations, like we talked about hours of operation. You can also impose vehicle trip count as a

limitation as well. However, the conditional use permit cannot get into some of the factors that you see with a rezoning and proffers. A CUP can't further restrict uses on a property because the CUP is only related to one use. Did that answer your question?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Any other questions for the applicant? I've got to open up the public hearing. Okay. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Foroughi: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, at this time we'll open up the public hearing for the Retail at Garrisonville. If you're here to talk, you can come on down to the podium. Anybody here to talk? No? Okay, then we'll close the... oh, no, I think we wanted to leave the public hearing open. Okay, we're going to leave the public hearing open and bring it back to the Planning Commission to ask any additional questions of staff or the applicant. Do you have any?

Mr. Randall: I have one more question for the applicant, I'm sorry.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Come on up.

Mr. Randall: We had to officially go through that just so you're clear.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, just to be official.

Ms. Foroughi: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And I guess I'm reiterating again the concerns we've had. So that I'm clear, the CUP request is to keep... is to zone the property and make it avail... make it more advantageous for a potential owner, the owner currently or a new owner, to be able to have all the flexibility they need to do a fast food, to do a donut shop, to do whatever it is they wanted to do on that property. Is that correct?

Ms. Foroughi: The conditional use permit...

Mr. Randall: Use permit for the drive-through.

Ms. Foroughi: Yes. That only allows for the drive-through. And the main intent of that was in the event they did a pharmacy with a drive-through or even a lab facility where they have a drive-around where they drop off blood or specimens or whatever to be analyzed. That was his initial thought with that and we advised him that he would need a conditional use permit for that reason. So that's why it was brought in concurrently.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay? Thank you. You good? Okay, now, Mr. Boswell, this is in your district.

Mr. Boswell: Yes, ma'am, Madam Chair. This is my last meeting and, based on what I've heard here tonight, this still needs a lot of work. So, what I would like to do is to defer both items to the second

meeting in January to give the incoming Planning Commissioner a chance to sling at this and Mr. Apicella a chance to work it some more, because I agree with most of what... just about all what he said. So, that's my motion.

Ms. Vanuch: Do we have a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Boswell to defer this to the second meeting in January, which is either the 22nd or the 29th once the Planning Commission sets the 2020 calendar, and a second by Commissioner English. Any further discussion Mr. Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Okay, go ahead and vote on the deferral. Tally the votes. Motion carries 7-0. Thank you guys very much. Okay, now moving onto item number 6, which is the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the Highway Corridor Overlay District. And for this we recognize Ms. Amy Taylor.

6. 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)**

Ms. Taylor: Good evening Madam Chairman and members of the Commission, I am Amy Taylor and I am here this evening to present to you item number 6 on the agenda, which is the proposed amendment to Section 28-59 of the Zoning Ordinance to add a turn lane requirement for non-residential development within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. The Highway Corridor Overlay District was established in 1995 for the purpose of protecting the health, safety, and general welfare of the public by the prevention or reduction of traffic congestion, and visual clutter and distractions, which may result in dangerous conditions on public and private streets. The district was created to provide suitable and sufficient road systems, and protect both existing and future roads from unsafe use. And limitations are placed on certain types of automobile oriented, fast service, and quick turnover uses and related signage that generate high traffic volumes which have the potential to impede safe travel. The HCOD currently consists of the following roads or road segments: Cambridge Street and Jefferson Davis Highway, which is US Route 1, beginning at Truslow Road to Garrisonville Road, and the intersection there at Garrisonville and Washington Street; Warrenton Road, which is US 17, beginning at Cambridge Street to Hartwood Church Road -- I believe that is on the north side of Route 17 and Richards Ferry Road along the south side; Kings Highway, which is US Route 3, beginning at the City of Fredericksburg line going to the King George County line -- so, Route 3 in its entirety; and Garrisonville Road, which is Route 610, beginning at Jefferson Davis Highway and goes all the way to Toluca Road along the north side and then along the south side it stops at Furnace Road. Non-residential uses within the HCOD... currently, non-residential uses within the HCOD must comply with development standards which require that access and internal circulation be designed not to impede traffic on a public street. Such designs may include the use of shared entrances, inter-parcel

connections and travelways, on-site service drives, access from secondary public streets, or internal streets of a commercial, office, or industrial complex. As corridor highways are generally high capacity roads with a variety of high intensity uses, concerns have been raised that new site development within the HCOD are not always required to provide turn lanes at entrances. VDOT currently determines whether turn lanes are required for all new development, based on several factors such as the number of travel lanes, speed limits or design speeds, and traffic volumes along the corridor highway, as well the volume of traffic generated by the developing site and the anticipated number of right turns into that site. The proposed amendment will add a right turn lane requirement to the existing HCOD development standards for all non-residential development regardless of whether turn lanes are required by VDOT. It will also require that turn lanes must be constructed in accordance with VDOT design standards, but it will also allow for exceptions where installation of a turn lane is specifically prohibited by VDOT or where installation of a turn lane may not be feasible due to lack of adequate frontage or right-of-way along the corridor highway. These next few slides are examples of non-residential projects approved or developed within the last few years, where turn lanes may or may not have been specifically required. This example is a small medical office along Cambridge Street in Falmouth, which was approved in 2014 under a minor site plan. The volume of traffic generated for this use was significantly low, and did not meet warrants for a right turn lane. This is a small commercial project with a proposed retail, office, and restaurant use along Garrisonville Road, which was approved in 2017. The volume of traffic generated for this use was also low, and did not meet warrants for a right turn lane. These are existing right turn lanes for the Stafford Lakes Walmart and the Stafford Lakes Plaza Royal Farms. Turn lane warrants for these... excuse me, turn lane warrants for these were met... for these projects... excuse me, very tongue-tied there. Turn lane warrants were met for these projects due to the volume of traffic generated for these uses, and was a proffer requirement specifically associated with the rezoning for each project. This example is a self-storage facility along Jefferson Davis Highway, south of Garrisonville Road, which was approved in 2018. The volume of traffic for this use was also low and did also not meet warrants for a right turn lane. This is another example; this is an existing small auto repair facility along Garrisonville Road, west of Shelton Shop Road, which was approved for a building expansion in 2018. The volume of traffic generated for this use was also low and also did not meet warrants for a right turn lane.

Ms. Vanuch: Can I stop you on that one? Thank goodness that didn't; that would have sent those poor business owners into bankruptcy.

Ms. Taylor: A lot of the sites don't necessarily require them under VDOT's...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah. I mean, and it really is not that hard to get in and get out, and you don't really need a turn lane for that, so.

Ms. Taylor: This last example is a multi-tenant retail building along Garrisonville Road, east of North Stafford High School, which was approved just earlier this year. This project is part of a larger project, and turn lane warrants were met for the overall development due to the volume of traffic generated for the proposed uses. The turn lane shown here is a proffer requirement associated with the rezoning for the overall project. Staff recommends approval of Ordinance O19-40, and the deadline for recommendation to the Board is December 20th of 2019. And that concludes my presentation.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions? I know Mr. Apicella does.

Mr. Apicella: Sorry Madam Chairman.

Ms. Vanuch: Probably a lot of the same ones I have.

Mr. Apicella: Amy, first of all, I want to say I appreciate your work on this. And I also appreciate the objective we're trying to achieve here. If you could pull up the slide that's, the one that has the two bullets under issue. So, I'm trying to understand and wrap my head around the statement on the first bullet and how the change language would achieve what we're trying to do here. Because, when I read the language, which is at Attachment 1, page 2 of 2, it uses the word may, which, in my mind, means it's discretionary. So, how do we get the desired end when the language in the ordinance change is discretionary? Meaning that, again, a developer would not have to do what we're asking them to do.

Ms. Taylor: Yes sir. Staff discussed this with the Director of Planning and Zoning, and we clarified that the current language in the... in this portion of the ordinance specifically states will, which suggested that all of those provisions for access to the site that were mentioned in the previous slides would essentially be required. And it is not typical that a site can meet all of those provisions. When a site comes in, they typically only have the ability to provide one or two of those components. So, as we were going through this process to make these amendments to incorporate the turn lane, the Director of Planning and Zoning thought it would be beneficial to go ahead and change that to be may. That would allow us to get as many of those components as possible, but not necessarily that all of them would be required.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but I'm still trying to understand, how would they be required to provide right turn lanes with the language that says may?

Ms. Taylor: This was also a discussion with County Attorney's office as well. I know that the intent coming down, the request that was referred to the Planning Commission I believe ultimately from the CEDC, our understanding was that the desire was to create an intent or mandatory requirement for turn lanes. And it was our understanding that we may not have the ability to do that, to make it a mandatory requirement.

Mr. Apicella: So, what real effect does this ordinance change have?

Ms. Taylor: In the discussions with the Director of Planning and Zoning, it was staff's takeaway that where the project or where the developing site has the ability to provide the turn lane, where they possess adequate frontage along their own site, or there is adequate right-of-way along the adjoining site, there is nothing specifically preventing them from providing the turn lane to meet the requirements designed to VDOT's design standards that when staff reviews plans coming in, staff would comment for the need to provide that turn lane such as the other components that we already review for.

Mr. Apicella: But they wouldn't have to.

Ms. Taylor: There may be the ability that the developers may push back or fight the issue if we can't... can't push the issue... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Mr. Apicella: I mean, as we've seen tonight, developers don't always do what they... what we want them to do even though it makes sense...

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... from our vantage point.

Ms. Taylor: Yes. And that was the discussion that staff did have internally regarding how to achieve the intent that was desired with this ordinance amendment. And, at this time, this was... this was the best approach that we were able to bring forward at this point in time.

Mr. Apicella: And we're under a time crunch; this is our only meeting in December and the timeline says that we have to put this to a public hearing by...

Ms. Vanuch: No, this is the public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: This is the public hearing. Yikes! Do we...

Ms. Vanuch: So, if we just fail to take action on it and then we ask...

Mr. Apicella: If we fail to take action, it gets approved, it's a defacto approval, so.

Ms. Vanuch: It's gets approve, okay. So then maybe vote it down and ask the Board for...

Mr. Apicella: To take another look at it and maybe...

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, give us a little more discretion.

Mr. Apicella: ... come up with an alternative suggestion?

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah. What'd you say?

Mr. Randall: What's the intent? What does staff want?

Ms. Vanuch: Apparently a lot of turn lanes.

Mr. Randall: Does staff want to have a turn lane in the Highway Corridor Overlay District in every case with few exceptions? And those exceptions should be very specific in nature. It has less than a hundred... a hundred cars per day. It has this and this and this. It has this and this and this. And if you meet one of these three exceptions, you may not have to do a turn lane. But if you don't meet any of those exceptions, a turn lane is absolutely 100% required. Is that the intent?

Ms. Taylor: Yes sir, that was the underlying intent. That was the...

Mr. Randall: Why can't we write it that way then? Why can't we write it that says this ordinance is applicable to all non-residential zoning... all residential plans. There are some exceptions, and those exceptions are listed as follows. And even then it may still be required based on staff's recommendations.

Ms. Vanuch: Because we don't have any legal enforcement to make them do something that VDOT isn't, right?

Mr. Randall: Then why have the ordinance and don't put it in?

Ms. Taylor: Essentially, yes. VDOT does...

Ms. Vanuch: That's what we're saying.

Ms. Lucian: I can jump in here. Legally we don't have the ability to require it, so that's the issue. So, even if you write it that way, there's a legal problem.

Ms. Vanuch: I just have a fundamental problem creating an ordinance that we cannot enforce. We literally jump through hoops to create ordinances that will pass legal muster, and we're intentionally creating a ordinance that...

Mr. Randall: So, where did this come from?

Ms. Taylor: This issue initially originated with the Board and I believe started with the CEDC, and was passed down to the Planning Commission and was referred to staff to work on the ordinance amendment. Staff did evaluate this and brought forth the concerns regarding the occasions where there may be an inability to not provide a turn lane. Those provisions were incorporated as exceptions into the language that you do see today regarding VDOT specific prohibition where they may not want or permit a turn lane to be installed...

Mr. Randall: Does VDOT... does VDOT require a turn lane in certain situations?

Ms. Taylor: Absolutely.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, yeah!

Mr. Randall: Where? Wouldn't it not be...

Ms. Taylor: As mentioned in my presentation, VDOT has a series of... all sites coming in, no matter where they develop, are required to do a turn lane analysis when a site is being developed. That turn lane analysis takes into account the volume of traffic that that site will be generating. It also takes into account the existing volume of traffic on the main corridor highway, whether it's within the HCOD or not. So, they're looking at the volume of traffic that travels along that primary road where the entrance is being constructed, and it also takes into account the anticipated number of right turns coming into that entrance.

Mr. Randall: So, we just saw, right before us so we just deferred something right off of Garrisonville Road, that the entrance will be right off of Garrisonville Road. And they presented something to us that did not have a right turn lane or a right... and/or a right out, as far as a right turn lane, dedicated right turn lane.

Ms. Taylor: Yes sir.

Mr. Randall: I would think that if any place in Stafford County, something right off of Garrisonville would...

Ms. Vanuch: It's because it didn't have a use associated with it, so it was like a ghost use. So, how can VDOT assess something for a turn lane unless they know what's going there? Now, let's say a

Chick-Fil-A was going there; I bet you VDOT would review it at construction plan and require it to have a turn lane.

Mr. Randall: But what's their capacity? A thousand cars a day? What's their...? I mean, anything coming off of Garrisonville should automatically by definition need a turn lane.

Ms. Taylor: A turn lane would definitely be beneficial along the corridor highways in order to get those...

Mr. Randall: But we have no legal force to make that happen? Is that what you're saying?

Ms. Lucian: Not under the Zoning Ordinance, no. Maybe there would be another alternative that, I can't think off the top of my head, but the way the ordinance is drafted right now, it doesn't work legally.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright. So, we could probably argue about this for quite some time because it's silly. So, what would we... we have to do the public hearing. I think we're good. Did I do the public hearing already? No, I didn't... no I didn't... no I didn't, not on this one. Not for this one. Alright, thank you. I can't wait to see those minutes. Man, my seat's not even cold yet! Alright, so at this point we'd open up the public hearing. Would anybody like to come down and address the Commission? Seeing no one rushing the podium, we will close the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Mr. English, what would you like to do?

Mr. English: Go ahead.

Ms. Vanuch: No, go ahead. What do you want to do? Mr. Apicella, I know...

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I unfortunately am going to recommend voting against the proposed amendment changes. So that's my motion, to vote against the proposed...

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. I just have a quick question about that. Do you want to interject any direction to the Board of why you're doing that?

Mr. Apicella: Would I need to do that as a separate motion or... I mean, how does that work?

Ms. Vanuch: You're asking me.

Ms. Lucian: I don't know that you necessarily have to do that. If you want to, you can, but I think based on the record, they will know the reason.

Mr. Apicella: Well, I think that... Okay, so I'll start over. I'd like to recommend that the Commission vote against the proposed amendment changes and that we also ask the Board to revisit the proposed intent here to see if there are other options or alternatives that achieve the desired end.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Any seconds?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so a second. Motion by Commissioner Apicella, second by Commissioner McPherson; any comments Commissioner Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, again, with the best of intent here and probably a lot of great staff work, I think this ordinance really doesn't have any teeth and I don't really see the merit in passing an ordinance that really cannot be enforced.

Ms. Vanuch: Any comments Commissioner McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: No further comments.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anyone else? Okay, seeing none, go ahead and vote. And remember, we are voting for denial, so you'd vote green for denying. Motion carries to deny the ordinance request 7 to 0. Okay, we don't have any Unfinished Business; we already took care of the New Business; and now moving onto the Planning Director's Report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

7. SUB18152473; Potomac Church Farms Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan utilizing Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) to create 212 single-family detached lots on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-54, 39-55, and 39-17F, zoned A-1, Agricultural Zoning District, located at the end of Old Potomac Church Road off of Jefferson Davis Highway, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: February 9, 2020)**

Discussed before Public Hearings.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

8. Lot Shape and Side Lot Lines

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Madam Chairman. I have two items specifically on the report. One is an ordinance referral from the Board of Supervisors dealing with the shape and configuration of lots. This is a proposed subdivision ordinance amendment. Staff, throughout time, has interpreted the Planning Commission's direction on lot configuration and also the code. The code is very broad and basically kind of, from my interpretation, encourages regular shaped lots; rectangles, squares, triangles, this of that nature. From time to time we have spirited discussions with developers and surveyors about the configuration of the lots. They disagree; on occasion you'll see a waiver request come before the Commission asking for an exception to some of the side lot line requirements in particular. So, this amendment would try to address that issue. Staff has researched other jurisdictions and also met with a number of surveyors and engineers, as well as representatives from FABAA, to come up with a draft amendment. Due to the fact that this is a subdivision amendment, the Commission has 60 days from today to hold a hearing and make a recommendation. So, staff would request your consideration of authorizing a public hearing tonight.

Ms. Vanuch: Anybody have any comments on that?

Mr. English: I'll make a motion then that we set a public hearing for it. How soon does it have to be, Jeff?

Mr. Randall: Is there a timeline?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner English, we'd recommend the second meeting in January in order to keep this on track, because the deadline would be February 9th to meet the 60 days.

Mr. Randall: Right. That's the third thing we've moved already to that meeting.

Mr. English: I know, that's what I'm saying.

Mr. Randall: With Westlake being on there as well.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: Can we get it the first meeting in February? Or is the deadline gonna... is that gonna be after the deadline?

Mr. English: It's past it.

Mr. Randall: Is that past the deadline?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Randall, based on the draft schedule we've put together which won't get voted on until next year, we look at the first meeting as February 12th, so that would be beyond the 60 days.

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, so motion to move it to the second meeting in January?

Mr. English: Mm-hmm, yes ma'am.

Mr. Boswell: How about the first meeting?

Ms. Vanuch: I don't think we could do it that fast. Would that be quick enough if we did it January 9th?

Mr. Harvey: I believe we do have time.

Mr. English: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Do you guys want to do that? I won't be here so it's up to you.

Mr. English: Yeah, let's go for the 9th then, Jeff. I don't want to pile everything on the 26th.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think it's January 8th.

Ms. Vanuch: January 8th, I'm sorry.

Mr. English: I'm sorry.

Ms. Vanuch: I'm gonna have my own meeting on January 9th. Alright, do we have a second?

Mr. Randall: I'll second it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Any discussion? Alright, go ahead and vote.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, Madam Chairman, I have a...

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Just for the staff report, I would just ask that it include some information on how other jurisdictions have dealt with this issue.

Ms. Vanuch: Ah, yeah.

Mr. Apicella: And also, to the extent that diagrams are helpful for us to see what is and is not appropriate and maybe a way to incorporate that into it could be an application or the code so that there's... you know, words say one thing but pictures, you know, paint a thousand words. I don't remember how that statement goes. But I think it would give people a better sense of what is and is not allowed if we could find a way to incorporate diagrams as well.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Anybody else? Okay, now we can vote. Motion carries 7-0. Mr. Harvey?

9. Draft 2020 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. At the last meeting, we discussed the possibility of the upcoming schedule. So, Ms. Stinnette has put together information for your consideration for the next meeting. In particular, she's drafted a tentative schedule, which you'll see at your desk. She's also provided a listing of the Board of Supervisors' tentative meeting schedule side-by-side to the Planning Commissions' tentative meeting schedule. And then last but not least, gave you an overview of the entire calendar for the year so you can have a more complete discussion at the January 8th meeting.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Do you guys have any comments on this? It was really just so you would be able to plan. Yes?

Mr. Apicella: Just real quickly, we normally don't have a meeting around Thanksgiving nor around Christmas. I see two dates on the calendar.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And also, we try to have just one meeting in July and one meeting in August, so folks can be thinking about how they might want to align the calendar based on those previous precedents that we've set.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes. And highlighted in yellow are the days that overlap with the Board meeting... not overlap, but that are back-to-back with the Board of Supervisors meetings. So those, traditionally we have taken so that they're not on the day after the Board meeting so that staff isn't going to back-to-back meetings.

Inaudible, microphone not on.

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, I guess they could.

Mr. Randall: Good luck with that. So, Mr. Harvey, are the ones on the tentative Board of Supervisor dates, are those that are crossed out, are those tentative cross-outs or definitive cross-outs?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Randall, the Board has not voted on their calendar yet, but we understand these are potential cross-outs.

Ms. Vanuch: You guys will see the Board... the Board will vote on their calendar on the 7th so you'll see it on the 8th.

Mr. Randall: Right. Proposed; I just didn't know why you wouldn't have proposed that for us as well. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And, Madam Chairman, being the last meeting of the year, it's been my pleasure to work with the Planning Commission for another year. I think we've accomplished a lot and been very productive. And also, Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate you on your election to the Board of Supervisors. We'll miss you here on staff level with working with you at the Planning Commission. We're looking forward to working with you on the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch: Well, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And Commissioner Boswell, we'll miss you as well. Looking forward to working with you in a new capacity.

Mr. Boswell: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Harvey: And I want to wish the Commissioners Happy Holidays.

Mr. English: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you, and you, too.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so now moving onto County Attorney's Report.

Ms. Lucian: Good evening, Madam Chairman. I second all of Mr. Harvey's statements. Hope everybody has a great holiday. Thank you, I don't have anything else.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ms. Vanuch: Alright, thank you. That's the most you have said. Alright, any... we don't have any outstanding Committee Reports and, under the Chairman's Report, I just want to take a couple of minutes here and let you guys know how... I know, just a minute maybe... how fun it has been to serve on the Planning Commission with you guys. I don't know that the Board of Supervisors is going to be nearly this fun. We all get along really well and we've done some really amazing things. We've updated the Comp Plan, we've revised countless ordinances, the A-1, M-1 subdivision plans, we've reviewed thousands of home and their impacts, we've helped dozen of businesses expand and open up in the past 4 years, and some of you have served even longer than that. And so I would ask all of you guys to please keep up the great work that you're doing and representing all of our constituents across the County and doing this for the people. And that's what I think we do a really good job of here on the Planning Commission is listening to our residents. I'll be forever grateful for all of your leadership guidance and the faith that you guys have put in me as your Chairman for the last 2 years. And I would be remissed if I also didn't thank Wendy Maurer for appointing me to the Planning Commission and she has done a wonderful job dutifully working for the Rock Hill District and I'm looking forward to trying to fill into her shoes. So thank you guys very much for the opportunity to work with you in the last 4 years. And staff -- Jeff, you've been amazing. I know I'm going to be asking you lots and lots of questions. Stacie, you've been phenomenal. Lauren and all of the staff, Mike, Amy -- Amy's my go to on transportation. I pulled her into a TRC today, so you have a wonderful team and I look forwarding to continuing to working with you all. So thank you guys. [Applause] Okay, Other Business? That TRC was actually today; it got moved. And so we have approval of minutes, October 9th. Who wants to take a shot at it?

OTHER BUSINESS

10. TRC Information - January 8, 2020
 - ◆ Joshua Landing - Rock Hill Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 9, 2019

Mr. Bain: Madam Chairman, I'll make a motion to approve the minutes of October 9th.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we have a motion; do we have a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Second by Commissioner English. Any comments? Okay, vote. Try again, vote again. Okay, motion carries 7-0. October 23rd?

October 23, 2019

Mr. English: So moved.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, Commissioner English. Second?

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Commissioner Randall. Anyone else have any comments? Okay, go ahead and vote. Alright, motion carries 7-0. Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Comments

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Carolyn Wolford	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"I live in Hartwood, and it is getting absolutely ridiculous with the congestion! Put in roads and services, THEN HOMES!!!!"
Heather Hall	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"We do not need any more subdivisions in Stafford. We already don't have room in our schools to accommodate our children or bus drivers to get them there!!! Please preserve more of our land!!!"
Jim Howe	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"Development in Stafford County is out of control."
Helena Russell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"I am against the Westlake development for the simple reason that over 1100+ new homes will cause exorbitant traffic issues on already heavily traveled roads, addition over crowding in already over crowded schools, not to mention disturbance and destruction to wildlife. This is a rural/agricultural area that needs to stay this way, not turned into the suburbs. Richards Ferry and Holly Corner cannot afford any additional traffic on their narrow country roads. I am always in danger of being hit just pulling in/out of my driveway or mowing my yard near the street due to the heavy residential and construction traffic, and SPEEDING...I SAY NO to additional development!"
Stephanie Suocpe	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"I am signing because we don't need any more development in this part of the county. It is clear by the out of control development with no proffers for infrastructure that the Developers have bought and paid for the members of the Board of Supervisors. Not only do we need to charge developers a LOT more in proffers, it needs to be on a sliding scale per lot. The more houses a developer builds, the more expensive the per lot proffer needs to be. Developers are raking in money hand over fist at the expense of our community. This needs to be stopped."
Shelby Hall	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16	"We're already overcrowded and the traffic is bad enough as it is"
kima johnson	fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"600k housing development in this economy? The traffic is already terrible, there is a growing need to protect wildlife and land - we do not need anymore over priced housing projects that will take years to yield any return on investment anyways."
Wendy Carver	Culpeper, VA	2019-11-16	"This is a terrible idea. The area is already crowded, adding hundreds of new housing units is going to make it absolutely miserable. The Stafford schools haven't figured out how to deal with current overcrowding, this is going to be awful"
Christopher Steiner	Menifee, CA	2019-11-16	"The next Hearing is on 11DEC19 AT THE STAFFORD COURTHOUSE 630PM. Please come and tell the committee how you feel. Let your voice be heard."
Kerry Cooper	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"Leave Hartwood as it is!"
Bryan Shelton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"There is no infrastructure to support this type of development. In addition, the amount offered for this property is in no way equal to the cost to the taxpayers."

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Jennifer Cooper	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16	"Please no more houses until we build better and safer roads. AND more schools. Build those first then build houses."
Thorir ThorirThorisson	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-17	"Plan sucks"
William Sullivan	King George, VA	2019-11-17	"Way too much uncontrolled growth."
Emily Arndt	Springfield, VA	2019-11-17	"I agree with these home owners."
Terrie Green	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17	"Stafford county roads are already to busy. We do not need more traffic."
Jerome Golden	US	2019-11-17	"Stop trying to turn this county into Woodbridge. If you need something to do, fix that depressing excuse for skatepark. Thank you."
Linda S. Hennebury Hennebury	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18	"Developers are destroying Stafford County. Our school's are already overcrowded, as are our roads. Stafford used to be a beautiful County, but because our supervisors keep allowing Developers to build, we also have a lot of crime."
Caroline Raymond	Spotsylvania, VA	2019-11-18	"This area does not need any more housing developments!! As a native of the area I'm growing really weary of all these housing developments being built, when the school systems are struggling to support the population as it is. Build more schools, NOT more houses!!!"
MELISSA HAWKINS	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20	"Hartwood is becoming way over developed, it's not the small area feel that we all were accustomed to. If the growth doesnt stop my family has plans to leave the area to find what we once had."
Micah Short	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20	"I care about the kids of the schools of hartwood"
Madeline Gregory	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20	"Where are our wild animals going to live? you have taken enough of THEIR land. stop"
Andrew Tucker	US	2019-11-21	"We don't need more development"
Kyle Crone	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21	"Because it's stupid just like the Stafford commission"
Jake Oyler	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21	"We need to grow in a smart way. Not like this. We need to have schools in place and roadways widened and kept up for the safety of our community"
Martin Vargas	US	2019-11-21	"I attend hartwood elementary myself and now so do my 2 brothers and sister. They love they school and their friends I don't any to see them get restricted"
Leslie Rojas	stafford, VA	2019-11-21	"STAFFORD IS FULL, our schools are full, our streets are full. We don't need ANY more housing around here. You want a house? Buy the ones already empty."
Ashlee Kerr	Carthage, NC	2019-11-21	"This is where my husband grew up and his father has a farm and Hartwood. The area is becoming saturated!"

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Lynn Bailey	Spotsylvania, VA	2019-11-21	"Hartwood is a beautiful country setting. No more homes to add to the traffic congestion."
Jacob Stevens	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21	"We don't need anymore neighborhoods!!"
Marc Whitt	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-22	"Marc Whitt"
Sheila Lieske	US	2019-11-22	"I live off of Hartwood Rd and do not want to see look the way that North Stafford looks."
Paula Sisco	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-04	"We MUST have undeveloped land and green space for quality of life. We, too, chose to live in this area because of the calm, rural aspect. That has already been greatly diminished by new housing developments in recent years. Traffic has become stressful and dangerous. Please, no more!"
Stephanie Newton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-10	"Stafford county is getting ridiculous! Stop all the housing developments! It's already not the same great place I remember growing up."

Recipient: Stafford County Board of Supervisors

Letter: Greetings,

Hartwood residents against Westlake development

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
Icpenland .	US	2019-11-16
Kelsey Dunn	Arlington, VA	2019-11-16
Tracy Uhl	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Chris Steiner	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Joanna Berger	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
James Anderson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Ben Klinefelter	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Jenifer ODriscoll	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Christopher Reed	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-16
Susan Young	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Kathryn Nordeen	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Joseph Berger	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Kristin Walker	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Stephanie Myers	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Carolyn Wolford	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Hank Koch	Kansas City, US	2019-11-16
Heather Hall	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Joanne Murray	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Natalie Anderson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Jim Howe	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16

Name	Location	Date
Vernon Steiner	Riverside, CA	2019-11-16
Helena Russell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Vongthipsuda Lofgren	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Sara Matczak	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-16
Vilaiwan Steiner	Riverside, CA	2019-11-16
Ana Mearing	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Julie Kruse	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Alexanna Hengy	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Carrie Gleason	Sedalia, CO	2019-11-16
John Valverde	Washington, DC	2019-11-16
Lisaundra Plummer	virginia beach, VI	2019-11-16
Vanessa Schuermann	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
John Rivera	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Karen Fisher	Raleigh, NC	2019-11-16
Branwyn Jobes	Winchester, VA	2019-11-16
Stephanie Suuope	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
John Skyles	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Darren Hendricks	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Matthew Darling	Cleveland, US	2019-11-16
Luis Maldonado	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Elizabeth Di Risio	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Robert Skyles	Windsor, CO	2019-11-16

Name	Location	Date
Raleigh koritz	Saint Paul, MN	2019-11-16
austin ward	Albany, OR	2019-11-16
Shelby Hall	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Mary Walsh	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
kima johnson	fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Helene Domi	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Patrick Hall	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Jennifer Hall	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
John Steven Skyles	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Annette Hall	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-16
Melissa Palmertree	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Irene Melson	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Kaleigh Mess	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Robert Jankovits	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Kris Jankovits	Virginia	2019-11-16
Dale Roberts	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
MArtha Cross	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Walter Roberts	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Carla Anderson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Christine Steiner	Richmond, VA	2019-11-16
Daisie Register	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Wendy Carver	Culpeper, VA	2019-11-16

Name	Location	Date
Nicole Deluca	Arlington, VA	2019-11-16
Lena Meng	Providence, US	2019-11-16
Isabela T	Brooklyn, US	2019-11-16
Brandi Meadows	Niles, US	2019-11-16
Julie Patton	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Mollie Payne	Locust Grove, VA	2019-11-16
Heather Zwicker	Centreville, VA	2019-11-16
Amanda Howard	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Teresa Patton D'Orazio	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Danielle Lichliter	Arlington, VA	2019-11-16
Brenda Young	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Theodore Patton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Kathleen Bell	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Christopher Shelton	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-16
Wanda Atkins	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Jason Knight	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-16
Kim Penick	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Dean Hohman	Manassas, VA	2019-11-16
Kerry Cooper	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Debbie Payne	Warrenton, VA	2019-11-16
Lisa Thomas	Ooltewah, TN	2019-11-16
Tam Knight	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16

Name	Location	Date
Glenn Graves	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Elizabeth Nast	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Ken Harding	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Melissa Spicer	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
greg dixon	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Bryan Shelton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Jennifer Cooper	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Martin Rivas pintos	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Denny Kelly	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Gary Lewis	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Brent Lawson	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-16
Travis Muhler	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
Shawna Roe	Stafford, VA	2019-11-16
LeRoy Strohl	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-16
Thorir ThorirThorisson	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-17
Catherine Thompson-Allan	Lexington, VA	2019-11-17
Haley Patton	Stafford, VA	2019-11-17
Kelsey Farris	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Susan Gammmon	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Raymes Khalid	Brooklyn, US	2019-11-17

Name	Location	Date
Candace Sayre	Detroit, US	2019-11-17
Sarah Gaumond	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Casey McCloud	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Mayori Lopez	Oxnard, US	2019-11-17
Courtney Phipps	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Cassy Welch	Stafford, VA	2019-11-17
Angella Page	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Tabitha Stires	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Evan Tilton	Rapid City, US	2019-11-17
Dennis Cornwell	Colonial beach, VA	2019-11-17
Sara Bryan	US	2019-11-17
Jackson Dang	Garden Grove, US	2019-11-17
Jasmine Wyder	Buffalo, US	2019-11-17
Daniel Malagon	Green Cove Springs, US	2019-11-17
Donald Pritchett	Dayton, US	2019-11-17
Emily Arndt	Springfield, VA	2019-11-17
Tina Blair	Montross, VA	2019-11-17
darin cosgrove	Seattle, US	2019-11-17
Shay Scott	Stilwell, OK	2019-11-17
Stacy Lillard	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Marta Ortiz	Virginia Beach, US	2019-11-17
Laura Cisario	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17

Name	Location	Date
M Green	Northern Virginia, VA	2019-11-17
Robert Senter	Christiansburg, VA	2019-11-17
Raquel E Rivera	South Hadley, US	2019-11-17
Lorrie Foley	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Aubrey Gustafson	Isanti, US	2019-11-17
Jason Elliott	King George, VA	2019-11-17
Timothy McCabe	Stafford, VA	2019-11-17
Robert Haydon	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Michael Baker	Austin, US	2019-11-17
Brian Ayres	Phoenixville, US	2019-11-17
Terrie Green	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Emily Hoiska	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Lauren Mukherjee	Canyon Country, US	2019-11-17
Mackenzie Hudson	Woodbridge, VA	2019-11-17
Eric Warner	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Minecraft_Moon12 Water	Wayland, US	2019-11-17
Jerome Golden	US	2019-11-17
Travis Knight	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Dawn Richardson	Oklahoma, US	2019-11-17
Kelsey Pearson	Rochester, US	2019-11-17
Norma Bourne	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Jason Phipps	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17

Name	Location	Date
Craig Woolls	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
David Rao	Ruther Glen, VA	2019-11-17
Ashley Woolls	Stafford, VA	2019-11-17
Ai Error	Anaheim, US	2019-11-17
Angela Wilhelm	STAFFORD, VA	2019-11-17
Ken Berry	Washington, DC	2019-11-17
Lukas Patton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Donna Phipps	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
Candice Gill	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-17
JENNIFER BURCHAM	FRED, VA	2019-11-17
James shifflett	Stafford, VA	2019-11-17
Mike Burton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Wanda Maturo	Arlington, VA	2019-11-18
Kalie Morgan	Brandon, US	2019-11-18
James Newton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
William Robinson	Hyattsville, MD	2019-11-18
TAJSHA GREENE	MCMINNVILLE, TN	2019-11-18
Eric H	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Akera Copeland	Norfolk, US	2019-11-18
Sarah Shelton	Stafford, VA	2019-11-18
Linda S. Hennebury Hennebury	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18

Name	Location	Date
Erick Speight	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Katy Millican	Grosse Pointe, US	2019-11-18
Sandy Brannon	Bardwell, KY	2019-11-18
Lee Smith	MossPoint, US	2019-11-18
janet hahn	fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Kevin Porter	Somerville, VA	2019-11-18
Ginger Wible	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Michael noble	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Caroline Raymond	Spotsylvania, VA	2019-11-18
Brittany Slade	US	2019-11-18
Susan Davis	Brunswick, US	2019-11-18
Meghan Collier	Fairfax, VA	2019-11-18
Alyana Entrena	Hialeah, US	2019-11-18
Carson Poole	Radford, US	2019-11-18
Hannah Lansford	Washington, DC	2019-11-18
Andrea Klinefelter	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Alex Joseph	Louisville, US	2019-11-18
Antonetta Di Diana	Las Vegas, US	2019-11-18
Donna Carmical	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-18
Alexandra Von Timroth	Worcester, US	2019-11-19
Chris Holloway	Lakeland, US	2019-11-19
Graham Baggette	Winchester, US	2019-11-19

Name	Location	Date
Christian Zita	Howell, US	2019-11-19
Tree Person	Hampshire, US	2019-11-19
Debra Shelton-Scites	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-19
Karen Burton	Newport News, VA	2019-11-19
Christopher Hough	Manassas, US	2019-11-19
Ethan Jones	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-19
Sean Imanian	Spotsylvania Courthouse, VA	2019-11-19
Donna Esquivel	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-19
Scott Loftin	Conroe, US	2019-11-19
Riley Hollingshead	Old Washington, US	2019-11-19
Hayleigh Allyssa Born	US	2019-11-19
Adam Kaluba	Cincinnati, US	2019-11-19
Eric Segbor	Muncie, US	2019-11-19
Chris Crawford	Stafford, VA	2019-11-19
Tracy Knight	Stafford, VA	2019-11-19
Brandon Michalski	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-19
Mike Gill	Washington, DC	2019-11-20
Ashtynn Schaefer	New Ulm, US	2019-11-20
Neo Wright	Saint Paul, US	2019-11-20
Natauni Jarrile	Chesapeake, US	2019-11-20
Madison Hines	Eagle River, US	2019-11-20
LeAnn Hensel	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20

Name	Location	Date
Destin Carter-Woods	Teaneck, US	2019-11-20
Nicholas Hafner	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Jennifer Hernandez	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
John Haren	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Alyssa Bailey	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Ginger Tinsley	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Daniel Powell	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Eric Buchanan	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Janna Durnavich	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Emily Curtis	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Londa Powell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Karen Feldbauer	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-20
Pellar Pellar	Washington, DC	2019-11-20
Patricia Burgess	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
David Kennedy	US	2019-11-20
ANDREW Rivers	Helena, MT	2019-11-20
Rachel Peller	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
Katrina Buchanan	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Joseph Feldbauer	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
Jarred Treadway	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
MELISSA HAWKINS	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Micah Short	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20

Name	Location	Date
Eli Beach	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-20
Haley Lutman	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
Madeline Gregory	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
Cole Childs	Stafford, VA	2019-11-20
Samantha Mitchell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Tracy Curtis	US	2019-11-20
Kyle Runkles	Falls Church, VA	2019-11-20
Anna Brumley	Remington, VA	2019-11-20
Mason Woods	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-20
Derek Wilson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Jamison Marshall	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Mary Meisner	Arlington, VA	2019-11-21
Barry Lutman	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21
Kenzie Donnelly	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Jeffrey Mitchell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Arturo Santillan	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Zach Deditch	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Cheyenne Walker	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21
Hanna Short	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Samantha Gilbert	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
N'Dya Kendall	Hyde Park, NY	2019-11-21
Luke Howard	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21

Name	Location	Date
Ali Marie	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Nick Baczkowski	Falls Church, VA	2019-11-21
Shawn Curtis	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Andrew Tucker	US	2019-11-21
Danielle Pierson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Erin Tucker	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Lori Michalski	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Karen Zink	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Michael Cockrell	Falls Church, VA	2019-11-21
Josh Bailey	York, PA	2019-11-21
Megan Moore	Milford, MA	2019-11-21
James Giles	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Jessica Giles	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Virginia Kerr	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Shaun Kerr	Fayetteville, NC	2019-11-21
David Carli	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Kyle Crone	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Steven Pischner	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Jake Johnson	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21
Kyle Theriault	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Lacey Gail	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Travis Leake	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21

Name	Location	Date
Brittnay Duncan	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Jake Oyler	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Samantha Boney	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Danielle OConnell	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Denise Pierson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Michael Evans	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Jessy Haugh	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Liam Gail	Fairfax, VA	2019-11-21
Elaine Mahieu	Mineral, VA	2019-11-21
Martin Vargas	US	2019-11-21
Justin Looney	Spotsylvania, VA	2019-11-21
Todd Hargosh	Leesburg, VA	2019-11-21
Elizabeth Taylor	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-21
Cory Helmandollar	Washington, DC	2019-11-21
Leslie Rojas	stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Ashleigh Dabney	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Lori Pate	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Luke Harris	stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Ashlee Kerr	Carthage, NC	2019-11-21
Bailey Vera	Locust Grove, VA	2019-11-21
Lynn Bailey	Spotsylvania, VA	2019-11-21
Alyssa Cugle	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21

Name	Location	Date
Heather Huntzinger	Hampton, VA	2019-11-21
Jacob Wheeler	Springfield, VA	2019-11-21
Emily Ohde	Rochester, MN	2019-11-21
Paula Motsenbocker	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
Lisa Arthur	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-21
jacob stevens	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Lauren Taylor	Stafford, VA	2019-11-21
Emily Waterman	Ashburn, VA	2019-11-21
Olga Pierson	Hackettstown, NJ	2019-11-21
Paolo Perez	Springfield, VA	2019-11-22
Todd Patton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-22
Marc Whitt	Alexandria, VA	2019-11-22
Ellie Whatley	Hartwood, VA	2019-11-22
kate koch	Stafford, VA	2019-11-22
brenna armstrong	Elkridge, MD	2019-11-22
Carlene Kerr	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-22
Sheila Lieske	US	2019-11-22
Kelly Carder	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-22
Joan Poillon	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-22
Mark Koch	Oxon Hill, MD	2019-11-22
Krissy Stroup	Stafford, VA	2019-11-22
Robert Carder	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-22

Name	Location	Date
Nicole Weiler	Stafford, CA	2019-11-22
Taylor Breivik	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-23
Susan Preston	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-23
Sharon Reik	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-23
Carolyn Barrett	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-23
Jonathon Euzent	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-23
Chris Short	Stafford, VA	2019-11-23
Christi Smith	Woodbridge, VA	2019-11-23
Theresa Helmandollar	Bradenton, FL	2019-11-23
Tatiana Chavous	Colonial Beach, US	2019-11-23
Daniel Pierson	Stafford, VA	2019-11-24
Rehab Abdin	Stafford, VA	2019-11-24
Kevin Dias	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-24
Janet Sforza	Northampton, US	2019-11-24
Brittany Michalski	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-24
Lauren Wilcox	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-24
Rakah Rrzheemsa	Troy, US	2019-11-24
Nasr Khan	Hillside, US	2019-11-24
Beth Queen	Washington, DC	2019-11-24
Caitlin Ferguson	Stafford, VA	2019-11-24
Mikayla Amaro	Harrison, US	2019-11-24
Shayna Cox	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-24

Name	Location	Date
Judi six	Stafford, VA	2019-11-24
Lunar Moyer	Fostoria, US	2019-11-24
Emily Bates	Fairfax, VA	2019-11-24
Danny Fitch	Fort Wayne, US	2019-11-24
David Weintraub	Port Saint Lucie, FL	2019-11-25
Ramona Snyder	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-25
Dustin Ewing	Loomis, US	2019-11-25
Doje Man	Hialeah, US	2019-11-25
Tina Moser	Garrisonville, VA	2019-11-25
Trenity Anderson	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-25
Aya Alwan	Louisville, US	2019-11-25
Mekhi Coleman	Elkridge, US	2019-11-25
James McEwen	Belfast, US	2019-11-26
Raymond Berry	Mechanicsville, US	2019-11-26
Rachel Caputi	Hazlet, US	2019-11-26
Matthew Hatcher	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-11-26
Rebecca Coronado	Stafford, VA	2019-11-26
Hebe Boyett	Falls Church, VA	2019-11-28
Haley Patton	Stafford, VA	2019-12-01
Brooke Myers	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-02
Aaron Ball	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-03
rylee fisher	Brighton, US	2019-12-03

Name	Location	Date
Shiny Articuno	Chesapeake, US	2019-12-03
Kyle Mckee	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-04
Eric Stewart	Bowie, MD	2019-12-04
Paula Sisco	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-04
Joe Brito	Stafford, VA	2019-12-04
Michelle Magrino	Stafford, VA	2019-12-04
Ava Moore	Asheville, US	2019-12-04
Tanya Harmon	Atlanta, US	2019-12-04
Jeancarlos Baez	Miami, US	2019-12-04
Erica Doyle	Stafford, VA	2019-12-04
Jennifer Eichberg	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-04
Michael Turner	Unionville, US	2019-12-04
Ryan Leland	Mesa, US	2019-12-04
Michele Utterback	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-05
Linda Peralta	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-05
Lisa Skeer	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-05
Victoria Shih	Plano, US	2019-12-09
Britton Dovel	Stafford, VA	2019-12-10
Rob McGuire	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-10
Rebecca McGuire	Stafford, VA	2019-12-10
Bettina Guest	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-10
Stephanie Newton	Fredericksburg, VA	2019-12-10