

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
January 13, 2021

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, January 13, 2021, was called to order at 4:30 PM by the Director of Planning and Zoning, Jeff Harvey, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center and at remote locations throughout the County.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella (remote), Darrell English, Barton Randall, Albert Bain, Kristen Barnes, Dexter Cummings (remote), Fillmore McPherson (remote)

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Trent Funkhouser, Joseph Valotta, Brian Geouge, Kathy Baker

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Apicella, I would request that Ms. Barnes, Mr. Cummings, and I be able to participate today from a remote location here in Stafford, and would ask the Commission to approve our electronic participation.

Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Mr. Randall: Second.

Mr. Harvey: I'll do a roll call vote. So, Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, the vote is unanimous for remote participation. Next is the Election of Officers. How this will proceed is I will request for nominations for Election of a Chairman, and I will take those nominations and request a vote based upon the order in which they're taken. Once a Chairman has been determined, the Chairman will take over the meeting and proceed with the Election of the Vice-Chairman and the Secretary. So, are there any nominations for Chairman?

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Election of Chairman

Mr. McPherson: Yes. This is Commissioner McPherson, I nominate Steve Apicella as Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Commissioner McPherson. Are there any other nominations? Hearing none, it appears that we have Mr. Apicella by acclamation. Thank you and congratulations Mr. Apicella.

B. Election of Vice-Chairman

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey. I'll now ask for any nominations for Vice-Chair.

Ms. Barnes: Steven, I'd like to nominate Bart Randall.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Are there any other nominations? Okay, seeing none, by also acclamation, Mr. Randall is now our new Vice-Chairman. Congratulations Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

C. Election of Secretary

Mr. Apicella: Moving forward, are there any nominations for Planning Commission Secretary?

Ms. Barnes: Steven, I'll go ahead and nominate Fillmore McPherson as well.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Barnes. Are there any other nominations? Okay, seeing none, Mr. McPherson, it looks like you're our new Secretary. Congratulations to you as well.

Mr. McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I congratulate both of you gentlemen and look forward to working with everybody for another great year despite the ongoing pandemic and the many challenges that it will bring. I have two more points to make. Voting on motions will be conducted by voice vote. And, if we have any technical issues, Mr. Randall will take over as Chairman. Are there any Declarations of Disqualification on any agenda item?

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, I do. I just want to make a point that I met with the Bumbrey's in reference to number 5 on the public hearing in reference to the Taco Bell.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. English. Anybody else? Okay, moving on, are there any changes to the agenda? Okay, seeing none, I'll now open the Public Presentations portion of today's meeting. The purpose of public presentation is to allow members of the community to comment on any item except those scheduled for a public hearing. There'll be a separate comment period for each of those public hearing items as they are considered. Mr. Harvey, do we have any written comments submitted to the County?

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, we have not received any written comments.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you Mr. Harvey. I believe the County facility is closed and there is no one in the chambers to provide any oral comments. So, I'm going to close the Public Presentations portion of the meeting and move onto the first item of the agenda, which is the Conditional Use Permit, Embrey Mill Town Center – South Phase 4. I will open the public hearing for this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on January 27, 2021, as per the date selected by the applicant's agent? Is there a motion to that effect?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP20153496; Conditional Use Permit – Embrey Mill Town Center – South Phase 4 - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a maximum of seven (7) drive-through uses and one (1) vehicle fuel sales facility within the PD-2, Planned Development-2 Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-53B (portion), 29-60C (portion), and 29-70K (portion) (collectively, "Property"). The Property consists of a total of 11.05 acres, located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: April 23, 2021)**

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. Randall: I'll second that Steven.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you. Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll do a quick roll call vote. Mr. Bain, on the motion, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings? Mr. Cummings? Okay, moving on, Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, the vote is 6 affirm with 1 absent.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Cummings is here.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Is your vote yes?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so the vote is unanimous. Thank you Mr. Cummings. Alright, moving onto item number 2, Telecom Tower Brent Marsh, Comp Plan Compliance Review. I'll now open the public hearing on this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on February 10, 2021?

2. COM20153256; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review - Telecom Tower Brent Marsh - A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2232, for the placement of a telecommunications facility, consisting of a telecommunications monopole, including ancillary equipment, on Tax Map Parcel No. 23-6, located on the south side of Brent Point Road and east side of the intersection with Arkendale Road and CSX Railroad crossing, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. CitySwitch II-A, LLC is the applicant. **(Time Limit: March 14, 2021)**

Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, and a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Any discussion? Seeing none, I'll do a roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Motion carries unanimously. Moving onto item number 3, Telecom Tower Brent Marsh, CUP. I'll now open the public hearing for this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on February 10, 2021? is there a motion to that effect?

3. CUP20153255; Conditional Use Permit - Telecom Tower Brent Marsh - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a communication facility ("Facility") within the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 23-6 (Property). The Facility consists of a 195-foot tall telecommunications monopole with ancillary equipment. The Property consists of 341 acres, located on the south side of Brent Point Road and east side of the intersection with Arkendale Road and CSX Railroad crossing, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. CitySwitch II-A, LLC is the applicant. **(Time Limit: April 23, 2021)**

Mr. Randall: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: And a second?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you. I'll take a roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Thank you everybody. Moving onto item number 4, Courthouse Tracts Proffer Amendment/Reclassification. I'll now open the public hearing for this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on February 10, 2021? Is there a motion to that effect?

4. RC20153242; Reclassification – Courthouse Tracts Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on 4.08 acres zoned B-2, Urban Commercial, to allow a restaurant with drive-through and a convenience store with vehicle fuel sales, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-3 and 39-3A (Property). The Property is subject to two concurrent conditional use permit requests. The Property is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: March 19, 2021) (History: December 9, 2020 Public Hearing Continued to January 13, 2021)**

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: And a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Great. I'll take a roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Moving onto item number 5, Courthouse Tracts Taco Bell, Conditional Use Permit. I'll now open the public hearing for this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on February 10, 2021?

5. CUP20153243; Conditional Use Permit – Courthouse Tracts Taco Bell - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a drive-through facility in the B-2, Urban Commercial and HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-3 and 39-3A (Property). The Property consists of 4.05 acres, and is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: March 19, 2021) (History: December 9, 2020 Public Hearing Continued to January 13, 2021)**

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. I'll take a roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. The motion carries unanimously. Item number 6, Courthouse Tracts 7-Eleven, Conditional Use Permit. I'll now open the public hearing for this item. I request that staff and the applicant defer presentations at this time. Will a Planning Commissioner please make a motion to continue the public hearing with staff and applicant presentations to be held on February 10, 2021?

6. CUP20153244; Conditional Use Permit – Courthouse Tracts 7-Eleven - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow vehicle fuel sales in the B-2, Urban Commercial and HC,

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts and a convenience store in the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-3 and 39-3A (Property). The Property consists of 4.05 acres, and is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Jefferson Davis Highway and Hospital Center Boulevard, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: March 19, 2021) (History: December 9, 2020 Public Hearing Continued to January 13, 2021)**

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: And a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Great. On this motion, Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye on the motion. The motion carries unanimously. Item number 7 is already deferred to the February 10 meeting. So, moving onto agenda item number 8; Mr. Harvey.

7. RC19152902; Reclassification – Tree Haven Rezoning - A proposed zoning reclassification from the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District to the A-2, Rural Residential Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 18-78, consisting of 3.67 acres (Property), to allow for the development of 3 single-family dwellings. The Property is located at the southwest intersection of Mountain View Road and Tree Haven Lane, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: February 26, 2021) (History: November 18, 2020 Public Hearing Continued to February 10, 2021)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. Downtown Stafford - Authorize public hearings for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Zoning Ordinance Text amendment regarding the UD-5, Urban Development, Zoning District, and a zoning reclassification application for approximately 29 acres to the UD-5 Zoning District, in the Courthouse Planning Area. **(Time Limit: February 12, 2021) (History: PC Work Session December 2, 2020) (Deferred to January 13, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Geouge will making the presentation for staff to give an update. We also have Ms. Baker and Mr. Zuraf remotely available if there are questions related to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Again, please recognize Mr. Geouge for the presentation, and Mr. Zuraf and Ms. Baker from staff will be available remotely to answer any questions you may have with regard to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the proposed rezoning application.

Mr. Apicella: Great, thank you Mr. Geouge.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you. Good evening and congratulations Mr. Chairman and Vice Chairman. Members of the Commission, I'm Brian Geouge with Planning and Zoning. This is a continuation of the discussion on Downtown Stafford, which encompasses three different items; a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, and Reclassification of County and JPI-owned land to the Urban Development-5, or UD-5, Zoning District. The Planning Commission discussed this in detail at a work session on December 2, as well as at their December 9th meeting. Mainly, that discussion focused on the Ordinance Amendment. So, the following is just a summary of comments made at those meetings, as well as... I'm not sure what happened there, I'm sorry... as well as staff responses to some of these comments. So, one of the comments was to amend the purpose of the UD District to state that it's only to be used within Targeted Growth Areas. That change was made to the draft ordinance by staff. Also, there was a comment about consideration of streamlining the rezoning process for UD rezonings. There was a comment regarding desired streetscapes and a desire to have some examples of those, which staff provided at the December 9th meeting. Considering bicycle and pedestrian requirements, there was a comment that additional facilities were desired. We do note, with the current approved Ordinance, bicycle lanes are only required within one of the street types, and that's the avenue street type. However, the proposed Ordinance would expand the definition of several street types to state that the design may also include bike lanes. This would provide some flexibility in determining where bike lanes would be most appropriate at the time of a rezoning. There was a comment regarding the elimination of setbacks from the streets, and elimination of street buffers. And staff revised the avenue and main street types to include wider pedestrian accommodations. So, previously, it was proposed that sidewalks would be 8 feet in these areas. We changed that to 10 feet. And also, we revised the Build 2 Zone definition to state that it's to be measured either from the edge of right-of-way or edge of sidewalk, whichever is greater. And that was mainly to address instances where in a more dense urban environment you have sidewalk that essentially extends from curb to the building, but the limits of VDOT right-of-way would likely end at the curb. So, measuring the Build 2 Zone off of that right-of-way would not be practical in those situations.

Mr. McPherson: Brian, can I ask a quick question?

Mr. Geouge: Yes sir.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: What if a restaurant wanted to set some outside seats and they'll extend down to the sidewalk; would that be allowable? Because that could make the sidewalk only 5 feet versus 10 feet. What's the rules going to be around that?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not sure about rules per se, but as long as it's located with outside... outside of the right-of-way and there's ample space there to accommodate that, I supposed it would be fine. And that's I guess another reason we bumped up that sidewalk width to anticipate, you know, some of that happening along these areas.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you. Because outdoor eating is going to be very popular at some point.

Mr. Bain: Does that mean that there's nothing in the ordinance that prohibits people from blocking the sidewalk for their business purposes?

Mr. Geouge: Well...

Mr. Bain: I mean, you can go to some places and they have racks of clothes out on the sidewalk and that sort of thing. Is there anything in the ordinance that would prevent that?

Mr. Geouge: I don't think there's any specific language that would deal with that, because in those situations it would be, um, it would be private property essentially. So, I'm not sure exactly how that would be regulated.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, to add onto that, if it created a situation where there was a safety hazard, especially for fire access, the Fire Marshal would probably ask them to cease and desist. If it's on public owned property, the County code requires that anyone proposing to use public property has to get permission from the Board of Supervisors to do so.

Mr. Bain: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Randall: So, I don't know if now is the right time to talk about it or whether we should wait, but on the same vein, what you're telling me then is that throughout Downtown Stafford, or at least through the county-owned property, we only expect that there'll be a 10-foot sidewalk between the road and a building. Is that correct?

Mr. Geouge: Well, it would also encompass a 6-foot minimum planting area. In this case the planting area would be tree pits, not a continuous landscape strip most likely.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So, it would be 10 feet from... so, it'd be 16 feet total.

Mr. Geouge: Correct. Minimum.

Mr. Randall: Minimum. Alright. What was the 10-foot based on? Was that just a more than 8, less than 11, or was there a reason why we picked 10 as a reason and not 15, for example, to give enough room where somebody would be able to say I'm not going to run into an issue if I have, you know, 3 tables and 6 chairs outside. I won't run into a safety requirement that the County may have. What was the basis for the number?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Geouge: I think a lot of it was based on just comparable examples that the County looked at when they were scoping this. We did find that that measurement is consistent with many of those locations that we looked at.

Mr. Randall: Okay. I guess we can talk about that a little more then. Alright, that's fine.

Mr. Geouge: Another comment was to adjust the Courthouse Targeted Growth Area numbers to reflect the increase in multi-family housing. So, additional amendments to the Comp Plan are proposed to increase that from 1,500 to 3,190; that's an increase of 1,690. The Downtown Plan proposes 2,418 multi-family units total, and it's estimated that 728 of those original 1,500 units within the TGA could be accommodated within the Downtown area. So, that's how that number was arrived at. There were concerns regarding impacts of public facilities. There are also several amendments to the Comp Plan proposed in response to that. There were comments regarding the requirements for green spaces. Staff does note that the ordinance specifies planning principles for the UD District which include integrating formal and informal active and passive open spaces within each Urban Development area. And that's to be connected with pedestrian and bicycle networks. Staff believes that the best tool to ensure compliance with the green space vision is through the rezoning process where we have a chance to review those, and see what's going to be next to these developments and see if additional green spaces are needed on a case by case basis. Continue on the open space topic; so, here's a picture of the Downtown Stafford concept plan. The plan identifies 8 parks total, ranging from a quarter acre to two acres for a 6¾-acre total. The Phase 1 area, which is the rezoning area, would include a half-acre park plaza area, and these are already highlighted in red but that plaza area is here in blue. And a quarter-acre park plaza area within the JPI property, and that's at the northeast corner. And the remaining 6 parks would be disbursed among the remaining Urban Development area or downtown area. There is also a request to have more information on the kind of street types that would be used within the downtown area. So, the next couple slides provide some examples for that. Really, we envision primarily there being two different street types used in the downtown area. The first one is shown here; it's referred to as the main street parallel street type. As the name implies, it would have parallel parking, no median, and you can see in the cross-section here that you see what I was talking about, about the 6-foot planting area with the tree pits, plus the 10-foot sidewalk between the curb and the building. So, where we envision that street type is shown in the red dash line on the map here. And also, you'll see a yellow background – that's where we envision there being some sort of bike accommodations through the downtown area. You'll see on the cross-section here, there's no bike lanes depicted. But, as I said, we did add some language to the ordinance that says that bike lanes can be incorporated with this particular street type.

Mr. Randall: So, Brian, can I ask one quick question then? Would we expect that there will be bikes used throughout this complex, not just those on the bike lanes?

Mr. Geouge: We anticipate that bicycle use would not be encouraged on all roads. They would be focused on certain roads. And there would be bike parking sort of strategically placed to where you could get close to the downtown area or the key destinations...

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Geouge: ... and be able to lock your bike up and walk within a reasonable distance.

Mr. Randall: Right. But would it be conceivable that you would have 10 year olds, 12 year olds, 13 year olds out riding their bikes through this area? Potentially on the sidewalks?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Geouge: On the sidewalks, I supposed it's always a possibility with sidewalks. You never know how people are.

Mr. Randall: Well, when you've got 2,500 dwelling units.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, you never know how people are going to use this...

Mr. Randall: I would fully expect that in order to ride to the park that they would be riding their bikes to those parks and those open areas.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah. And some of these roads may be low volume enough to where you could have shared road signage and, you've seen them, the striping on the roads that say, you know, share with bikes and things like that.

Mr. Randall: I understand. I'm just saying that it's great that we have the bike lanes in the roads as identified in the yellow, but I think it's also conceivable to think that with 2,500 dwelling units in the area that you're going to get a lot of bikes, a lot of – especially with the parks scattered throughout the area – you're going to get a lot of bikes going throughout this whole area which is another thing we need to think about when we talk about sidewalks. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Hey Brian, to that end, I'm looking at the diagram. I see kind of a T shape with respect to the proposed bike lanes. And so, in the center, I see it starting and ending at a certain point, and one of those points is close to the biggest park area. Why not a bike lane all the way through to Burns Corner?

Mr. Geouge: You mean like this?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Geouge: Sorry, I was getting to that on the next slide.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Geouge: That's fine. So, the second street type that would be used, it's considered the neighborhood street type. The cross-section is shown here. Again, no medians, parallel parking areas. But in this case you have buildings are separated potentially a little further from the road and just typical sidewalk kind of setup here where the right-of-way would likely encompass those sidewalks as well. So, the difference here is the sidewalks are slightly wider than what is required by VDOT. So, VDOT requires 5-foot sidewalks; these are shown at 6 feet. So, not a full multi-use standard as far as width, but hopefully a little more that can accommodate some of those potential conflicts and users. So, that street type we are envisioning to be used as you move out from the urban center more towards the residential portion of Downtown Stafford where density is a little bit lower and as Mr. Chairman stated, you have more of the parks and things like that in that area. And again, the yellow highlighting would indicate the bike lanes that would extend out to Courthouse Road realigned.

Mr. Randall: Right. So, Brian, that number of 6-foot for the sidewalk, again, is an arbitrary number? Just greater than 5, not really... we could make it 7 without too much of an issue?

Mr. Geouge: I supposed you could. It's...

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Randall: Okay. Again...

Mr. Geouge: ... at our discretion... *inaudible*.

Mr. Randall: Right, and that was my point. Again, we're talking about the fact that if – especially because, you know, I'm assuming that you're going to have a lot of residential. These are people that are going to be in apartments. They're not going to have a place to have their kids go play. Those kids are going to be outside. They're going to be wanting to ride their bikes and either they're going to be on the sidewalk with other people or they're going to be in the street.

Mr. Geouge: Right.

Mr. Randall: Because there is no other place for them to ride. And so, given that preference, I'd rather have a... even a 10-foot wide multi-use path where they can ride on the sidewalk without killing, you know, people on the sidewalk rather than actually in the street.

Mr. Geouge: Right. So, you see the yellow line extending west to east here. A possibility of errors that where it coincides with the blue line shown in this... as this street type, it could be a shared-use path that accommodates those cyclists at 10-foot wide. And then as you transition to the red line, it could change to a bike lane, on street, a bicycle accommodation where you have that separation. Another thing I'll note is that these are minimums. So, when we receive rezoning requests and evaluate those on a case by case basis, similar to how we're thinking of approaching the bike accommodation issue, focusing in that on certain roads, the same approach could be taken with the sidewalks where potentially you could evaluate it on a case by case basis and say, you know, at this particular location we think a 10-foot shared-use path would be appropriate; however, on these streets maybe a 6-foot sidewalk is okay.

Mr. Bain: Brian, what would be the speed limit on these roads?

Mr. Geouge: My guess would be 25 for all of them, yeah.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Yeah, I would hope that would be the maximum, yes. Then I've got a thought. Looking at this drawing, there are five new road accesses to Route 1, between Hospital Drive and Courthouse Road. Will Route 1 be modified to have a median so that those access points are right-in and right-out only? Because I would sure hate to see five additional places where people could be trying to cross traffic either coming out of the development or going in. Do you know?

Mr. Geouge: We did have some discussion with VDOT about that a while back. They obviously are interested in minimizing those points of access to the greatest extent possible. However, I think they mentioned that maybe we could have one signal along that stretch in the center or thereabouts. The others would need to be restricted to right-in/right-out only by some means; of course, the most effective would be the addition of medians.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Bain, to add on to what Brian said, our current plan for the Courthouse Area is a broader plan than this small downtown area. We had envisioned the possibility of a signalized intersection at that middle street because of being halfway between the intersections of Courthouse Road and Route 1, and Hospital Center Boulevard and Route 1 in order to meet VDOT spacing requirements. The current Comprehensive Plan envisions this section of Route 1 to be 4 lanes divided, so likely the other street connections would be right-in/right-out.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: Are we going to have any signals inside of this Downtown Stafford, or is it going to be mainly stop signs?

Mr. Geouge: I would think, depending on the density, we'd need some signals. Especially where there are pedestrian crossings involved, but I'm not positive.

Mr. McPherson: Is that a VDOT thing, or is that for the Planning Commission to figure?

Mr. Geouge: That's a VDOT thing.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: Moving on, so, there were some additional Planning Commission comments we felt like for these listed here we could use some additional input from the Commission. There was one regarding the Floor Area Ratio. So, currently in the current approved ordinance, you have incentives that you can have a higher Floor Area Ratio if you use TDR; however, we were proposing to eliminate the maximum Floor Area Ratio. So, there was some thought of maybe reinstating that and figuring out what FAR numbers would be appropriate in by-right and with TDR. I noted in one of the previous presentations that really the maximum density on a block by block basis in Downtown Stafford in the concept plan is I believe around 2.8 FAR. There's another concern about eliminating street buffers and we do note that street trees would still be required in these areas as stipulated by the DCSL. For single-family and multi-family developments, that standard is for understory or large trees spaced 100 feet apart. But if you use understory trees, you need to incorporate three small shrubs within that 100 feet as well. For commercial developments, the specific plant types aren't stipulated, but the requirement is that you have 21 plant units per 100 feet. So, you could have potentially a scenario where you have three canopy or understory trees that are 33-foot apart. Also, there was a comment about considering requiring a mix of uses to ensure that you have proximity between commercial uses and residential, and that you have varying housing types.

Mr. Apicella: Hey Brian, before you move onto this slide, all three of these are ones that I mentioned and are important to me. So, I'm going to go through the first one. My concern is that having No Floor Area Ratio at all, as it says here, may disincentivize individuals who own sending properties from using the business opportunity, or the Floor Area Ratio that we provided in the TDR, and going with residential instead. I don't have a specific number and I don't know what the balance or strike even point is, so I'm looking to you all to help us identify what that minimum ratio should be such that it doesn't stop people from participating in this Urban Development regime, but also doesn't do away with this TDR incentive that we have. So, have you all thought about it some more? Have you talked to the folks in the Economic Development office? Where can we get to so that we don't lose this I think potential useful option that's currently in place?

Mr. Geouge: I'm not aware of any discussions that we've had with Economic Development on that particular issue yet, so I think it's something we need to talk about more internally and get back to the Commission on.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, things have been moving very quickly lately. I did have a discussion with Mr. Holden who is here in the audience and can assist with any questions with regard to Economic Development. Our discussion earlier today was that they would rely on Planning staff to make recommendations with regard to FAR. I will note, as Mr. Geouge stated in the presentation that our current Master Plan and Generalized Development Plan have a FAR of 2.8 shown on average with

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

blocks, so that may be a starting point for a limitation. So, if somebody wanted to add more units through TDR, they could maybe exceed that 2.8.

Mr. Apicella: 2.8 is a lot, right. Am I missing something?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, and with the configuration that shown in this area, it is going to have a high FAR when you potentially can have 5-story office buildings, because they will take up a lot of building square-footage relative to building footprint.

Mr. Apicella: Well, again, I think we need to have some more ongoing discussions before we put this to bed, and I think, as a starting point, 2.8 is maybe too high and not going to get us what we want. It might get us what we want on Urban Development, but it's not going to get us what we want necessarily on folks who want to again transfer development rights from the sending area to this receiving area. So, let's continue to maybe noodle this a little more. I'm going to move onto the next one. So, are you saying that the DCSL minimum requirement is one tree per 100 feet for I'll call it residential housing.

Mr. Geouge: Correct, for street trees.

Mr. Apicella: And you don't think that folks who live in this area might want to have more than one tree per 100 feet?

Mr. Geouge: I think that's a good possibility.

Mr. Apicella; That's a pretty wide swath. What can we do here at least to potentially consider something like 50 feet to keep it the same as... well, I see two canopy understory trees spaced 50 feet apart for the commercial. Can we get there on the residential as well, or do we have to make a change to the DCSL?

Mr. Geouge: Similar to what we've done with the current proposed ordinance, we could essentially modify what's stated in the DCSL through the ordinance. I think that's a good option. We could easily change that to 50-foot for multi-family, and then keep the commercial rate as is.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. What do other folks think about the trees? Go ahead. Alright, well, I mean, if other folks have a different thought in mind, you know, now's the time to chime in or if we don't move this forward tonight, which I doubt we will, if you want to think about it and see where you might be in terms of what the right requirement would be for residential.

Mr. Randall: Steven, just one comment to Brian. When we saw those other locations and they had trees, what was the... do we know how far apart those trees were? Did it seem like they were... it didn't seem like they were 100 feet. I've been there a couple times, different places, and it seemed like 50 feet was fairly common, somewhere around there, maybe 40, maybe 60, but it didn't seem like any of them were 100. A hundred seems pretty far to have every tree. So, I guess I'm in agreement with Steven; 50 being arbitrary, but something that's in the half of a hundred and a little more pleasing aesthetically. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Randall, if the proposed change is going to have to take place in the DCSL, I believe that'd be beyond the scope of what was sent to you by the Board, because the Board asked you to consider changing the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. So, if there are going to be adjustments, it would have to be in the Zoning Ordinance. So, we have to be careful as to how we craft that.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I understand. So, again, here's another issue you can take a look at and see how we might get there from here, if it's even possible. Moving onto the last hashmark...

Mr. Bain: Before you go, Steve, could I just...

Mr. Apicella: Go ahead.

Mr. Bain: What type of trees are being envisioned? I mean, if it's an oak tree, that can have a 60-foot tree limb span and so then your trees are going to, at a hundred feet, they're going to almost be touching each other. Is there any consideration of the type of tree that would be envisioned for Downtown Stafford?

Mr. Geouge: We don't have any specific guidance on the type of tree. Typically, ornamental style tree would be used in situations like this and preferably something that would be, you know, drought tolerant.

Mr. Randall: And then we'll have a root system that won't tear up the street or the sidewalk 15 years from now.

Mr. Geouge: Right.

Mr. Randall: We don't want to repair a mile's worth of...

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, and in that regards, the understories might be, you know, preferable to the canopy trees.

Mr. Bain: Is that something that the ordinance or the DCSL would specify?

Mr. Geouge: It's not something that it explicitly specifies as far as what you need to use. However, that is something that staff looks at when we receive plans. Not only what kind of impact it's going to have on what's around it, but are plantings too close together that they're not going to have a high likelihood of survival, and those things like that.

Mr. Bain: Good, good.

Mr. Geouge: So, that's integrated into the landscaping review for site plans.

Mr. Bain: Good, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, on the last bullet here, probably the issue I feel most strongly about. If you can go back to a slide that shows the layout for the Downtown Stafford area. Okay, I think I understand the scheming here; obviously R or Res means Residential, O means Office, MUR means Multi-Use Residential, MUO means Multi-Use Office, I'm not quite sure what CV means, and I think the spaces that are partially or fully in green are parks. So, my concern is we've got this area, we have some thoughts I mind about what we want. Not... or most of these parcels aren't owned by a single entity. How can we, in the ordinance, make sure that one or two or three developers don't eat up, I guess I'll say the best parts or the most profitable parts of what would occur here to the detriment of other developers? And, what I'm trying to say is, one or two developers could take up all of the residential that's desired here and we don't get the other things that we want. We don't get the office, we don't get the other types of commercial that we'd like to see that helps mitigate the impacts. I don't have a specific,

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

you know, set of language or verbiage, but I'm just concerned that some folks might take up more than their proportional share or take up the best parts to their advantage to the disadvantage of other developers and ultimately, as a result, we don't get what this picture looks like.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the input. We did have some discussion internally. I think the feeling from staff was that such guidance would be better in the Comprehensive Plan, not necessarily as strict a zoning or ordinance requirement. Just because of the nature of it and that there are a lot of variables, there could be a lot of unique circumstances that we'd have to deal with on a case by case basis. Mr. Harvey, did you have any more input on that?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, I agree with what Mr. Geouge said. The Comprehensive Plan provides us with guidance and ultimately it's up to the Board of Supervisors as to how they and what they approve for a rezoning application. And this image that we focus on here is with Downtown Stafford, but we have other Targeted Growth Areas which are going to have varying size properties, some small, some large. If we put a percentage on parcels, we may have to have an acreage requirement and it can get a little bit messy as far as a specific and a code and having someone comply with a code. Whereas, in a Comprehensive Plan, that's a guide and it gives us, the staff, Planning Commission, and Board the ability to evaluate whether or not the project that's being proposed for a zoning change meets the intent of what everybody's asking for. But I think it's totally appropriate to have some guidance in the Comp Plan, but again an ordinance amendment's going to be difficult to try to codify and ensure that it's going to give us the effect that we want.

Mr. Apicella: I hear ya, and again, hopefully we can get there from here. My concern is I'm looking at 09, 14, 13, 12. Again, this thing, just like with JPI/County property, it's going to develop piecemeal and so, we're not going to have the full picture at any point in time until the final parcel is developed. And so, someone may want to come in and develop 9 and 14, and someone may come in and want to develop 13 and 12, and because of that we don't know if and when we're going to get 19 or 18 or 17. So, again, somehow we've got to point to some guidance or direction that says everybody's got to play fair and everybody, you know, can't get more than their proportional share. Again, I don't know what specific language would do it in the Comp Plan, but I'm not sure if I'm making myself clear. But I think somehow we need to... we need to put up some better roadmaps as to how this thing gets developed and shapes out and in the way that we'd like to see it and that we don't end up with a completely different picture 10, 20, 30 years from now than what we hope for.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chair, if I could. We have a great example of this in Aquia Towne Center, where we have all that residential built with the intent I thought of having commercial built follow-on to that. And for whatever the reason, they built all that commercial, took all the money out of the commercial... I'm sorry, out of the residential, once they sold them all they just walked away. You know, rather than for every so on feet of residential you have to build so much feet of commercial; or something along those lines that prevents Aquia Towne Center from happening again. You know, to Steven's point, if they build 9, 14, 13, 12 and those four, what then now we're leaving it to somebody else to come in and build 2, 6 and 10. Well, maybe 2, 6 and 10 aren't the most profitable and only 12, 13, 14 and 9 are the most profitable. Well, you know they're going to come in and they're going to say well, I want that piece because I know I can make the most money off of that piece. Well, okay, that's fine, but with that piece comes 6 or with that piece comes 10. So, when you build that one, you have to build that one as well. Or something along the lines that says okay, we're doing Downtown Stafford, but the first buildings that are going to be built are 2, 7, 10, 15, and 19. Build all those – you guys work together, build all those, and then we'll work on the residential later. Or something along the lines. But, we have a great example right down the road of residential and no commercial. I think what the intent that commercial was going

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

to be built and it never was; they just walked away. You know, and we can't have that happen. This is a great example of how we can learn from that into this so that we can put it in stone. I don't care. If you're not the developer that wants to help us, we'll find somebody else. But we gotta do something to Steven's point that says, you know, we want it all built and we want it all built right, but we also want it available. So, anyway, thanks.

Mr. Geouge: You'll see that sometimes in a...

Mr. Cummings: Let me jump in for a second. I'm sorry, let me jump in for a second and try to take a stab at it. So, I agree with everything Steven said and it goes back to something I said at the last meeting, the plan and what that plan looks like and how we end up making decisions about what we end up with in Stafford. And, for me, it's how we begin, right. And it's the drivers; what are the drivers for us? And, you know, we always sort of defer to and start talking about making it economically viable, but we know that within the new era that resiliency, we know that there's some key things that we have to deal with in order for it to be economically viable and profitable long term. And to also provide the type of quality of life that we're talking about, right. We see it throughout the Economic Development Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, and the question becomes how do we view that? How do we ensure that that happens? And it is about... it is... it has to be done in the code as Steven said. I think that the code that we're using and the type of code that... *inaudible*... and many, you know, many... most municipalities have it, is not going to get, we know it's not going to get us what we need. Because, as Steven said, it's locked into this block by block type of interaction and approval and processes that doesn't allow for the integration of and the consideration of the different uses and how those buildings interact and impact the adjacent buildings and, more importantly, the people in those spaces. So, we have to really decide what's at the center. And I think the people are at the center and for me, and I'm not a big, you know. climate guy, but I think because of the situation that we're in, energy is important, how those buildings use energy, and since we're being... we're headed down the path and we are a smart city, we need to leverage that technology... *inaudible*... and try to drive towards using data driven solutions. And I'm going to, you know, it's a new phrase for me, it's form-base coding or performance base code, right. We have to figure out and from what I understand, and I'm very new at this, is that it's based around the performance of the building. And the performance of the building is determined by the drivers that you set and the inter-relatedness and the connectedness between all the things that go into planning. It's the size of the building, it's the shape of the building, it's the orientation of the building, it's the energy use of the building, it's the infrastructure, it's the hydrology; you know, all of those things. And we have the ability, right, to be able to download that data and create a three-dimensional form or image or platform or solution that allows you to then do gain type scenarios and what-ifs. And we can... and if we can come to some consensus around what the drivers are, right, and what we want this place to look like and the impact that we want it to have on the citizens and/or... and the environment around it, the green space as Steven talked about the trees and the size of the trees, and it's important. But we're looking at trees as an aesthetic value rather than an integral part of what it contributes to the overall ecosystem and the health of the community and the health of its inhabitants. And so, there's a reason why Central Park in New York City works, right. There's a reason. And so, there's examples here, there's examples of this being used in other localities, and I would really urge that we take a step back, if at all possible, with knowing that what we have coming down the pike with Downtown Stafford and all the commitments that we have, I think we can make those commitments and still... and make us take a stab at looking at this new technology, the three-dimensional, all that... *inaudible*... that's available to us in putting that in a solution and see where we end up. I think we'll be better off for it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, do others want to chime in on this topic?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: Steven, can I just ask a quick question?

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Ms. Barnes: Maybe it might be easier if staff could tell us, is there something specifically in place in this project that will make sure that we don't get another Aquia Towne Center? Is there... what is the primary difference that that just doesn't happen again, because it sounds like they're two completely different, I mean, obviously they're different projects, but what specifically is in place so that... because that's the biggest concern that I hear from constituents is oh, we've got a whole new... *inaudible*... we've got Downtown Stafford – how are we going to make sure that that's not going to be another Aquia Towne Center, that's not going to another one on Garrisonville? So, is there something specific that you can give us to make sure that doesn't happen again?

Mr. Geouge: What I was going to mention earlier is that sometimes you'll see in proffer statements where a developer proffers to build X amount of commercial square-footage before they can do a certain amount of residential units. So, that... if we had recommendations and guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan, that's potentially something that we could work with developers on when they come in for rezonings to be able to make those recommendations about how their project is being phased. I guess a very basic level, with this amendment we would have this concept plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. So, really our review and recommendations would be driven by what is shown on this plan, where those commercial uses are located, where those dedicated residential uses are located. So, it may just come down to who is rezoning their property and how that overlays on this concept plan as to what we ultimately get from that development.

Mr. Bain: But this is the... the point I was...

Ms. Baker: I can add to that. Sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Bain: That's the point I was trying to make at the last meeting. Since these are multiple parcels that are owned by various individuals, possibly to be consolidated if developers get them together, but there is nothing. The concept plan is meaningless in terms of telling the developer that he has to build residential on that unit. If it's in a UD District, and that's what we're proposing, and in that UD District he can make maybe make more money with office space, it's up to the developer to decide that. So, I don't see that we have any leverage, and maybe, Mr. Harvey, if you can tell me that there is some sort of ordinance that we could implement that specifically would say that this block has to be office, that block has to residential; I don't believe we can do that. So, I think it's all concept and it just depends on how willing the developers are to work with the County. And if I owned part of that land and you told me I had to put a part on one entire block and lose the potential revenue versus a 10-story apartment building, I would tell you to go fly a kite. So, I don't... again, Mr. Harvey, if there's some sort of way that we can zone that and make it happen, I'd be happy to support it. But I don't believe there is.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain and Mr. Chairman, the two options are, and it's been several years since we had the discussion with the Board of Supervisors, they could rezone property on their own initiative similar to what they're proposing with the County's property on other peoples' land. And they could rezone to a specific map as we see here on the screen. The other option is to allow property owners to come in voluntarily and request zoning changes. We would use this plan as part of our Comprehensive Plan to evaluate their application. And ultimately it'd be up to the Board of Supervisor whether or not to grant the rezoning. This concept plan that's in the Comprehensive Plan amendment, in addition to identifying the uses for each block, does have a chart that describes how many square feet and how many

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

dwelling units are associated with each block. So, that would be a very good guide for us to, in evaluating it as to what they can and, or should and shouldn't be considered for their property. This is more level of detail than we have in any other area of the County within our Comprehensive Plan as far as how to evaluate someone's development proposal.

Mr. Apicella: Jeff, if you don't mind my jumping in here. So, on your first point about the County rezoning, well, that's kind of what's happening when we get to the rezoning plan for this sub-portion of Downtown Stafford. And, as a result, we're not getting any proffers. So, that might be an issue in going down that path on the larger Downtown Stafford area, especially as it relates to residential. And then to your point about not having this level of specificity/granularity, on other Urban Development/TGA areas, that is what drives me to this very point. So, again, without getting into too many specifics about another area of the County where somebody came in with a plan and all they wanted to do was maximize their yield with one type of residential, that's sort of to me very much like the Aquia Towne Center issue where somebody came in and did what was most advantageous for their, you know, profit margin, but not necessarily get us what we want in the larger Targeted Growth Area. Such that all we would get is that residential and potentially nothing else that we wanted, like other housing types and other commercial. So, somehow, some way, we've got to tell folks, in my opinion, we don't just want one type/residential or/just office. The whole purpose behind Urban Development is these, you know, mixed uses at least when the parcel size or the related parcels, adjoining parcels are the sufficient size. Again, we just can't... we can't just end up with one thing and again, the benefit of just one developer, not knowing what's going to happen in the future and potentially approving that request, but then shutting down other opportunities because we've approved that one. And we've done it in isolation.

Mr. Cummings: So, let me give you an example of how this ensures compliance or the form-base conforms compliance. And again, it takes a rethinking of how we're planning, right. And I'm not the expert. And Kathy, I'm going to need you on this; I know you, uh... So, my understanding of it is that the performance of the building and whether it's the efficiency, energy efficiency, the orientation, the air, light and sun if we use climate as a driver, but we can use other drivers as well. And also... and based on the plan that's submitted, do some what if scenarios, right, to determine what the potential consequences are; game theory if you will, to understand what the impact... or what the challenges might be with that particular building, including real-time traffic. So, in terms of gaming scenarios. And so, everything that you're asking for, Steven, I think in terms of being able to say no to something, right, requires us to be able to access the data and to use that data. And let me step back. So, we're basically taking our code that we are doing in a slightly different way, right, and starting with the values that we really want and putting those elements of what that particular use is supposed to be, whether it's supposed to be a commercial building or whether it's supposed to be residential, it might be family. It has to perform in a certain way, right. And so, and so everything is... and that's why Downtown Stafford, this first block or this first area and how it's configured, you're absolutely right. That's what everybody's afraid of. If we don't get it right, it's going to have all kinds of impacts down the road. And so, the only way that I know of, and Kathy, if you're familiar with form-base code please chime in and let me know if I'm misstating something or if I'm overambitious with what it can do.

Ms. Baker: No, I don't believe you're misstating anything. I was just going to point out that in your staff report we did include the MOU for the 29 acres that the County owned and JPI property. For the rezoning area – sorry, just for the... yes, for the County and the JPI – it spells out what the responsibilities are and it does talk about architectural guidelines, it talks about the mix of development, and it also talks about limitation on requirements for commercial areas to be built with residential. So, there is some phasing included in that MOU. So, on the 29 acres, there's going to be some, even though we're not getting proffers on that, we are getting items through that MOU. So, if you all would take a look at that,

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

it may answer some of your questions with regard to that. But phasing is something that we have done in the past on mixed-use projects where we require a certain amount. So, as Jeff indicated, when we get to the rezoning phase, stage, then that's what we're going to need to work with those developers as they come in and talk them through that and see if they're willing to do that. And then, like Steven said, or whoever said, that it's ultimately up to the Planning Commission and the Board to make those decisions whether or not it's what they want. And I think we still need the code to be flexible enough that it's going to incentivize these developers that are going to want to come here. And if we continue to have them work through our Economic Development Department as a partner and, you know, through the marketing outreach, then I think we have those opportunities. But, we want some flexibility in the code so that people aren't going to be afraid to come in and go the rezoning route. Sorry, that might've been a little too much for you, but I wanted to point that out.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just going to piggyback off of the other constraint that we have in trying to figure a way ahead on this specific issue. We only have six weeks. We have to come to a conclusion on the policy so that we can get it advertised by the March 24 hearing. So, and I believe we're going to get the rezoning at the next meeting, the rezoning package. So, we don't have a lot of time and I appreciate the kind of variables that you're talking about, Dexter, and there may be you know 10, 20, I don't know. Mine are much more basic just in terms of commercial versus residential and making sure that we get both, and that there's a good balance so that at the end of the day the taxpayers aren't footing the bill for the residential and we didn't get the commercial that we wanted as well. I think that's kind of the very issue at Aquia Towne Center. Those things, those two pieces, those two building blocks were expected; they were within the purview of one, you know, applicant. This is much harder because, as Mr. Bain said, and I think I said earlier, no one person owns every single parcel here. Probably no one person owns two parcels here. So, trying to link them up, latch them together, again, to get some picture of what we want. And I'm not saying at the end of the day that the picture looks exactly like it is, but I think at the end of the day we want to strike the right balance between the number of residential units, the number of different types of residential units, you know, single-family detached, apartments, townhomes, that fits in line with the overall numbers that we're looking for, as well as the different commercial types, not just office buildings and not just retail but the right mix that gets us at the end of the day where we want to be. So... go ahead, somebody wants to speak.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, one quick question for Mr. Geouge and then we can move on. These look like they're split up into city blocks type things. And the determination was is that we're going to adjudicate these by city blocks, by 17, 18, 14, 13, right. Who made that determination that it was going to be by those city blocks? Was that something that... I mean, it's not an MOU obviously because that's just our properties and Jerrell. What would be the change to the overall process if we, for example, and I'm sure everybody's looking at the same map, if we combine 13 and 17, for example, in one block. Keep 13, keep the residential right on that block, keep the mixed-use office in the other block, but combine 13 and 17 into one parcel. Combine 12 and 16 into one parcel. So, when I'm buying... when I'm selling 12, I'm selling 16. When I'm selling 07, I'm also selling 6. When I'm selling 11, I'm selling 10. Why couldn't we bind those parcels into bigger... into more city blocks so that I'm allowing a developer to come in and do a residential section and a commercial section. Now, doing quick math, it looks like we don't have one for one, so we would have to finagle that. But I think there's some validity in saying, you want to come in and build here and we want you to build, but you're going to build 13 and 17 together as one parcel. That way we know we're not going to get just 13 and not 17. That way we know we're getting both. You know, it's the same as 4 and 8... or 4 and... I don't know. You'd have to sit down and do a little bit of math to make sure that every mixed-use office has a residential or mixed-use residential associated with it so we would know that instead of 19 different parcels, I now have 7 different parcels. And those parcels now are a combination so that I have some of each.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Bain: That would be nice, but we don't know what the property boundaries are for the existing parcels. they may not line up with any of those blocks and streets. they could cut blocks in half. So, there's no way to require the developer to do 17 and 13 or any other combination if his parcel doesn't include those other areas.

Mr. Randall: If the parcels... if he parcel is a 7-acre parcel, then his parcel is going to include 13 and 17. If it's a 3-acre parcel...

Mr. Bain: Yeah, but you don't know that. So, how do you impose that on the developer?

Mr. Randall: I would expect that before we go out and to do this that we would have something laid out. The developer's not going to come in and go I'm going to cut 14 in half, I only want to build this little corner, and then somebody else...

Mr. Bain: The developer's going to buy whatever land he can buy. It may not conform to the configuration of this concept.

Mr. Randall: That's up to the County to sell it in a way that it includes the parcels that we want built.

Mr. Bain: How do you do that? How do you tell a developer, don't buy all of that parcel, or buy this parcel and the adjoining parcel that the current owner doesn't want to sell? I mean, how do you control that?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Bain and Commissioner Randall, go to the first question that Mr. Bain raised. The existing parcel lines do not follow the alignments of these blocks. You probably won't find anywhere in the County where ownership follows the alignment of blocks. So, it's contemplated that we have a grid system like this for many reasons. One significant reason in this overall area when we think about just this part of Downtown Stafford, but also the broader context of the Courthouse Targeted Growth Area is that we want the grid network of streets to help alleviate the traffic flow on Route 1 and Hospital Center Boulevard and Courthouse Road. So, the people in this area have options to travel internally and not necessarily have to get onto the main roads. The current Small Area Plan for the Courthouse Area envisions a grid network. It was modeled by VDOT's consultant when we worked on that plan, and the grid network of streets was shown through the modeling to mitigate some of the traffic impacts of the area. Generally speaking, the way the blocks are set up, they're intended to be walkable. If you get the blocks too big, they become less walkable and more auto dependent. We know that our area of the County is... or our County in general is mainly suburban. In some areas it's approaching urban densities and we know that people are going to have cars. So, that's why you see a number of surface parking lots on this diagram. And then also, too, what was discussed in earlier meetings with having access to parks and access to green areas, it's important that to get the access to it you'll have to have multiple streets to do so. I think it's important to think about that we have the tools here in the Comprehensive Plan to evaluate someone's project. So, if someone doesn't own a full block, we may say to them, well, until you get control of a full block of land, we're not going to consider your rezoning or we won't approve your rezoning. And that could be what ultimately happens. But right now, this gives landowners, developers, others that are interested in investing in the County the opportunity to understand what we're looking and what we may find acceptable. And it's up to them to put that process together of acquiring the land, making the right deals so the project's profitable to them and can meet our goals. And Mr. Holden is here this evening and he did provide some additional information. Maybe it's a little bit early in the discussion to involve him, but he did provide an economic

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

analysis of what this area could potentially be for the County as far as an economic engine. And also, how this can help spur on investment in the County.

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm going to bottom line my point, which is I think if you're going to build residential in a TGA, especially at the maximum allowed density, then you have to also, either on your parcel or in partnership with somebody else, build a sufficient amount of commercial to mitigate the impact. And I appreciate that, you know, rooftops drive potentially commercial but it doesn't... we don't always get it the other way where commercial drives rooftops. Again, I just want to make sure that somebody isn't, like we had before, coming up with a plan on a single parcel to maximize their residential yield and we get nothing else with it. And the hope is that maybe somebody else might build some commercial tied to that specific parcel. So, do folks want to hear from Mr. Holden now or do we want to wait until we get the rezoning package? And I'll just say again, that my issue is not just with Downtown Stafford, but it's with the whole urban design construct so that we're not putting ourselves in a position with the policy that we get just the problem that I'm talking about.

Mr. English: How much more do you have to do?

Mr. Geouge: Just a few slides.

Mr. English: Hey, Steven, can we let Brian finish and then have Mr. Holden come up?

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Geouge: Alright, I'll try to be quick. Moving on, a couple weeks back we met with representatives from JPI-Fountain Park and discussed the proposed ordinance with them. And went over their latest proposed concept plan, which is shown here. You can see the arrangement of buildings. You'll see that within certain buildings there are parking areas shown that would be structured parking integrated into the ground floor of those buildings. And also, the park that was previously mentioned at the northeast corner. These buildings would include several different uses ranging from purely office to a combination of office, office/multi-family, just multi-family.

Mr. Randall: Is that a park that would be used for everybody, or just for that little development? So, people would be walking through this area to get to the park.

Mr. English: It'd have to be everybody because it's connected to the courthouse, correct?

Mr. Geouge: I expect it's privately owned but – open to the public?

Mr. English: It'd have to be public.

Mr. Randall: Right. And all I'm saying is that it's open to the public and therefore people would be walking through this whole mixed neighborhood in order to get to the park. That would be the expectation, correct?

Mr. Geouge: Right. And there would be sort of the plaza area in downtown at the southwest corner as well.

Ms. Baker: And I also want to note, there is going to be perimeter sidewalk so actually we're recommending shared-use path along, all along Courthouse and Route 1. So, if, I don't know, Brian, if

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

you can point that out to show where the public is going to have public access all the way around, so they would have access to that park. And it's also tying into the Courthouse side where we've already got that wider sidewalk along the entire frontage of Route 1. So, the idea is connecting again, and Brian's going to show you a slide in a minute where it's connecting not just to this Downtown Stafford area, but adjoining areas. So, we'll get to that. I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. Randall: Roger. Thanks Kathy.

Mr. Cummings: So, let me jump in one second with that slide. Can you go back to the slide for me? And I'm going to try to ask questions now and I'm gonna make statements, okay. I'm going to give a little bit of context. So, does everybody know what the heat signature is going to be on that property as it's configured right now, that design? Does anyone?

Ms. Baker: I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question.

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, do we have a way of figuring out right now what the heat signature, and I may be using the wrong phrase, is going to be on the configuration of buildings like it is on this diagram?

Mr. Geouge: Mr. Cummings, could you elaborate on what you mean by heat signature?

Mr. Cummings: Okay. So, we have a lot of buildings, right, surround by some green space. Do we know that we have enough green space?

Mr. Geouge: Do you mean in terms of managing stormwater runoff and that sort of thing?

Mr. Cummings: Stormwater runoff that's created by all the concrete that's going to be there, right, and some of the other impacts that comes from the building, whether we consider the light and air, space, and how that impacts individuals that are going to be operating in that space. And the only reason I bring it up is that I'm trying to get to the thing that Steven keeps going back to is how do we ensure that we don't get those options results. And I understand and I'm not against developers maximizing the space for profit. And I think from what I've read there's a way for us to do that. And it is in the code. And these are the types of things that needs to make its way into the code, right, and the only way it can do that is by doing it in a different way. And so, and I said I was going to try and ask a question. Kathy, can you tell me, or anyone, Planning Commission, what form based coding... code is and why it's – does anyone know what form-based code is?

Mr. Apicella: Mike does, and I think we had it previously. So, you want to chime in Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. So, while the UD zoning district actually is designed off of the form-based code concept, it's more so really focusing on the orientation of the buildings, you know, within an area and more so focused on setbacks controlling kind of your intensity more so by building height, setback from the streets, and you know ensuring that you have different modes of transportation with the pedestrian accommodations. And in like these situations, the smaller building setbacks. So, those are some of the basics.

Mr. Cummings: And there are other considerations, right, that can go into form-based code to ensure that you get what you desire, correct?

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. While I've been kind of quiet, on your question about the heat signature, I'm not certain of that concept but I think just in general, with this plan that you see on the screen, it's kind of a... it probably has much less of an impact with regard... it's more compact. So, you know, you get definitely a lot more development on a smaller area but, in this case, you have it appears parking spaces are provided beneath the buildings so you're using up a lot less land and a lot less impervious area by, you know, total. You know, the percentage is pretty high, but you've got a lot more development in a much smaller area. So there's some benefits to that.

Mr. Cummings: Right. And so, the benefits related to that, there are other issues, right, or other considerations that can be put into the code to make sure that we're getting the kind of impacts that we want on humans, right, as well. And also for the energy efficiency of the building, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: I would say correct.

Mr. Cummings: We can get more granular is my point, right?

Mr. Zuraf: With form-based code?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: I think really... well, my understanding is with form-based code it's more so focused on the layout, the site layout. I'm not familiar with that relating to building design.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Cummings, as Mr. Zuraf said, there are components of the UD Ordinance that are related to form-based code and I believe that Mr. Geouge has presented some of those in the previous presentations where the ordinance stipulates certain buildings and types have balconies and how those balconies relate to the street. Same with other recessions and projections off of the buildings. True form-based code does not look at density or number of units in a building, or use in a building; it just stipulates how the building should look and how it should be placed in relation to the street and other buildings. So, our UD Ordinance was based off of form-based code but modified to be more reflective of the sensitivities we have here in the County about what type of development we want to see in specific locations and the number of households we're going to ultimately get.

Mr. Cummings: And... but we don't have anything that will allow us to measure those impacts on traffic or anything else as we build, correct? That's just done on an ad hoc business block by block, parcel by parcel, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, we would have to, through the rezoning process, we require traffic studies and they're done with every individual project. And that gets to the level of looking at intersections in particular. When we look at road corridors, the overall larger planning area was studied in 2012 and came to the conclusion that the overall network would work. But, as we've seen with other zoning cases in the nearby area such as Burns Corner and also the Courthouse Tracts, that specific intersection improvements still need to be made even though the overall corridor works.

Ms. Baker: And I'll just add, Commissioner Cummings, talking about certain things like building efficiency and such, there are some localities that either have in their... probably most likely in their Comprehensive Plan where they make recommendations for buildings to follow lead certification, your energy efficiency certification, certain other environmentally friendly building components, rooftops that are green rooftops, things like that. So, there may be some of those items that we add into the Comp

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Plan... *inaudible*... piece of it that are more recommendations as opposed to code standards, but something else we could take a look at to get a little bit to your point of some more of the energy and climate issues.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, anybody else want to chime in? I'm sorry, did we finish your presentation Mr. Geouge?

Mr. Geouge: I've got a few more slides.

Mr. Bain: Okay, before we go on, I was just looking on my computer and I believe Mr. Cummings is anticipating or suggesting using form-based code in a much deeper sense, actually allowing the code, the form-based code, to specifically identify what type of use would have to be implemented on each specific parcel. And on the computer there's a form-based code institute and it just happened to have a little note that Fauquier County has implemented form-based code. So, maybe staff could look into that for us and see how they are using it and whether it would be applicable to Stafford County.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, and again, the only other caveat or overlay here is whatever we do on the Comp Plan amendments and the ordinance and also on the rezoning, it's all... we're kind of boxed into a corner with a deadline, as I said, six weeks away to put whatever we decide on forward for public hearing, make that decision on February 24th and hold that public hearing on the March 24th deadline. So, that's kind of the reality check on how far we can go and what we can do in this short amount of time. Alright, Mr. Geouge, go ahead.

Mr. Cummings: Oh, can I ask a question Steven?

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Cummings: So, process wise, right, I know we have the time limit, so if we could present or see staff reviews Fauquier and Columbia Pike and some other places have used form-based with some success, and they could see potentially their applicability or even get a presentation that says, okay, these are the benefits of it and this is how it could be done or implemented in Stafford within a reasonable period of time. You know, what would be the process for us to be able to then try to get form-based code and, more importantly for me, a tool that allows us to do what if scenarios approved or considered.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Cummings, to pursue a new form-based code zoning category or zoning scheme, that would be outside of the scope of what the Board sent the Planning Commission. So, we'd have to work on that as a separate recommendation to be sent to the Board. But the Board specifically sent the UD Ordinance, as well as the Comp Plan change, to the Planning Commission for review and recommendations. So, we'd have to stay within the bounds of the general recommendations from the Board.

Mr. Zurf: And if I could add, the UD zoning district is form-based code.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, and this is Bart. You know, Dexter, to your point, I think a lot of the discussions that we're having are bordering on the form-based code insight. You know, form-based code is designed to replace zoning. When zoning isn't applicable and zoning can't do exactly what a County wants it to do, then they put in some form of... regulate it through a form-based code. As Mr. Harvey said, they go through the process, they adapt form-based coding in a county as a means of a... as a means of zoning, as a means of development of a county, you know. Some of the things that we are talking about, we're

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

concerned about how it looks, not necessarily what the use is. And so that's what form-based coding is as far as I understand it. And so...

Mr. Cummings: It actually goes farther than that...

Mr. Randall: ... I appreciate the fact that we want to do that, but I also appreciate the fact that, you know, we have a very specific timeline, it's not within our scope, and I think we need to make the adjustments that we can based on the applicability to the process that we currently have to fall under. Thank you.

Mr. Cummings: Right, right. But I'm hearing that staff will review and come back and present to us whether or not there's a way forward on or some things that we can add to our current... what's within our scope, right.

Mr. Randall: Yes, but not under the guise of form-based coding. So, let's... I think the staff's okay with going back and talking about some things that we've been discussing, but the actual form-based coding has to be something that we talk about at a later date if that's what we choose to do based on the recommendations of the Board; not something that we want to apply to this being that it's out of the scope and our timeframe doesn't allow it. So, let's talk about what some changes we can make to it.

Mr. Cummings: But Bart, we don't know that yet. But Bart, we don't know that yet.

Mr. Randall: We absolutely know that. It's without the scope. Mr. Harvey just... that the Board of Supervisors...

Mr. Cummings: No, no, no, no, no. It's... so, form-based coding is for the UD, right, it is based on the UD. So, if you have a solution that takes the data, takes the information, right; we're not talking about paper and pen, we're talking about a solution that allows you to digitize and take the data that's available, right, that is the UD and puts it in a framework that allows you to then manipulate that data to see what happens when, as Steven mentioned, you know, the concerns that Steven mentioned. And then see how we need to maybe manipulate that form or that... the site, the location of that building and get some data. If that's doable within our timeframe, I think it's worth... it's a worthy exercise. So, that's all I'm asking for is for us to consider it, see if there's a solution that can be done in the timeframe, and then, if not and it's not within the scope, understood; we just need to move forward... *inaudible*. But I think we owe...

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm going to just... *inaudible*...

Mr. Randall: Just a question I have then, Dexter...

Mr. Apicella: ... I'm going to chime in and one more time clarify what my concern is, is again ensuring as part of Urban Development that we get a mix of uses, especially when it comes to residential, that we're not only getting residential, that we're also getting commercial. And somehow, some way, whether it's by the Comp Plan and/or the ordinance, that we tell perspective applicants that we want both and that we're not going to consider favorably... are not going to take favorable action on their projects unless and until they include a mix of uses, especially where a parcel is of a certain size and I don't know what that minimum size is. I think what you're talking about, Dexter, might be a little bit different than what I'm thinking of the issues are here. I'm not even sure I know what specific variables of data sets that you're looking for to be able to run some analysis. And to do that in the next weeks or six weeks, I'm not sure we're on the same collectively, all seven of us, are on the same page with regard to what

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

you're asking for and applying it to this specific project or policy again in the short timeframe that we have. I don't... I'm not saying what you're asking for isn't something we might want to look at in the future, but as it relates to this specific project, what I'm hearing from staff is it could be outside the scope – well, they said it's outside the scope – and the other thing is I want to make sure whatever we're considering, you know, doesn't run afoul of the state code and the things that we're allowed to consider when we can evaluate projects and whether or not we're going to make a recommendation for or against. So, with all that without a lot of conversation, we've been at this now seems like a couple of hours, I'm just going to ask Brian if he can finish up his presentation and see where we go from here.

Mr. Geouge: Okay, continuing on, discussing the comments from JPI, one of the concerns they had was about setback requirements for structured parking. You noticed on the concept plan that the structured, theirs integrated into the buildings that had office or multi-family or mixed-use within those buildings. So, applying the parking setback to the structured parking areas in that case would be contrary to the objective of locating the parking close to the streets. So, typically with the different building types that are allowed in the UD district, the parking setback is much greater than the building setback. So, there's a conflict there where you have structured parking, especially when it's integrated within the building. Along those lines, Downtown Stafford concept plan depicts the County parking garage that's located close to the street where setbacks are consistent with the other buildings. So, staff is proposing language which states that the minimum parking setback would only apply to surface parking areas and not structured parking. There was a concern about meeting the Build 2 zone requirements as we detailed previously, we're proposing to change how that would be measured. So, staff is also proposing to increase the maximum Build 2 zone for commercial and mixed-use buildings from 10 feet to 15 feet. This would make the Build 2 zone for consistent with the standard for multi-family buildings and provide greater flexibility based on specific parcel configurations. I'll go back to the slide real quick. You'll notice this building here where this property line is, this office/multi-family building, it's kind of an irregular shaped property line. So, when you have situations like that, in order to meet the Build 2 zone, you'd have to have likely an irregular shaped building to sort of parallel that line. So, bumping that Build 2 zone up a little bit would help provide some more flexibility in those kinds of situations. There was also concern about parking space dimensions within parking garages. A developer noted that typical parking garage spaces are smaller than our standard 9 x 20, but we did ask for them to look at some similar garages and provide us some more data as to what they think would be appropriate within structured parking.

Mr. Randall: So, Brian...

Mr. Apicella: Brian, before you move on, I mean is that something we can even tinker with here, or is that another zoning ordinance requirement that would need to be changed?

Mr. Geouge: We'd have to look at that. It could be outside of the scope of this effort.

Mr. Randall: Brian, why would we think of changing that?

Mr. Geouge: I don't think we're necessarily entertaining changing it, we just asked them to provide some more information to provide to the Commission so that you all can consider that.

Mr. Randall: We fought long and hard for the 9 x 20.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Randall: Yeah, okay, moving forward; thank you.

Mr. Harvey: And part of it goes with the discussion staff had with them asking the question, do you know what size parking spaces there are in parking garages? Because my experience in parking in parking garage spaces are small than a surface lot space. So, I didn't know if there was a standard and they were going to give us some examples from other jurisdictions.

Mr. Randall: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Harvey: We don't have any in the County right now, so we're not sure. We'd have to look to other sources for information.

Mr. Randall: Not a problem getting the information. I don't have an issue with that. I want to be able to park my truck though everywhere though, so that's the 9 x 20 requirement.

Mr. Geouge: Another concern was in regard to the parking rates and shared parking credits. It was noted that the majority of the proposed multi-family units within their development will be 1-bedroom units and they felt like the current rate of 2.2 spaces per unit may be high. They also requested increased shared parking credits between residential and business and other retail uses. We did point out that the ordinance, as proposed, would allow the agent to modify parking requirements with acceptable written justification that if they're able to demonstrate for instance that the majority of their units are one bedroom, maybe that would be a justification for modifying that rate. Staff is also proposing to change the shared parking credit between residential and general business and retail from 1.3 to 1.4. And that's reflected in the latest draft. There's another concern about block length requirements. There are two block length requirements currently in the ordinance. There's a perimeter length and just a block length. So, generally speaking, the perimeter maximum block length is the block length times 4. So, we didn't really feel like having the perimeter block length was necessary when we can just measure them on a block by block basis. So, staff is proposing to remove that perimeter requirement, and we're also proposing to increase the maximum block length for UD-4, that should read UD-4 and UD-5, from 440 to 500 feet. We note that some of the blocks depicted on the concept plan are greater than 440 feet, so that change would obviously help us achieve the concept plan vision. Another concern was about landscape area requirements. The DCSL requires planting areas to be located outside of easements that run parallel to the roadway, and an urban setting accomplishing that would be most likely very difficult. Staff is proposing additional language in the ordinance which would allow required plantings to be located within those easements subject to approval by the easement holder, and that would alleviate them from having to seek an exception from the Planning Commission to have those plantings within the easements. A developer requested that certain retail uses be allowed on upper stories in UD-4 and 5 and asked that commercial off-street surface parking be allowed by-right. Staff is proposing a couple changes there as well, which would allow service and retail businesses to be located on upper floors of commercial buildings, and is also proposing to allow commercial off-street surface parking by-right which we felt like that could help accommodate some of the interim parking demands, short-term demands of the development and in advance of parking garages being built.

Mr. Bain: The parking garages – how would you allocate the space in those garages to various components of the development so that the developer could say, well, the people in this block are going to use that parking garage, but the people in the next block won't. Is there some rationale for that?

Mr. Geouge: There's a shared parking agreement so we would require that prior to plan approval if they are... say if there's an existing garage and there's capacity left in it that a new development is going to

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

take advantage of. We would require a shared parking agreement to be recorded prior to approval of that plan, which would reserve that portion of the structured parking.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: And Commissioner Bain, also the code currently has a maximum distance that parking can count toward... offsite parking can count towards meeting that parking requirement. So, it's 500 feet, so it lines up with the block length that we were discussing. So, essentially you'd have to be within the next block in order to be able to use that parking area.

Mr. Bain: Okay, good.

Mr. Geouge: Just a quick recap on the Bike/Ped Plan. So, here's the Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Plan for this area. You'll see that we do recommend a number of shared-use paths that were covered a little bit earlier, including along Route 1, Courthouse Road. This solid line here is an existing shared-use path that's 8-foot wide through this section, across the new interchange into the commuter lot. Along Hospital Center Boulevard Extended, we currently are proposing just sidewalks along that area. And the green line represents the envisioned route of the East Coast Greenway. Again, basically covering the plan facilities for Downtown Stafford in regards to the bicycle/pedestrians, this map shows the envisioned network with the blue line representing proposed bike routes. The bike symbols would be potential bike parking areas. I will note that there are ordinance requirements in the UD district for bicycle parking, so that will need to be accommodated with each UD development that occurs here. The red lines represent proposed sidewalks, and the yellow lines represent proposed shared-use paths along the perimeter of the development. As far as next steps, it would be to authorize a hearing for the Comp Plan amendment and zoning ordinance text amendment, and as well as for the zoning reclassification which, of course, hasn't been presented yet. But the deadline for the Comp Plan amendment and zoning text amendment is March 29th. There is no set deadline for the reclassification yet, but there is a contractual obligation with JPI to have it done before July 9th. And, as Mr. Harvey stated earlier, John Holden with Economic Development is here, if you have any questions regarding economic development or some of the other attachments such as Smart City that were provided with the report.

Mr. Randall: Brian, could you go back to the last slide for me please? I was just looking at the shared path on the south side of the area, whether we want to put one on both sides, whether just a simple sidewalk on the south side of Hospital Boulevard, or whether we want a shared path on that as well. And put a mixed-use shared path on both sides.

Mr. Bain: What's the design difference between the blue line bike path and the shared... yellow shared path?

Mr. Geouge: As I noted earlier, a bicycle route can essentially be a shared-use path in certain locations. So, the shared-use path shown along the perimeter would, of course, also accommodate cyclists, but where you have the blue line here it could be all bike lanes on the street or maybe in the lower density areas here it could be a shared-use path and that transitions to a on-road bike lane through the more urban areas. And then the north/south route here, where it's shown as pretty high density, that would likely just be bike lanes on the road.

Mr. Bain: Okay, I guess the question I was asking, what's the difference between just a sidewalk and a shared-use path in terms of the design, the width?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Geouge: Primarily width.

Mr. Bain: Okay, and what is the difference? We were talking about sidewalks of 10 feet... 8 and 10.

Mr. Geouge: A 10-foot sidewalk would meet a shared-use standard typically.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: As I stated, sidewalks are typically 5-foot. That's a VDOT minimum requirement.

Mr. Bain: So, we're looking at wider sidewalks around the perimeter that would then tie into that existing bike route then. That would be good. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thanks Brian. Just if you'd stand by, if Mr. Holden wants to come up and give us a quick brief on the information he's provided.

Mr. Holden: Thank you Chairman and members of the Commission. I prepared some comments based on conversations with Mr. Harvey as the week progressed here in preparation for a number of questions I know have come up. So, I don't know that I have any specific answers for anyone in my business, but I want to make some points and comments on some of the questions that were raised, if I may. First and foremost, a key from the development side, and I've spoke about this and I spoke to you I think recently to the EDA and the Board is the message, right. Since I've been here 970 days, I've harped on our message. Our message needs to be that we want investment in Stafford and that's what you're contemplating right now. This plan will help guide that investment. So, I really appreciate your attention to that. And as in all smart planning – I hate that term but that's what it is – there needs to be guardrails on those investment. And I appreciate the guidance you're doing on that. I want to point out, however, one concern is... well, I think, if I may, Jeff pointed out that as projects come along beyond the 32 acres of the County and JPI, those will all come before this body again. And if that parcel is not meeting what's in that map that Brian had up there, we simply don't recommend it. That's the best guardrail we have. So, it is a plan and I encourage you to think of it that way. And again, with all due respect, I don't mean to disrespect or make comments that sound disrespectful or not appreciative of your work. Kathy mentioned flexibility and that's a key to what we do go forward. Now, I hadn't planned to talk about Aquia Towne Center, but I'll comment on some questions that were raised, and I know it's a common question in the community. And again, that was a little bit before my time. However, as I understand the history and development of that that maybe not everyone knows in the public. And, again, with all due respect to everyone that was involved in that project, including Jeff and others, it was a process that both involved planning and economic development and a possible investment, okay. As I understand it, the planning side had a plan for that area. It was... someone said they would like it changed; there was change being considered. And the proffers that were enacted as part of that perhaps weren't as enforceable as they should have been in terms of housing and commercial use. So, number one. Number two, every economic development investment, every economic development project is different from another, period. It's different because of the people involved, it's different because of the financing involved, it's different because of the way the relationships work between the different parties. I want to emphasize that and I would encourage you to just... we can certainly talk more at another time, but when people compare the idea of the 28 acres we're talking about for the Stafford County, it's really quite different than any other project that you can compare to, first of all, because the County, the Board ultimately with the staff and others, including this Commission, have complete control over what we want to do with that in the scope of the plan being developed here. So, again, the difference is timing, parties, and the situation. On the concern related to residential and future sites, again I would encourage

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

you to – I talked to Jeff about this a little bit – keep the guardrails, keep the guidance in the Comprehensive Plan, not in the code. That just gets restrictive because we don't really know what the future will bring. But if you have the guardrails in the plan, as I think this plan has or at least the work that Stantec has done over many months prior to the work that the Planning staff have done, I think it's in there. I'm going to come back to a little bit about how it could develop, again, the parcels after the 32 acres, if you will. So, two other points I'll try to summarize then in that regard. First, in Economic Development, it's a cliché but time kills deals. And so it's important to keep that in mind when you're looking at the requirements in code you're putting on things, and we need to be flexible in that arena. And I can tell you, in the last 6 to 9 months since we announced and inked the deal with JPI for Fountain Park, as well as the work we're doing in Smart Stafford and the work with CIT and the Smart City Test Bed, we have had more people knock on the door because they're seeing we're doing things and we want to invest, encourage those investments. I just bring that up to say that these things get a momentum, and we want to do them right, absolutely understand that, but we want to also keep that momentum going. Just today, I had two investors meetings talking about developments in and around Downtown Stafford. One of those was a high-tech business company that specifically wanted to be in that area because of the work you're doing, but also the Smart City initiative. So, again, secondly, in regards to housing, I can tell you conservatively speaking, there's probably 600 to 650 jobs, new jobs that are going to be created in Stafford County in the next 12 to 18 months. Some of those you are aware of; a public announcement with DHL, but there are others pending announcements very soon. One of my concerns about that is a serious shortage of the variety of housing types, and I mean not just ownership but rental and otherwise, and condos that could be developed in this area. And it's a shortage in our region. Notably, it's the lowest supply in over 5 years in the region and in Stafford. The FAAR, the Fredericksburg Area Realtors, just today sent out a report to document that and "inventory has been the main challenge facing the local real estate market for a few years and the events of 2020 already exasperated that already bad situation. So, the key to economic development, which I think I've expressed to some of you, is workforce. We want to have people working. We want to provide jobs for people in Stafford, and the region, but it would be really nice to have jobs for people in Stafford that, by the way, they wouldn't have to drive from across the bridge and across the river to come to work. So, again, I know that's not necessarily the purview of the things you deal with at a very detailed level, but I just want to keep that in mind that when we look at this diversity of housing, it's critical. I believe that the plan that you're contemplating will provide a wider range of those residential units. But again, I would not want to prescript that block 17 or 18 has so many units of this and so many units of that. Rather, and I'll come back to that in conclusion, it's in the plan so when a property comes to this body, you look at that diagram and say, well, nope, it doesn't have it. Go back and talk to the neighbor by the property and come to us again. Also, in the memo I've provided you, I've done a bit of... well, more than a bit of... a long bit of research recently on the type of housing that's contemplated here, the higher density. I would just keep in mind that that's a stock that I've talked to residential realtors; it's in demand. Apartments of that nature or condos if you will. But even apartments and condos are in demand in that way and they do provide a higher value per acre in terms of assessed value, and they provide a lower cost per acre in terms of costs, particularly to schools, just because of the nature of the type of development. The economy is moving into an area where younger works, frankly, workers of medium to even older age want options to walk to work. And I would suggest that the developments we're going to start to see, particularly in the County's property, will be even more in that arena due to post pandemic designs of office space so that people can literally live upstairs and come down to an open space, have their meetings in a common area, and go back upstairs and do their work. Again, this is all speculation but it's where I see economic development vis-a-vie residential development going. Finally, you contemplate a lot about what happens in the other acreage outside the Fountain Park in the 20 acres and, you know, we all know we don't know, right. We have to give the best shot at this plan and knowing that, again, as I mentioned again, that, you know, this body and the Board will ultimately have some

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

decisions if a proposal comes forward. But here's how I would propose we do that as a community, is get the plan in place. It's partly my department's job working with others, working with business leaders and investors and the EDA and Planning to go out then and find developers that might want to develop the balance or a major balance of the rest of that property. Recognizing that that's all privately held, I don't know how many parcels, more than a few, so, you know, there's negotiations and dialogue that happened but, with this... with a plan in place, that's one of the major roles of our department is to obviously work with local... with the current property owners – there shall be no takings – but to see if they want to work or if they're interested in investment or cashing in if you will on their investment, because their value will go up, with other parties that could put the properties together and actually put... I don't know, I don't have the diagram up... block 17, 18, 19, and 20 together to get that mixed-use that I think you're all looking for. So, again, I don't mean to... you've been here two hours already I think, I don't want to take an inch more of your time. I tried to address a couple questions or comments, and I'd be glad to try to answer any more.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Holden; we definitely appreciate your perspective and where you'd like to see us headed in the future. Questions for Mr. Holden? Okay.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I have one quick question.

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Do you think there's some benefit in combining those parcels now rather than going back to them and saying no, we're not going to let you do 12 unless you buy the property for 17 and you bring them both together? Do you think there's some benefit in expanding the size of that parcel so that the chances they could do both?

Mr. Holden: You mean, in theory, the parcels outside the County's?

Mr. Randall: Outside the County's, yes.

Mr. Holden: Absolutely. I mean, the best perspective, if we had all sat back, you know, maybe 7 years ago, 10 years, I don't know, would be to find someone to buy up the whole area, right, or buy larger blocks of it. But, regardless of 7 or 5 years ago, that's what, quite frankly, we, my department will seek to do. But, I want to be real clear we're not going to buy someone out that doesn't want to sell, we're not going to, you know, infringe on property rights. But with this plan in place, that will be the goal, is to assemble more properties together so that you can do three or four of these blocks or whatever we call them.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anybody else? Alright, I appreciate it Mr. Holden.

Mr. Holden: Certainly.

Mr. Apicella: Any final questions for Brian? Okay, seeing none, this is going to come back up at the next meeting. I don't think we have to take a vote on this. And, as I think I was advised the rezoning package will hopefully be ready for us to take our first look at the second meeting this month. So, with that said, moving forward...

Mr. Randall: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, this is Bart. I have one quick question for staff... or I guess for the Commission and then for staff if they want to answer. Does staff have any homework between now

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

and then? Are there some things that we still want them to continue to look at as far as, you know, streetscapes, are we okay with an 8-foot sidewalk, are we okay with the fact that there doesn't look like there's going to be any outside dining available through the entire area because the setbacks aren't enough? Are we looking at changing those things, or are we pretty much stroking this as the same way we have seen it? Over.

Mr. Apicella: So, I think we mentioned some things as we progressed through the brief. I hope staff took some good notes. I certainly mentioned some things that are of issue to me. I would say if there's anything else folks want staff to look at and take another shot at, now would be the time to advise them.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Then I guess I'm locked with Mr. McPherson and the fact that we need to figure out some way to ensure that there's outside dining available. Whatever we need to do to make sure that happens. Whether the setback needs to be... and I'm not saying it needs to be for the entire 28 acres or the entire maybe there's just a 15-acre area where, you know, we call the actual Downtown Stafford where we expect people to come and walk and visit and, you know, maybe that's the only small section. But I think we have to... we have to find a way to have outside dining. Whatever. So, if that means I have to have a 30-foot setback so that they could have 15-foot of outside dining, with another 10-foot for sidewalk, we have to find some way to make that happen. So, I don't know the details but I have the vision of what I want to see, what I think we should have there, and what I think will attract people. You know, the idea to have outside dining where I can take my dog, who I've been walking through the entire area and I can sit him down next to me and I can put a bowl of water next to him and he can relax while I'm having outside dining, I think is a huge draw to people. I think it's imperative that we have some way of putting outside dining in Downtown Stafford. So, whatever that needs to... however we can make that happen.

Mr. Geuge: One thing I would note, if I can just make a quick comment. So, just one thing to keep in mind is if we do bump up those street standards to say, you know, 10 feet to 12 feet, that's going to be for everything. It's going to be whether you have an eating establishment there or just general retail or if purely office or residential. So, it's one thing to keep in mind where maybe it's something that we don't want to work into the street sections necessarily, but to have some other standard somewhere else where you do have restaurants you provide x amount of additional space.

Mr. Randall: Again, I go down... I'm in DC a lot and I've eaten numerous times on 8th Street right outside the Navy Yard, and they have offices, restaurant/offices all the way down the street. And you're right, they don't vary the setback. But that setback's about 20 feet, right, and if you want to go to... and it allows people to pass without any issues, it allows people to eat outside, and there's office so you have to walk another 10 feet that way to get to the office versus oh, I can walk right here and eat outside. So, I think the setback should be far enough that whether it's an office and I have to walk a little farther, or whether I have outside dining, it's got to be far enough where I can do that. And I know that... anyway, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Mr. Randall, I think they got that message. Is there anything else within our scope that anyone else wants to mention that was not previously mentioned? Alright, thank you everybody for your patience and work on this particular action item. Moving onto the next item, Mr. Harvey, is there anything you want to say about item 9 or do we just move onto the next item on the agenda?

9. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance - Discuss proposed Resolution R20-81 and proposed Ordinance O20-20 to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the Implementation of the Board of Supervisors Healthy Growth Strategic

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Plan Priority. (History: PC Work Session October 7, 2020) (BOS-PC Joint Public Hearing October 29, 2020)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, just for informational purposes on item 9, the Board of Supervisors does not have this on their agenda for their next meeting. It's being deferred until after the building is open to the public. So, we don't have a specific date yet as to when that's going to be reconsidered.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: You're welcome.

Mr. Apicella: We have no New Business, so back to you Mr. Harvey, Planning Director's Report.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

10. 2021 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Harvey: Yes. First item to discuss is the meeting schedule for this year. The Planning Commission needs to please consider to vote to adopt your meeting schedule.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Harvey. I think everybody has a copy of the draft meeting schedule, and staff provided a side-by-side with the Board of Supervisors meetings. I didn't see any that conflicted with our meetings except for the September dates, which our meeting dates would be one day after theirs. I would also just add that we normally cancel the Thanksgiving related meeting, which in this case would be November 24th, and the Christmas related meeting, which would be December 22nd. And we also usually cancel a meeting in July and a meeting in August. If we were to have the same schedule we had last time, we would potentially cancel the July 14th meeting and the August 11th meeting. So, with that in mind, how would folks like to proceed with scheduling our meetings for the next year?

Mr. English: Is that going to be a recommendation that we just scratch July 14th, August the 11th, November 24th, and December 22nd, correct?

Mr. Apicella: That would be my recommendation, yes.

Mr. English: I agree with you and I'll make a motion to accept that part.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Ms. Barnes: I'll second that.

Mr. Apicella: Great, so there's a motion to cancel the July 14th, August 11th, November 24th, and December 22nd meeting. I got a second on that. I'll just do a quick roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yep.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. So that motion carries unanimously. Mr. Harvey, just a quick question on the September meetings. Do you have any concerns about our having a meeting the day after the Board's meetings?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any concerns at this point in time.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. So, we've got our meeting locked in. We can always add or take away meetings as we go forward. Appreciate everyone's consideration on that. Next item Mr. Harvey.

11. 2020 Annual Report

Mr. Harvey: Yes. The next item is the Annual Report. At the dais you'll see a modified version from what was sent to you in the packet. There was a correction made with regard to the Healthy Growth presentation to the Board. A previous version indicated that Commissioner Bain made the presentation; that was corrected to indicate that I made the presentation and he was in attendance.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Harvey. Are there any recommended changes, or would somebody like to make a motion to approve the Annual Report as revised.

Mr. Randall: Steven, I'll make that motion to approve the Annual Report as revised.

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Mr. Randall. Okay, thanks Mr. McPherson. Any discussion? Seeing none, I'll do a roll call vote. Mr. Bain, how do you vote?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes aye. The motion carries unanimously. Next item on the agenda, our budget. Mr. Harvey?

12. Yearly Expenditures (to date)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Currently, the Commission's expenditures are within the budget limitations. I will note that there is a negative balance on public notification, and traditionally staff will make adjustments within the budgeted amounts for various items to cover any negative adjustments. So, between what we have in print shop, copying, and also seminars and conferences, we can more than cover those items.

Mr. Apicella: Just for information, is there a reason why we were in a negative balance situation on public notification?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to run that down in more detail, but I do know that the first half of this fiscal year, which this is reporting a fiscal year starting July 1 to June 30th, the Planning Commission had been very busy and has had a number of public hearings. So that's likely dealing with the public hearing advertisements.

Mr. Apicella: So, if we just cut our public hearings in half, we'll be good to go.

Mr. Harvey: It would help from a fiscal standpoint, yes. But, unfortunately, it would not help with getting business done in the County.

Mr. Apicella: This is true. Okay, so no action to take on that one; that's just information.

Mr. Harvey: Correct, Mr. Chairman. And if we run into a situation towards the end of the fiscal year where we're running low, the Commission can request the Board of Supervisors to take consideration of additional funding.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Apicella: We'll try not to make that happen. Thanks Mr. Harvey. So... go ahead.

Mr. English: One question. What's the thing with the dues and membership; what is that about?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner English, the County pays for membership into the American Planning Association for the Planning Commission.

Mr. English: Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: You're welcome.

Mr. Bain: And can we use that balance to provide dinner at the meetings?

Ms. Barnes: If that's a motion, I'll second it.

Mr. Apicella: I'm not going to take that under advisement because I'll be in trouble with the Board if I push that one forward. But you're free to bring your own food. Alright, Mr. Harvey, next item?

13. Review Uses in A-2 Zoning

Mr. Harvey: And then Mr. Chairman, the next item to discuss is the Board of Supervisors referred an ordinance request to the Planning Commission requesting the Commission re-evaluate the uses permitted in the A-2 zoning district. And similar with the A-1 zoning district, which was done in 2019 and 2020, it'd be a review of the uses allowed and the intensity of those uses. There have been a number of complaints in recent years with regard to the A-2 zoning and conflicts between agricultural activities and nearby residential uses. As you might recall, the A-2 zoning category allows for a minimum lot size of 1 acre and agricultural uses on those size lots creates some negative affects on the neighbors. So, there's a desire to revisit how some of the uses are allowed in the zoning category.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Harvey, in terms of the referral, was there a deadline?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to get back to you on that. I don't recall off the top of my head.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I didn't see a deadline. What I'd like to do here is create a subcommittee; I'm sorry, I know we've done a lot of subcommittees but I think this is the kind of thing that is best done at a subcommittee level. And I would like to appoint Mr. English, Mr. McPherson, and Mr. Cummings as Chairman. Perhaps meet over the next 90 days, see where we are, and if you can get... finish your progress before then, great. If not, just let us know where you are between now and those 90 days and see if we can come up with a recommendation. Does that work for you gentlemen?

Mr. English: Yep.

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Mr. Harvey? Excuse me Steve. Could you elaborate on what some of the concerns have been? I didn't hit the link, sorry. Is it... okay, never mind.

Mr. Harvey: And then Mr. Chairman, just a reminder. Right now the Planning Commission is scheduled to have a joint hearing with the Board of Supervisors on February 16th for the Project Mover – DHL application. And that concludes my report.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Alright, so, County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: I know you'll be shocked; I have no report. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I am shocked! I think we have to set a new standard; at least one report from Ms. Lucian every quarter. Alright, moving onto Committee Reports. I don't believe there's anything new on Healthy Growth, Mr. Bain, so I'll spare you a brief on that one. In terms of the Land Conservation Subcommittee, again, we've been meeting over several months. Our next meetings are January 14th and January 28th at 3:00 PM in the Planning and Zoning Conference Room. Mr. Randall, is there anything you want to talk about with regards to the Cluster Ordinance Subcommittee?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

14. Healthy Growth Subcommittee
Next Meeting – TBD
15. Land Conservation Subcommittee
*Next Meeting – January 14, 2021 @ 3:00 PM, Planning & Zoning Conference Room
January 28, 2021 @ 3:00 PM, Planning & Zoning Conference Room*
16. Cluster Ordinance Subcommittee
Next Meeting – TBD

Mr. Randall: No. Just... yes. Just briefly. We have pretty much finished our work. Staff is finalizing the report and we should be seeing that... I think it's going to be on the 27th we should see the final report from the subcommittee for adjudication by the entire Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Thank you Mr. Randall. Okay...

Mr. Bain: Mr. Apicella, one quick comment.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Bain: One quick comment. You said that the Land Conservation Committee meeting's at the Conference Room. With the building closed, I understand it's all virtual; is that right?

Mr. Apicella: That is a good point. Yes, I believe it is going to be all virtual.

Ms. Baker: That's correct.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021

Mr. Apicella: My apologies.

Mr. Harvey: And if anybody wants to watch the meeting, the link to the meeting was included in the press release meeting announcement.

Mr. Apicella: I'll tell you what, Jeff or Kathy, can you send that out to all of us in case... I do believe that Ms. Baker did send it out but just in case.

Ms. Baker: I resent that this morning to everyone, to all the Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- Appointments
 - Architectural Review Board
 - Economic Development Authority (Liaison)
 - Parks and Recreation Commission (Non-voting member)
- Committees
 - Healthy Growth
 - Land Conservation
 - Cluster Ordinance

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Thank you Ms. Baker. Alright, moving on to Chairman's Report and Appointments. So, tonight I'd like to appoint Mr. Cummings to the Architectural Review Board; Mr. McPherson to the Economic Development Authority as our Liaison; and Mr. Randall to be our non-voting representative to the Parks and Rec Commission. And in terms of Committee appointments, I'd like to keep things as they were, if everybody's amenable. So, for Healthy Growth, that would be Mr. McPherson and Ms. Barnes, with Mr. Bain as Chairman; the Land Conservation Subcommittee, Mr. English, Mr. Bain, Mr. John Howe, and Mr. John Harris, with myself as the Chairman. And for the Cluster Ordinance Subcommittee, as long as it still lasts which doesn't sound like it's too much longer, Mr. McPherson, Mr. Bain, and Mr. Randall as Chairman. So, that's it for Committee appointments. And, as I've said over the last couple of meetings, although I don't think it applies in this case for this meeting, but pursuant to our by-laws, I hereby authorize the Vice Chairman to sign any documents in my absence. Other Business – TRC, it looks like we've got some activity for Aquia, Garrisonville, and Griffis-Widewater, and hopefully you've gotten or will get your material before those meetings. And next item on the agenda is Approval of Minutes. Is there a motion to accept the October 28, 2020, meeting minutes as written?

OTHER BUSINESS

17. New TRC Submissions
 - * Big Spring Est Sec 2 – Aquia Election District
 - * Port Aquia Wawa – Aquia Election District
 - * Embrey Mill PH IIA Rec Ctr B – Garrisonville Election District
 - * Milestone Widewater – Griffis-Widewater Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

18. October 28, 2020

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Two folks on that one. Okay, I'm going to do a quick roll call vote. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. And approval of minutes for the November 18, 2020, meeting; is there a motion to approve?

19. November 18, 2020

Mr. Randall: So moved.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I think there was a motion and second there. Roll call. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
January 13, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Apicella votes aye. Happy New Year everybody. With no further business before the Planning Commission, I call this meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:52 PM.