

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 27, 2022

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 27, 2022, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Kristen Barnes, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kristen Barnes, Albert Bain, Dexter Cummings, Steven Apicella, Martin Martinez, Laura Sellers, Willie Shelton, Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, LeAnn Ennis, Mike Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Barnes: Do we have any declarations of disqualification? Hearing none, do we have any changes to the agenda? Okay, hearing none. Next on our agenda, our Public Presentations and I believe that we have a speaker. Mr. Harvey.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Welcome YES Program Student Brady Nast

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, yes. Unfortunately, Mr. Counsell is stuck in traffic.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: So if we can postpone his presentation to later, but also I'd like to recognize that we have a new student from the YES Program, which is Youth Engaged in Stafford, is Mr. Brady Nast. He's from Mountain View High School and we would like to welcome him to the Planning Commission meetings.

County Transportation Construction Project Quarterly Update by Bryon Counsell, Director, Capital Projects

Discussed after item 2.

Ms. Barnes: Welcome, thank you. Okay, so I will go ahead and open up presentations by the public.

Several members discussing a phone ringing; microphones not on.

Ms. Barnes: That's on the record permanently now. Okay. Okay, so I'll go ahead and open up the presentations by the public. The public may have up to 3 minutes to comment on any matter except for those items which appear as public hearings on today's agenda. So if you're here to speak on the Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review or the Departure for Design Standards, that public hearing will be later. There will be separate comment periods for these public hearing items. Before starting your comments, please state your name and your address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there is 1 minute left. Red means your time is up. If anyone would like to speak, please come forward. Hearing none, we'll move to the next item on the agenda. And that is our Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review and for this we recognize Mr. Zuraf.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. COM21154253; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Stafford County Schools High School # 6 - A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-2232, of a proposed street or connection to an existing street and a proposed public building or public structure, consisting of a new high school and public road connecting Truslow Road to Warrenton Road, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 36-37 and 44-61A (Property). The Property is located on the south side of Truslow Road, across from the intersections of Cool Breeze Way and Summer Breeze Lane, within the Hartwood Election District. Stafford County Public Schools is the applicant. **(Time Limit: June 26, 2022)**

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, good evening, Madam Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department here to present this item. So this is a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review. And so the request, the specific request is to determine compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2232 for (1) a proposed street or connection to an existing street, and (2) a proposed public building or a public structure. The proposed street is a... would be a public road connecting Truslow Road to Warrenton Road. And the public building would be Proposed High School number 6. The properties in question are zoned A-1, Agricultural, and B-2, Urban Commercial. The total site area of these two properties is approximately 138 acres. It's in the Hartwood Election District and the County Public Schools Division is the applicant for this application. The site itself is highlighted in blue on this location map. It's on the south side of Truslow Road across from the intersections of Cool Breeze Way and Summer Breeze Lane, and then on the north side of Warrenton Road at Stafford Plaza Drive. As you can see from the aerial photo here, the site is wooded and undeveloped. Falls Run bisects the properties running from east to west. Also, the property slopes downward from Truslow Road and Warrenton Road down towards Falls Run. Other nearby uses include residential dwellings in the Willows subdivision to the north, Cardinal Forest subdivision to the east, and then across Warrenton Road from this site is Stafford Lakes Village. There's an existing private street into the site, that is Stafford Plaza Drive and that was constructed concurrently with the Royal Farms that is right along the frontage of Warrenton Road. This is the zoning of the site. It shows the subject property zoning and all surrounding properties as well. The light green represents A-1 zoning and the red shading represents B-2 zoning, the yellow shading represents R-1, Suburban Residential. I also would note, while we're on the zoning map, that the subject properties are subject to what is considered an ongoing zoning reclassification case known as Willow Run. That case is still open, but it's inactive right now.

Ms. Sellers: I have a question. What do you mean by that? What do you mean it's still active or?

Mr. Zuraf: The case is still open. And it... so there's a zoning reclassification, and it's... it has not expired yet.

Ms. Sellers: So is it sitting with the Planning Commission or is it sitting with the Board?

Mr. Zuraf: It actually... we're waiting for modifications to the application. So it's basically back at the staff level.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Bain: And that application is by the current property owners.

*Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022*

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Because it's under... it's still under private ownership, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, so this is not a request... this doesn't have any connection to that.

Mr. Zuraf: It does not.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, and so here is the site layout plan provided with the, with the application. This shows the proposed high school number 6 site and proposed public road extension, which would be an extension of Stafford Plaza Drive to access the school and connect up to Truslow Road from Warrenton Road. The proposal to locate high school number 6 on the site is a result of an extensive site selection process carried out by the County Schools Division. The high school site would include approximately 68.5 acres of the overall area, excluding the road right-of-way area that would be needed. The new school would relieve high school enrollment capacities that are projected to exceed 100% of design capacity at the existing five high schools by the fall of 2023. In addition, the new school would be located in an underserved area of the County, which would reduce travel times in the... for students in the southwestern corner of the County along the Warrenton Road corridor. Here is a color rendering focusing on the school area. The school would be located of course between Truslow Road and Falls Run. The school building itself would be centrally located on the site and I guess I will get the pen out to kind of help point these things out. The school building is here, and then also the building would be surrounded by parking and access drives for the bus and parent drop-off areas. There are athletic fields proposed on the western end of the site. There would be three entrances proposed off of Stafford Plaza Drive in this location and these other two locations. And one exit only driveway onto Truslow Road in this location. Stafford Plaza Drive extension would be a public road. A traffic circle is proposed at the Truslow Road intersection on the plans that were provided. The school building is estimated to be around 290,000 square feet in size, three stories tall, and designed to provide up to 2,150 seats. Staff would note that a separate conditional use permit would be required for the school as it's currently envisioned, as the building height is proposed to be 48 feet tall. That exceeds the maximum building height of 35 feet in the A-1, Agricultural zoning district. So in this... the way it's currently being designed, the Commission would likely see this project again in the future.

Ms. Sellers: Madam Chair, did you say 150 seats?

Mr. Zuraf: Two thousand, one hundred fifty seats.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So, since this has been the first I guess Comp Plan Compliance Review for several of the Planning Commissioners, I'm going to provide kind of a quick tutorial on a Comprehensive Planning Compliance Review, what it means, and a little background. So we'll call it Comp Plan Review 101. And so going through these points, so the first question, what is a Comp Plan Compliance Review? It is basically an application to review the consistency of certain public improvements that... against the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. It is a requirement that originates out of the State Code. It's specifically provision 15.2-2232 out of the State Code. Some of the statements, some of the

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

information within the State Code – I'll just read it – says, this provision states that the Comprehensive Plan shall control the general or approximate location, character and extent of each feature shown on the plan. On that, in Stafford, the Comp Plan shows existing public facilities and the few future facilities that may have been proffered, so we know the locations specifically. No other future sites are typically identified in our Comp Plan. However, the County's Plan does estimate the number of future public facilities that might be needed based on future growth projections. That also includes location criteria and recommendations. So on the second point there, it prohibits construction of public infrastructure that is not identified in the Comp Plan unless the Planning Commission approves the proposed infrastructure as being substantially in accord with the Comp Plan or a part thereof. So this process has been commonly required for requests in Stafford to extend public water or public sewer outside of the Urban Service Area, for example. There are also other provisions in this section of the State Code that would require review for telecommunication facilities, cell towers. So that's just a brief update there. And also, just on the question of what the purpose of a Comp Plan Compliance Review is, the purpose is to ensure that the public investment into public infrastructure is consistent with future goals and visions for future development that is outlined in the locality's Comprehensive Plan. So, there is an optional kind of path forward that one could take and this could be addressed by seeking an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Through this process, the specific school site and road segments could be specifically added to and identified in the Comp Plan. So then, the next question is why then request a Comp Plan Review as opposed to a Comp Plan Amendment? Each process does ultimately or would achieve the same result of determining the public infrastructure as being designed consistent with the County's growth goals. From a logistical standpoint, the Comp Plan Compliance process is quicker. It just goes through the Planning Commission. A Comp Plan Amendment, that's a little bit of more of a lengthy involved process. It goes through the Board of Supervisors for initiation initially. And then for a second round of public hearings. In this case of this proposed high school, a Comp Plan Compliance Review could be seen as appropriate because the Comp Plan does already identify the need for more high schools in the future, and the Compliance Review then would mainly focus on confirming if the location is appropriate. Also, if the Comp Plan, though, did not identify that a new high school was needed, then that would make it maybe more appropriate to go through the Comp Plan Amendment process to clarify the need as well as the location.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, before you move on, have we done this for other schools? A Comp Plan Compliance Review versus a Comp Plan Amendment?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't recall that one being done.

Mr. Apicella: What did we do for Anne E. Moncure when we moved it?

Mr. Zuraf: I think the County was just was able to purchase the land.

Mr. Harvey: It went through a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review. And in that case, similar to what we might find here, is that building was located in an agricultural zone and needed a conditional use permit for the extra building height.

Mr. Apicella: So it didn't need a CUP just to go there because it was on A-1 property...

Mr. Zuraf: Because of the height.

Mr. Apicella: ... because of the height.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Mr. Harvey: I stand corrected. I recall now with the Moncure school, actually, the Urban Service Area boundary was modified to incorporate that property with the knowledge that there would be a school there. In that case, the property was initially outside the Urban Services Area.

Mr. Apicella: And public facilities didn't... this is an A-1 parcel, so public facilities, meaning a County school, would not require a CUP except in the circumstance where you said where we had to extend... *inaudible*.

Mr. Zuraf: For height, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Sellers: Jeff, did we own the property before we did the review on Anne E. Moncure? I, I thought we owned... we purchased the property and then did the process?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, ma'am, that's correct in that situation.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: I don't recall if the schools purchased the property or the County did. But I know that the property was already in hand before the process started.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I can't remember that either.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, on the third point, how would you evaluate the uses and compliance with the Comp Plan? This is accomplished by evaluating the use against the applicable goals, objectives and policies and other land use recommendations. For example, with a telecommunication facility, we focus mainly on evaluating against the Telecommunications Plan, and all the recommendations there. The follow-up slides on this presentation, I will go through the evaluation process that staff went through that's outlined in the staff report. Another question would be are there conditions of approval? Unlike a rezoning or conditional use permit, there are no conditions of approval. This is... the Planning Commission is strictly voting on whether or not the proposed facility location and type as proposed is consistent with the Comp Plan. So there's not... well, you can't place conditions well, it has to be over here or require anything of the approval. So now going through the Comp Plan evaluation, there are several policies in the Comp Plan that support location within the Urban Services Area. Policy 2.2.1 under the sustainability goal establishes an Urban Service Area where among other things, it states characterized by the presence of public facilities. In Policy 3.6.1, under fiscal responsibility... under the fiscal responsibility goal states that future public facilities should be encouraged to be located within the Urban Services Area, and Policy 8.1.3 under the education goal recommends the same. On the second main bullet, Policy 8.1.4 addresses the siting of new schools. This site is centrally located and the overall goal of the siting recommendations is for the safety and well-being of students as a priority. This site is centrally located between several existing and planned residential communities, including England Run, Cardinal Forest, Stafford Lakes and the planned Westlake development further to the west. The site would greatly minimize the length of bus trips as these neighborhoods have to travel all the way to Colonial Forge and Mountain View in some instances. The site is located close to existing water lines and sewer lines and a public sewer line is currently terminates on the property. And then the new public road would provide alternative routes to and from the school. And then the site is not in close proximity to any major transmission lines. The Comp Plan Future Land Use Map classifies the property in Suburban Commercial Corridor and Resource Protection Future Land Use designations. The school in the

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Suburban Future Land Use Designation would be consistent with the general recommendations in the Plan. The school would be in close proximity to established neighborhoods in the vicinity. The site design is suburban in nature and the building is not proposed to exceed three stories as recommended in this section of the Comp Plan. To the north of the site the Comp Plan does recommend Agricultural and Rural land use. That area includes the Willows, a large lot rural residential development. The Public Facilities Plan does estimate additional public facility needs due to projected growth through year 2036, the timeframe of the Comp Plan. And the Plan does estimate the need for two additional high schools; although as mentioned, the specific locations of those two high schools are not identified. The Transportation Plan includes an anticipated transportation needs map that recommends a two-lane upgrade to Truslow Road. Currently, the County's Capital Improvement Program does not include though any specific projects for the improvement to that road yet. On the last point there, also the extension of Stafford Plaza Drive is not a recommended improvement in the transportation plan section. However, the Comp Plan policies do recommend creating more effective, efficient patterns of traffic flow and circulation, and promoting alternative routes to relieve congested corridors. A road connection from Truslow Road to Warrenton Road also would be beneficial from a public safety perspective, providing multiple access points to the school. Continuing with transportation, there's also the Comp Plan... there's a Comp Plan policy that addresses traffic impacts from new development and recommends development should maintain a Level of Service C or better for any impacted intersections or not further degrade already failing intersections. The applicant did prepare a traffic study that was included in the attachments. Some of the key results or findings did show that the overall Level of Service at Warrenton Road and Stafford Plaza Drive would degrade from Level of Service C to D in the morning peak hour and increase delay in the afternoon peak hour. Level of Service would not be impacted at the Truslow Road intersection and new site entrances would operate adequately.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Zuraf, do they take into consideration that Stafford High School is just down on off Enon Road and that there's already traffic right there at that fork where Truslow and Enon are? I know it's a little further down but it's all the same area and Warrenton... and Truslow Road is pretty narrow.

Mr. Zuraf: This traffic study did not go out that far, do not look out that far.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So some of the recommendations out of the traffic study include that at the Warrenton Road intersection, to do a few things first. Install a second eastbound left turn lane on Warrenton Road. So for traffic turning left onto Stafford Plaza Drive, that would provide more capacity for cars waiting to turn. Then also optimize signal timings as a result of the new traffic patterns that results. And then extending Stafford Plaza Drive north all the way to Truslow Road as shown and as proposed. And then at Truslow Road installing either a westbound left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane on the road... on Truslow or the roundabout option. And the site layout plan does show the proposed roundabout concept. A roundabout would serve a dual purpose of providing adequate Level of Service and improve safety along Truslow Road by slowing down traffic in this area.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, can ask a quick question about that? This is an exit only, so if you have a roundabout, there's no getting back in.

Mr. Zuraf: With a roundabout you basically could move fully around.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022*

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, the exit only is separate. It's a separate...

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: ... further like halfway through down the site.

Mr. Shelton: Madam Chair?

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Shelton: I have a question on the roundabout and school buses. The length of a school bus trying to consider coming around that roundabout, is that a wise move?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I think probably in this location, having a roundabout on Truslow Road, it's going to have to be designed to accommodate all kinds of larger vehicles including buses, fire trucks.

Mr. Shelton: Absolutely.

Mr. Zuraf: And so this will go through VDOT review and have to meet... have to meet all, you know, VDOT required, you know, they have standards for the roundabouts that they have to follow.

Mr. Bain: Especially since your previous slide talked about adding two more lanes to Truslow Road which would make it a four-lane roadway. And to do a roundabout with a four-lane roadway takes considerably more area for the diameter of the roundabout.

Mr. Zuraf: And let me clarify that. What my point was on Truslow Road for the Comp Plan for the future improvement was just a two-lane improvement. So, it still remains a two-lane road. But it's just an improved condition; wider lanes, not as sharp. So it's still recommended just to be a two-lane road through that area. So this is just a summary of all the elements of the Comp Plan and the school site and public road extension that would be seen as consistent with the Comp Plan. In other words, basically where the school and the road kind of checks the compliance boxes, these are all points that I've summarized in my presentation. So I won't read all the, all of them in detail. And then, as I have mentioned, this is the one negative point, as noted in the presentation, related to transportation degradation at the intersection with Warrenton Road. Staff does recommend the Planning Commission find the request substantially in accord with the Comp Plan pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution 22-03. And that ends my presentation.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Any more questions... I see lots of hands going up... for staff?

Ms. Sellers: We have a question down here.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Sellers: Our friend here wants to ask about Poplar Road, the intersection of Poplar and Truslow Road and the backup there. So he comes from Mountain View High School, remember, and he's very familiar with this area.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that was brought up in some of our internal discussions. And yes, that is... we're aware that that could be a concern, because this plan, you know, this is focused on this site. And yeah, there's...

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

there will likely in the future be a need for separate right turn lanes from left turn lanes, and will likely happen when Truslow Road gets approved. But once the school is getting to a point where it's going to be open, there might be a need to advance that type of project. But it's not part of this request.

Mr. Shelton: Madam Chair?

Ms. Barnes: Go ahead.

Mr. Shelton: One question. If I understood your presentation, there's only one entrance onto Truslow Road. The three other entrances are on Stafford Plaza, correct?

Ms. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman?

Ms. Barnes: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Zuraf, can you go back to your 101 brief? So, again, just to clarify what we're being asked to do tonight, we're only... it's a binary question, right? It either is... what's in front of us either is consistent with the Comp Plan based on the criteria that we've been provided or it's not. A yes or no kind of a question.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So it's, it's kind of different than a rezoning that might be in front of us.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right.

Mr. Apicella: We're not... we're not specifically evaluating the site plan tonight either, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: It's just for general information.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right.

Mr. Apicella: It could, it could change. I don't know how official the site plan is. It's probably still going through some review, I suspect.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. I know the school division, they've been meeting with the community and they've been modifying the... they're continuing to modify the plan based on public input.

Mr. Apicella: So hypothetically, again, I don't know what the Commission as a whole is going to decide to do with respect to the application, but if the Commission decided to recommend, or decided to approve the applicant's request, what's the next series of steps?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the next step would still be, I guess what's ongoing is the process of actually acquiring the land. And so that's something the School Board is handling. But then the follow-up step, then, as we've mentioned, they're still going to need a conditional use permit for building if it's going to exceed the 35 feet in height. But then also, they will still have a major site plan to go through for the road and the... and the building and overall site itself.

Mr. Apicella: So, as you said, this is not the end of the process, it's sort of the middle of the process, I guess I would say. And the County staff, the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors will have an extensive role going forward to, you know, to look at those other issues to decide on the CUP, to decide on the site plan, etc.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Right? And the public will have a chance at those, at the time that those things come up to provide their input on their concerns, or whether they're pro or con, what's in front of them at that point in time.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bain: I know this is probably not really pertinent right now. But since the traffic study was performed and presented to us, in my experience, traffic studies generate a tremendous amount of data. And they follow a lot of very specific criteria in their analyses. But I find that a lot of times they don't use common sense. I'm amazed to see this traffic study says that there'll be no impact on the Level of Service on Truslow Road at the potential roundabout. That just boggles my mind. I mean, logic would tell you that high school, at the end of the day, everybody leaving campus, you're gonna have some problems on Truslow Road. Possibly, they said, well, high school lets out before rush hour, so it's not going to impact the normal PM rush hour blockages that hit Truslow Road every day. But I wonder if they really looked at situations like, so, suppose there's an afternoon baseball game or soccer game, and the game finishes at rush hour? What's that going to do to the roadway? So I think that traffic study probably needs a lot of scrutiny. And I would question some of their conclusions. Just my opinion.

Mr. Zuraf: And the applicant's traffic consultant is here, I believe, to maybe can address some of those concerns.

Mr. Bain: It's probably not the right forum to go into detail on it, because it really isn't pertinent to what we're being asked tonight, but I just want to air my feeling. Thank you.

Mr. Shelton: Could I ask one question? You said there's a limitation of 35 feet. Is that something that we're doing for what reason? What's the limitation on the height? Why 35 feet?

Mr. Zuraf: That's in the Zoning Ordinance. It establishes maximum building heights in different zoning...

Mr. Shelton: Wasn't that done years ago, when we didn't have aerial fire apparatus, and we didn't have sprinkler buildings and those things?

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Mr. Zuraf: Well, that's only a maximum height requirement in the A-1. I think the idea is typically you're only having... it's only two-story homes. And so in these rare cases where you actually have then a school building, then you're likely going to have to go above... the other zoning districts have much higher maximum...

Mr. Shelton: It's not an impediment to the flight plan or anything like that, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Not in this location.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Any other questions?

Mr. Martinez: I'm sure, if I could?

Ms. Barnes: Mm-hmm. Go ahead.

Mr. Martinez: First of all, I appreciate the staff reviewing and checking to make... to see if this is following the Comp Plan. I see mostly on the transportation side and but I was curious, did the staff also review the potential environmental impacts to the connecting road and seeing if that follows the Comp Plan as well? Because I know there's a stream right there. And I know, according to the Comp Plan, we want to focus on reducing stream erosion and things like that. Did the staff review that as well?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it's... I know, you know, the idea is to minimize impacts and I guess the idea of, you know... Yeah, they're... you know, it's not, it's not good at all to have, you know, really any impacts. But if you're going to have that, try to minimize it. And so if there's just one crossing, then that's... and the other I guess aspect is any crossing is going to have to go through a pretty thorough environmental review, when it gets through the design phase, to minimize wetland impacts and overall impacts to that area, and make sure that, you know, it is crossing at a, you know, perpendicular direct... you know, at 90 degrees and not like, you know, at an angle where you're gonna maybe have more impacts to the Resource Protection Area. So, that also will go through definitely thorough review at a more later stage.

Mr. Martinez: Would it be fair to say that that's a potential negative impact for, you know, in terms of the positives and the negatives that you, that you weighed?

Mr. Zuraf: It could be viewed as a negative if, you know, any environmental impact.

Mr. Martinez: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, to be clear, though, this is for both the school and the road; we can't separate those two for this, because it seems like there's almost two... there's the school and the road and they seem like they can be separated. But here we're putting... we're all lumping it together.

Mr. Zuraf: I think the Commission does have the leeway to separate it out and could divide it up if you so choose. But you know, it's both... the project really does... I was going to rely on, you know, on the road and you know, so.

Ms. Barnes: So they're definitely tied.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Zuraf: I would say so but there is leeway if you choose to break it up.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to again reiterate my question, which is, it's still not fully fleshed out. The road could change to some extent. Even the roundabout could change, right? This is not cast in pavement so to speak.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right.

Mr. Apicella: So it's really conceptual. We're kind of looking at it from a conceptual perspective, whether or not the school and proposed additional road linking up 17 to Truslow Road, however that plays out, again we're just looking at it from a conceptual perspective.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. I think the road is not going to vary too far because this is... this kind of... *inaudible*... lines up with the light, traffic light at Warrenton. And so yeah, it could vary a little bit.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but to Mr. Martinez's question, they could make some changes to mitigate those impacts...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... once they dig deeper into what those are.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: This seems a little unusual. And then you call it conceptual. I'm almost calling it hypothetical. Would that be a better word for it? Because we really... this is, if we were to put a school here and a road here, even though all of that really hasn't been worked out, would this be consistent with our Comp Plan?

Mr. Zuraf: You could see it... yeah, I guess you could view it as hypothetical.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, because it seems a little unusual that we really don't have more things nailed down at this stage of the game. And it might be a little confusing because of that.

Mr. Zuraf: We do have a good, you know, the schools put in a lot of time and effort in developing a plan. So they're... and they're getting close. And they can speak to how far along they are with the design and everything.

Mr. Apicella: I'd just use the word conceptual because we have this thing called a conceptual plan. And it's more like a conceptual plan than a hypothetical.

Ms. Barnes: Is it hypothetically conceptual?

Mr. Zuraf: I'll let you guys argue on that.

Ms. Barnes: Alright, any more questions for staff?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, just to add on to the discussion. Again, as Mike pointed out in his presentation, under State Code, the Planning Commission must find that the location, extent, and

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

character of the proposed feature is compliant with the plan. So that typically is not a detailed engineering drawing; in fact, the wording in the State Code regarding the Comprehensive Plan says it's general in nature. So in this case, if you had a road being proposed, and it's proposed to be a two-lane road, and then later on its... that proposed change is to be a six-lane road, well that would probably have to come back for review again because that's changing the extent and character of the feature. Similarly, if they get approved for a high school, and come back for a high school and an elementary and a middle all on the same property, that again, that would have to come back because it's changing the extent and character of what has been approved by the Commission.

Ms. Barnes: Not that that's actually happening.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. It's not part of this proposal.

Ms. Barnes: It sounded like a lot of schools there. Okay, so last call for questions from staff.

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, you gotta thank Mr. Apicella for this one. So, can we go back to the zoning, the area plan and the zoning. So, it's A-1 now, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Yeah, where the school would be is A-1.

Mr. Cummings: Right. Right. And so to Mr. Apicella's point, agricultural on the... that's in the service area, right, but still zoned A-1, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Cummings: And so within the Comp Plan, and we do need a school, but is this the right place for the school is the question. And the way it's zoned. So I'm gonna go back, I'm just putting that, putting that for everyone to, to marinate on it. And to determine how they best, how they see, see it, shaking out. The other point that I had was or thought about was the, the fact that Truslow Road improvements, they're not planned, right? Is that what you said?

Mr. Zuraf: It's in the, uh, it's in the long range vision, but it's not... there's not a specific year mark yet for, for the work to be done.

Mr. Cummings: And pointing out to Commissioner Bain's questions and concerns about Truslow Road, which I also have; I've lived not too far from Stafford High School, and I've seen the traffic, experienced it firsthand. So, you know, I think that... so, and again, does it fit the character, right? We need a school in that area. And I'm just, I'd love to hear from applicants or from the school to see why this... inaudible.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, we're gonna get them next, I think.

Ms. Sellers: Where is the Urban Services Area on this map? Because we're talking about that and that typically means that's where your water and your sewer and all your stuff is.

Mr. Zuraf: This is the northern limit of the Urban Services Area. And basically this area is in the Urban Services Area.

Ms. Sellers: So where going west is the Urban Services Area and... because it's pretty rural once you get past that, that Royal Farms and Mary Washington.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Zuraf: It continues on and it actually then includes land to the south of... Westlake is actually a large development that is approved out, pretty far out.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And that, that project is 700 homes. So you have Urban Serviced Area to the south as you get farther west on Warrenton.

Ms. Sellers: Who approved that?

Mr. Zuraf: This was ... that was approved in like 1989 or something, so.

Ms. Barnes: 1981. Let's go over that again; 1981. I think I'm gonna... I think we're good with questions for staff. Do we want to hear from the applicant at this point?

Mr. White: Good evening. Hi there. I'm Lionel White, Director of Facilities Planning with Stafford County Public Schools. Our counsel, Mr. Gifford Hampshire, with Blankenship and Keith, he's going to give our PowerPoint presentation this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Hampshire: Good evening, Madam Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. I am Gifford Hampshire. I'm with the law firm of Blankenship and Keith, and I represent the Stafford County Schools. I have a background in representing schools. I've represented the Prince William County Schools for years and had been through any number of these, these hearings. Up there they call it a PFR, a Public Facility Review. Fairfax County calls it an item shown. Other counties call it what you call it, a Comprehensive Plan Consistency Review. But as Mr. Zuraf said, the idea really is to determine whether or not a school is in a particular location is or is not substantially compliant with the Comprehensive Plan. Now, let me first make it clear that I'm just one member of our team. We have other team members here from the schools. We have Mr. John Anderson, we have Lionel White who just was up here. And Mr. Joe Nubert. We have our architect here, Mr. Paul Klee from Grim and Parker Architects that have worked with the schools for years and other schools. And we have our civil engineers, The Timmons Group is here. And Mr. Steve Rile is here from Timmons on the civil engineering side. And Timmons also has the traffic engineer here, who authored the traffic engineering report for that firm, Mr. Thomas Roth. So between all of us, we hope we can answer any questions that you might have. So as Mr. Zuraf said, and I don't want to belabor this because we've already been over it, but it's worth saying the whole basis for why we're here is determine a very kind of general thing. And as Mr. Zuraf said, if you have a feature shown you don't need to go through this review. But if a feature is not shown, it shall not be established or authorized unless and until the general or approximate location, character, and extent has been submitted and approved by the Planning Commission as being not exactly but substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. So, as has been said earlier, this is a very sort of general review. Often localities don't have zoning ordinances that control public facilities, per se. So this is... works as kind of a zoning control for public facilities. So the other point I want to repeat is, that was said earlier, is that we, the schools that is, will still have to go through a detailed engineering site plan review, just like any other landowner, for this project, which will bring into play all the design manual requirements for engineering, things like buffering, things like building design, access, parking, and that sort of thing. So when we talk about these three things, location, character, and extent, we, as Mr. Zuraf said, we need to look at the policies that are in the Comprehensive Plan. And as has been said, there are a number of them that are, that are at issue. For location, we have policy 8.1.3 that says that schools should be in the Urban Service Area; we certainly meet that policy. We have a policy in 8.1.4 that says that schools should be near existing or planned residential areas; we certainly meet that. And it should be near other

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

public facilities that can serve the development... or excuse me, the school, things like public water and sewer and has, as has been said, we meet that requirement. And it's away from transmission lines. There's another policy that goes toward location, and that is that actually the technical skill training be built into the levels of service. And as we will see in a minute, we have Career and Technical Education Academies as part of the school. There's another policy that says that construction should begin to ensure that other schools don't exceed 100% of capacity. And that's exactly why we're doing it. And indeed, as it was stated, in that very fine staff report that you have, by 2023, it's estimated that the other schools in the County will be over 100%. And there's another Comprehensive Plan policy that says that the school should start to acquire sites once the capacity gets over about 96%. So you don't wait until it's already too late. So that's... we're meeting that policy, because the last we checked, we were at about that, that level. So let me just skip forward a couple slides. You've seen much better maps than this about the long range land use plan. It's in the Urban Service Areas. The area in yellow is the Suburban Planning Area. There's a little bit in red, which is along the commercial corridor, but the school is going to be in the Suburban Area, again, near existing and planned neighborhoods that it would serve. The zoning map, it is zoned A-1, a little bit of B-2 down near the road. But again, we're here on the Comprehensive Plan consistency review, not really so much the zoning. And then, with respect to extent, remember this is the third leg of the stool, we have a policy in Chapter 5 of the plans that says that high school enrollment should not exceed 90%. And that staff, and that staff or 100%, and that in 2023, again, that's going to occur and that we should begin the process. With respect to extent it was stated that we have 290,000 square feet of school, which is exactly the standard in the plan. And we have a standard here also of 70 buildable acres, and we have 68.5, once you take out the floodplain and the road. So we meet those policies in the plan. We want to make it clear that this is not our first effort at this. We have been engaging the community for some time. And we have other meetings planned even after this meeting to hear feedback from the community about what the community wants in terms of design. And these are some of the things on this slide that we heard, things like large hallways and access to natural lighting, space for teachers to plan and work, etc. More parking. So we are actively engaged with the community, we have been and we will be in the future. Here's a vicinity map that shows you, is intended to make the point that this school would be located in an underserved area. You see the red star there. And you see the other high schools, the existing high schools in the area and those radii, if you will, the red circle is one mile distance, and the blue circles are 2.5. So you can get a sense from that scale how far some kids have to be bused right now to go to school. And that will be a better lifestyle for them. And it will also promote operational efficiencies for the schools. And here's the vicinity map that shows you the location, you've seen this before. And this is my first time trying to operate this pen so I'm not sure if I'm gonna do it right. But let's see here. Well, maybe not, maybe I shouldn't mess with it, all right, we'll go back. But you should... do you have a suggestion for me? How do you do that?

Mr. Zuraf: Alright, we better not.

Mr. Hampshire: Yeah, I should have, I should have practiced before I got up here. Okay. But anyway, this shows a vicinity map; in blue is the whole property. Keep in mind, there's Falls Run goes, you can see Falls Run that goes through the property. As was stated, with respect to public facilities, there was a sewer line that's on the south, the southeast of the site. And as stated in the staff report, there's adequate public water already along Route 17. And more facilities being planned to be extended up to the Westlake development that was mentioned before. And here's the site plan. And this, again, is a conceptual site plan. This will be the basis for what we will use when we get to the real site plan at site plan stage. But there was some discussion earlier, what we have here and if you've looked at the staff report, you'll see how we have multiple entrances off of the Stafford Plaza Drive extension that will separate the buses from the cars. So they so they won't mix together. The traffic circle or roundabout, if you will, is seen up here at the intersection. And Mr. Rao can talk about this more if you have

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

questions. But if you see how that roundabout is configured, the whole intent of that roundabout is to get off and away of Truslow Road, you see those feeders there. So that the, so that the buses and the cars will get off of Truslow Road, circle around, and either come down the site or do the same thing when they leave. So it's intended and was actually recommended by VDOT as a good function. And again, it will be designed, it will have to be designed to accommodate buses and other large vehicles. You will see here that we have athletic fields out to the west. An important point to understand is that because this is a conceptual plan, we're not showing all the detailed buffering features that we would have to show at the site plan. But you can kind of see the buffer here to the west opposite the baseball field that will buffer the properties to the west. And you can also see the Falls Run and the Resource Protection Area around the Falls Run. The staff report made the point that the floodplain and the, and the RPA are all, and the wetlands are all located within that area and we're staying out of every inch of it. We do have to cross it as was discussed earlier, but crossings are allowed under the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act Ordinance. And we will of course be required to minimize whatever impacts of that crossing there are.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Hampshire?

Mr. Hampshire: Yes ma'am?

Ms. Sellers: What are you guys doing? This says lot not included in the proposed project. Are you guys not trying to buy that or what's happening? It's better on that other... yeah, this one.

Mr. Hampshire: Correct. That is the remainder of the site that we will not be acquiring.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Hampshire: But we have preserved access points to that land for... onto Stafford Plaza Drive so that they can utilize it, utilize that public road.

Ms. Sellers: And so do you guys have like information that shows how this this access road will be beneficial? Like why does it need to go all the way through? Why can't we have like one entrance and off 17 and maybe have, I don't know, buses or... and this it looks like either students or staff get in there. And then coming off of Truslow Road you have other people. Why would we build like one access road?

Mr. Hampshire: I guess the first thing to say in response to that is VDOT actually recommended it as a, as a traffic betterment, if you would, to mitigate the impacts on the traffic, because it will distribute the traffic impact between the two entrances. If you looked at the traffic study, you'll see that about a third of the traffic goes up towards Truslow as anticipated and about half or so comes down. And the remainder I can show you in a minute, but the point is it distributes the traffic better. And we were talking about this earlier in preparation for this meeting with our team. And the idea would be that the schools would have certain rules to direct traffic in the direction they need to go. For example, only the traffic that would need to go to the subdivisions along Truslow Road would go out that way. The others would come down on 17. And I'll show you in a minute the other mitigation... mitigating improvements that VDOT suggested.

Ms. Sellers: So I guess I'm curious too, when you say that, because the map that you showed in the beginning with those circles, it looks like you're trying... yes, this one... it looks like you're trying to service, you know, the folks out here in the, in the Hartwood, out towards 17, out towards where Mr.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Shelton is from. But if you're talking about going up Truslow Road, and it's pretty close over here at Poplar, so when they say the kids going on Truslow Road, where are they going? Because Stafford High School is what? A mile and a half up the street?

Mr. Hampshire: Well, I mean, the schools can talk more to that. But there will certainly be people in the Willows and Cardinal, but certainly in the Willows up here, they will be going to the school and they'll need to get home and certainly along Truslow Road.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: I have a quick question on the last point you made that you said that, that the high school would direct traffic for kids that, or employees that need to go one way? How in the world are they going to do that? Are they going to have stickers on the cars?

Mr. Hampshire: Well, like any other rule in high school...

Ms. Barnes: That's going to be really... I'm not sure that VDOT has 16 year old's driving because...

Mr. Hampshire: Right. I'm not saying that the rules will be uniformly successful, but that would be an attempt to try to get people to. And I think there's a self-interest in, in people going the most direct route home. There would be no incentive for someone to take a roundabout way, if you will, excuse the pun.

Ms. Barnes: You don't think 16 and 17 year old's want to do a little fun joyride?

Mr. Hampshire: Well, assuming they're going right home. Right, you're right. We have, we do have the Royal Farms down there to the south. So we anticipate there'll be some traffic that will want to go down there.

Mr. Apicella: Can I piggyback on a couple questions?

Mr. Hampshire: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: So the lot not included, it's still part of the site, but it's not going to be used for the school itself.

Mr. Hampshire: No, sir. It's not part of the site.

Mr. Apicella: Who owns that parcel?

Mr. Hampshire: The Ward Corporation, same entity that owns the rest of the site.

Mr. Apicella: So we don't know what they're going to do with that parcel?

Mr. Hampshire: I don't no. That may be part of the rezoning that's in; I'm not sure. But, uh, but I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: And do we know what the size of that parcel is?

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Mr. Hampshire: It's what, 20 or 30 acres I think? The whole site is 100 and something; we're taking 70 or so. I can find that out for you in a minute.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And I may not have seen it in the staff report, but will that be a signalized intersection where the Stafford Plaza Drive extension is off of Warrenton Road?

Mr. Hampshire: Yes, sir. It already is. There's already a signal down there. So the signals will be maintained and then optimized, or adjusted, I guess is the right word, for the site.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Hampshire: You're welcome. This is a, this just is a slide that kind of repeats what I already said, but in graphic form, intended to summarize the traffic calming measures, the multiple entrances. We will have a core stormwater management features; those will be mandated like for every other developer and site plan, we will have lighting, and we will need a conditional use permit for the, as we stated earlier, for the building if it exceeds 35 feet and for the poles. It is possible just to be, I think I should mention this, that depending upon the grade, once we get in there and do final grading that it could be that the buildings are under 35 feet, we just don't know yet. But it will be 35 feet from whatever the final grade is. And this, this slide illustrates that so we may need to get a conditional use permit for building height if the grade is... shows it to be that high. The timing I think this was a question earlier, we've been negotiating with the property owner for some time... property owners, I should say. The Ward Corporation owns the site where the high school would be. An entity by the name of Stafford E&A owns the land where the road would be. And we've been, we've submitted offers to both property owners, and we really have not heard back, we're hopeful we will. But assuming the 2232 Comprehensive Plan Compliance is successful, which we hope it will be, then we will move forward with, if we can't reach an agreement, we'll move forward with eminent domain with the idea that construction would start in about a year from now. And the school would open in 2025. There was a question earlier about the evaluation of the site. Stafford schools really did go through a comprehensive process lasting many months with, and with the retention of a consultant and looked at, as it says here over 100 locations. They had a committee that met multiple times. And of course, the criteria that we looked for is the same criteria that's in the Comprehensive Plan; sites of at least 70 acres, access to utilities, transportation access, acceptable topography, and environmental features that can be avoided. And we narrowed it down to this site. There's another comprehensive plan policy, I mentioned the others earlier, but Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan talks about adequate public facilities. And also and the goal of meeting the current level and expected level of increase in students and also repeats the goal of locating such sites within the Urban Service Areas, and the minimum 70-acre buildable site. The traffic study was done. The thing to understand about traffic studies is that the very first step is to do a scoping meeting with VDOT, and to understand from VDOT's point of view, and sometimes the County's point of view, what intersections are relevant, and what should be studied. And so we took that, that information and the intersections of, at 17 and also at Truslow were identified to be studied. And those, the traffic study, as you can see from your packet, was very extensive. The assumptions in the study included the peak time traffic, and it was stated earlier that that's generally 3:45 in the afternoon and 9:45 in the morning, so in the morning it's after, it's pretty much at the end of the morning rush. And in the evening, in the afternoon, it's pretty much before, at least the height of the afternoon rush. And we understand the point about games and things. Those would be hopefully sporadic. But on a regular daily basis, the peak hours are before the morning and evening rush hour. The recommendations from the study, here's the traffic distribution that I was referring to earlier. You can see about 35% of the traffic is anticipated from the Truslow area. Here's a slide that intends to illustrate the traffic mitigation measures that were recommended by the study and, so far, and we have VDOT's current agreement with them. And I say

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

it that way because it's premature as I understand it for VDOT to have a final sign-off on the traffic impact study until later on in the site plan process. But Mr. Rao and Mr. Ruff will tell you that in their discussions with VDOT, that VDOT has agreed with these recommendations. So you'll see here in graphic form the recommendations. The first one is the extension of Stafford Plaza Drive all the way through precisely because it is a traffic distribution method; the installation of the roundabout in a way that does not impact or interfere with the traffic on Truslow; the construction of two left-bound eastbound... excuse me, a second left-bound eastbound lane on 17 to get into the site; and a number of different access points on Stafford Plaza Drive for the students that separate buses from cars. Environmental...

Ms. Barnes: Can I interrupt for a second?

Mr. Hampshire: Sure.

Ms. Barnes: Can you go back two slides? One more. One more. Okay. The second bullet there. Cut-through traffic on the new roadway expected to be minimal.

Mr. Hampshire: Right.

Ms. Barnes: How do we know that?

Mr. Hampshire: Well, that's a matter of traffic study. And I'll turn, I'll let Mr. Rough from...

Ms. Barnes: Are they making that, because I know that if I were going from 17, and it got bad, and I could get to Truslow, I'd zip right up there if I could, unless you somehow make it not quick for me to do that.

Mr. Hampshire: Right.

Ms. Barnes: Because I, I can't imagine why that wouldn't be a cut-through.

Mr. Hampshire: I'll ask Mr. Rough is he want... do you want to come up here or no?

Ms. Barnes: Well, we can, we can get to that if you want to finish yours first.

Mr. Hampshire: Okay. Alright, alright. So, okay, so environmental. So again, as you saw graphically earlier, the construction would be outside the RPA, except for the crossing. And we've done, we've actually done an environmental site assessment with no major concerns. Wetlands and floodplain are within the RPA. So we've really done a lot of engineering and environmental work and traffic study work already, before we even came to, to this Commission. And again, water and sewer are, are available. So the key takeaways here, we're located near existing and planned residential areas, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, that will minimize the length of bus trips. We don't have a design; yet we're working on it. But as I mentioned earlier, that's precisely why we're engaging the community and we're going to continue to engage the community with our architects to come up with a design that is, that is attractive and the people will like. And the size of the site is consistent with the parameters in the Comprehensive Plan as mentioned earlier. So that is our presentation. And I'm ready to answer any other questions, as the rest of our team.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Go ahead.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Ms. Sellers: So we have two questions. One, when you guys looked at the traffic study, and you developed the parameters, was it based on this year's school start time or next year's school start time? Because those are different.

Mr. Hampshire: Alright. I will ask Mr. Ruff from Timmons to come up and talk a little bit of the traffic study, because I'm getting out of my depth on that.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Ruff: Thanks for the question. So the, the traffic study data was collected over a three hour period...

Mr. Bain: Please introduce yourself.

Mr. Ruff: Oh, excuse me. Thomas Ruff, a traffic engineer with the Timmons Group in the Stafford County team. So to your question, yeah, we collected traffic data around a three hour period that included the start time with the current start time, but it also included an extended period of time, and we captured the highest peak at that period. So it's not, it was really intended to find the most traffic that's occurring around that time. So if there's, if the start time does, I mean, if we're talking maybe hours of difference, you know, yes, that we would not be capturing the same time. But as long as it's within that general two hour period that we collected, we chose the highest volume, over four 15 minute periods, to make sure we were conservative in the amount of volume we're looking at.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, and then my next question is, you have a, you have a picture on here, that shows that 55% of the people going to the school are coming from the eastern side, coming from the east, going west on Truslow to get there, but then you show another graph that says you're servicing an underserved area. And so I'd love an explanation on that, because those kids coming from the east could quickly go up Enon Road and go to Stafford High School.

Mr. Ruff: Sure...

Ms. Sellers: So, your things aren't really matching there.

Mr. Ruff: And this may be a better question for the public school, but if you look at them... Okay, yeah. So if you see the yellow area that the current folks on Truslow Road and south of Route 17 actually go to Colonial Forge. So they do not go to Stafford High School, they actually go further beyond. And so this school would serve as a majority of those students, as well as take away from Stafford High School and Mountain View. So they are already in this area, right around how that may be 100% divvied out in the future. I will rely on you know, this is an approximation based on where residential homes are located.

Ms. Sellers: So can I ask why this is the site we're set on when if, if it's coming from the east and we look on the same map, if you go to the east towards King George County, you have a whole area out there that is not already a traffic nightmare. You know, the roads off of Route, whatever it is, the King Highway or whatever it is going out to King George is awfully large. Like why are we trying to shove this right on this site and, you know...?

Mr. Ruff: So we're not trying to shove anything anywhere. What we're doing is if you look at the map here, we have Colonial Forge High School is split. So its boundary has what we call a sort of an island. And in that yellow area...

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I live in Embrey Mill, so I'm very well versed on where Colonial Forge kids come from.

Mr. Ruff: Okay, so some people may not be aware that Colonial Forge boundary is off the 17, it goes below the 17. So there are many high school students within that detached polygon. And in terms of the school's location, the goal is to minimize the time that students are on a bus. Also, we have young drivers on the road; we want to minimize the amount of time they're on the roads driving to school. So this location, not only it's advantageous, because there's already a high school on the eastern side of 95. So we wouldn't want to locate another high school east of 95. If you look at our map, we have a bigger service gap, a deficit, a need more so on the western side of the County, so that's why the committee agreed that this is the best site.

Ms. Sellers: Do we have numbers for that?

Mr. Ruff: Do we have...?

Ms. Sellers: Do we have numbers? Because you know, when you look at this, and I hear what you're saying, but we a property, we have the Clift Farm property, right, in the Falmouth district that is big enough to hold a high school. It was proffered and purchased with the intent of being a high school. And on the eastern side, and you're telling, like, I'm just not really understanding if we're saying there's a need. I get the need, we all understand the need.

Mr. Ruff: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: But when you look at this map, and you tell me we're under, we're servicing an underserved area, but then you show me 55% of the students are coming from the east, not from the west, it doesn't make sense to me.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I'm gonna jump in here real quick. I think these are good points, but I think it might be out of the scope of what we're doing tonight. I think that the scope here is just not is this the best place for a high school, but could this be a place for the high school in accordance to the Comprehensive Plan? So we might want to, might want to maybe come back and focus on that a little bit, even though great points, Ms. Sellers.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, can I piggyback off of that point you just made?

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: So going back to the slide, we don't have to pull it up, that Mr. Zuraf provided about the Comp Plan Compliance Review 101. And also sort of piggybacking off of Mr. Cummings' question. So again, a Comp Plan Compliance from your perspective, I'm asking a similar question that I asked Mike, I might say it a little bit differently. But a Comp Plan Compliance Review for a public facility is not looking at whether this is a good or a great place for a school and/or connector road, but whether putting a school and an associated road improvements in this area is consistent with the Comp Plan's policies and goals.

Mr. Ruff: Precisely. You said it very well.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Are you finished with your presentation?

Mr. Ruff: I am. Thank you for your attention.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Do we have any more questions for the applicant? No? Okay. So at this point, we will bring it back to the Commission. What is the pleasure of the Commission at this point? Okay, oh, that's true. Okay. So we are gonna have the public hearing – maybe I should put my glasses on, that would help. Okay, there we go. We'll open up the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on these public hearings items. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. And red means your time is up. If you would like to speak, please come forward.

Mr. Howell: Hi, there. Are we started?

Ms. Barnes: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Howell: Oh, Jim Howell. I'm from the Hartwood District. What I've found over the years is when people come up and present to you and tell you what's going on, always listen for what they don't tell you. So we heard that there's been all this great public engagement from the School Board to the community about this new high school. The only thing that they haven't engaged us on is where to put the high school. It's been done in secret, complete secret, and we wrote to the School Board, a number of us from the Hartwood District last year, never received a response. Numerous emails, phone calls, promises made, never were involved in this 100 site down to one site decision. So if they had talked to us, we would have been glad to tell them that there's a number of problems associated with this specific parcel of land. There are environmental concerns; Falls Run is connected to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It's got federal protections of some sort. That has to be considered when you've got the runoff now from all these parking lots, rather than the absorption into the ground. We talked about things like noise pollution, congestion, this cross road that they're going to put in that mysteriously is not going to be used by a lot of people because that's what the traffic engineer kind of divines. Well, we live there, we know what's going to happen with that crossroad. And Mr. Bain, your comments about the traffic circle and congestion and traffic, absolutely spot on. Truslow is already a train wreck. I would invite you all, if you haven't done it, come down on a Friday afternoon, maybe around three o'clock, when all the New York license plates are going by at about 60 miles an hour, and you can't get out of your neighborhood. So now add to that, you know, hundreds and hundreds of cars and buses every day, I think you've got yourself set up for a disaster. So we would embrace public discourse about where to put the school. But it seems like we've got a fait accompli here, where the School Board has not engaged the public on location. And it's just said, here's where it's going to be, never mind the bulldozers, you'll get over the noise. So I would encourage you to really kind of push back on this. There's a lot more work needs to be done about this site. A lot more decisions and discussion and evaluation needs to be done. You can't go on a three hour traffic survey that was done two days before Thanksgiving on one day and think that that's a good way to evaluate the traffic situation. So thank you very much for your time. Appreciate it.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Minnick: I have a copy of notes. Can I give them to you, Mr. Shelton, since you're representing Hartwood? Thank you very much. My name is Donald Minnick. I also am a resident of the Willows and I'm President of the Homeowners' Association there. But that's anecdotal. I'm not representing the Homeowners' Association in any way, but I just wanted to let you know that. Okay. I'd like to push

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

back on that traffic study primarily and a lot of the assumptions that were made in that traffic study that really, really bothers. Okay, so I'm going to present seven points to you. Traffic Analysis – how long was its duration? What impact did the pandemic have, or was it even considered a factor? Traffic counters near the site were observed for only two days during a time when many people work from home due to the pandemic. We are seeing significant, a significant uptick in Truslow traffic right now. This study needs a newer, more comprehensive look at the situation. Number two – currently, there exists two blind curves between Summer Breeze Lane and Cool Breeze Way close to their intersections with Truslow where numerous accidents occur. We see this all the time. Residents are tired of having cars wind up in their front yards and their drawings don't depict the real life issues along that stretch. You must drive it; I doubt they did or if they did they chose to ignore it. Number three – quote, limited cut-through traffic is expected on the proposed new school roadway much to your point, okay. What is the basis of this assertion? Thirty years of residing in Stafford observing worsening traffic patterns. I guarantee that if a road is built that connects Route 17 over to Truslow Road, every driver with GPS will find and use this shortcut without hesitation when Route 17 becomes a parking lot, and that happens quite a lot now. And you know that too, Mr. Bain, don't you? Number four – quote, improvements are needed on Route 17 to manage queuing and operations. But it claims there are no operational issues at Truslow Road and Summer Breeze Lane. How does building one small traffic circle suddenly solve all of Truslow Road's...? Is it some magic? I don't know. You will have... you're going to have unavoidable delays and queuing and what will that do to Cool Breeze Way, which is just right up the road? And then that's a T intersection. There's no discussion about that. So we're limiting the ways that we can get out of the Willows subdivision simply because there's going to be more traffic coming and that T intersection is going to be a problem. Number five – parent drop-off/pick-up will have a dedicated space away from Route 17 or Truslow Road. I say that's false. Use of this entrance during school hours and during games or other activities is sure to aggravate traffic, halt traffic flow, and increase accidents. Consider moving this entrance to the Cool Breeze entrance, adding a second traffic circle, okay, for calming and safety along that entire stretch. Number six – the study implies that traffic will enter the school mainly from the Route 17 side onto Stafford Plaza Drive. You cannot possibly predict what the traffic pattern will be when faced with increasing traffic along Route 17. And students and parents are faced with finding a workaround and realize they can easily cut through the Cardinal Forrest development.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you. Your time is up. Thank you very much.

Mr. Minnick: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Come on down.

Mr. MacDonald: My name is Donald MacDonald; a resident of the Hartwood District, I live in the Willows. I want to start off and second the first comment that I think there's been very, very little coordination on from the school district with residents in the local areas about this project. In spite of inquiries made, I realize that's not your issue but, since they're here tonight, I wanted to say that. I do think that does impact though how the Planning Commission and the Supervisors and the School Board go forward with this because it really does limit the amount of input that's, that's available from the public. I concur with the previous comments that traffic is the principal issue. Truslow is getting to be a bigger traffic nightmare all the time. I think you all know that. A particular concern I think is the traffic circle proposal at Summer Breeze Lane. The layout of Truslow Road, I come out Summer Breeze from the Willows on Summer Breeze, onto Truslow all the time. And there is in fact a blind corner. And that corner coming from the west is going to continue to be a major problem with a traffic circle or no traffic circle. The volume of traffic that will come out of that school is going to just create a perfect

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

storm of accidents. I really do believe that the School Board, the Planning Commission, and the Supervisors need to look at a second exit out of that, out of that property onto 17 either up at the Holly Corner intersection, or someplace perhaps a little bit further up from that. And if that requires the use of some eminent domain, so be it. We're already talking about eminent domain, I think in terms of requiring this property if there's no successful negotiation. The last thing I want to say is that the, um, the proposal for the, where that parcel of land that shows that it's not going to be a school. I know originally that the Ward Corporation was planning to proffer that as a, as a proposed site for an elementary school. So I don't know where that stands. But that's something that had been discussed before. But the principal concern on this, again, is traffic on Truslow. And we need to figure out how to mitigate that. And I think there are some ways to go about that if there's a real opportunity to sit down and have some conservative discussions about that. But thank you for your time.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you very much.

Ms. Ferrence: Hello, my name is Lisa Ferrence. So, if you stand on my porch having a cup of coffee, you can wave at the hypothetical school buses going through the circle. So, I live at the main entrance where the traffic circle would be. You already know what Truslow Road looks like. We're talking about that quite a bit. Eight or nine blind curves between Berea Church and Poplar. There's no weight limit on that road. There's a lot of bypassing tractor trailers and logging trucks because I live there and I see them. There's no shoulder. So when I cut my grass, literally, I'm two to three inches from the edge of the active roadway. You know that there are accidents and speeding cars and that it is already a bypass for Warrenton Road to get all the way down to Route 1 because there's one stop sign at this point that people have to go through to get from all the way from Poplar all the way down to Route 1. The traffic study was mentioned at the March 30th meeting. I asked the question; it was out there for two days during the pandemic when a lot of our government employees were still working from home. In the past, the County rejected rezoning of this exact piece of property stating that Truslow conditions were too curvy and too narrow. And 35% of the over 4,000 trips per day that this school will add means that 1,500 trips per day are going to be added to Truslow Road right at that location. On page 9 of the proposal that was posted online, it stated that that connection road will provide an alternative means to bypass Warrenton Road. But then there was also a contradictory comment that people won't be using it. But it was, it was in the presentation on page 9 stating that that was a positive; that it would relieve the congestion on Warrenton Road. There's a VDOT roads crash map online that shows where the accidents occur on that road. And the highest number of accidents in that area occur between the two entrances of the school. So with all those things taken into consideration and all the other comments that you're hearing today, I urge you to consider this as probably not the best or possibly not the best location for this high school. It needs a lot more consideration should... before it be included in the Comp Plan. Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Hunley: Alright, good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm David Hunley. I'm smack in the middle of these two intersections. I'm the one that has the, the cars that that wreck on Truslow Road. They fall in my neighborhood. They fall in my driveway most of the times because I'm right in that smack in the middle. So obviously, you've heard a lot of the concerns about the traffic, the blind spots. I see it every day. I really do. And I, you know, pray for those young kids driving because they're hauling ass. I mean, they're 60 miles an hour, and they're crossing the lanes. They're not, they're dipping in and out like it's fast and furious. It's pretty crazy. But another concern that I have is that most of the residents from Willows, we own about three and a half acres plus, which gives us an opportunity to do our own shooting range on our property. You got a baseball field across the street from our house. I can imagine

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

what it's going to sound like or the panic when you have someone that's going to start shooting because they're target practicing when a baseball game is going on across the street. That's... because we see it on social media today. You know, people are panicking. And this is something that isn't being considered or thought of about the, you know, the possibilities. Again, you know, there's a lot of concerns about the traffic. I see it every single day. And I welcome any of y'all to my, to my driveway, and y'all can watch it firsthand. There is a school down the road, as mentioned several times. My daughter just graduated last year from... two years ago from Colonial Forge. And I questioned that as well. Why is she going to Colonial Forge when there's a school down the road? But that's, that's a different conversation. But again, there is a lot of challenges with the roads, we see it with schools, there's going to be deliveries, there's going to be all types of heavy vehicles that are coming in and out. Even though there's an improvement that's planned on that road, it's still not going to fix the road, it's still not going to fix the traffic and the congestion that we see day in and day out. So I think a lot of the folks have already kind of mentioned the traffic so I'll kind of stop beating that dead horse. But I just wanted to reiterate the, the fact that a lot of us on Truslow Road that lives in the Willows utilize our land as, you know, target practice and whatnot. And what I'd hate to see is, you know, my house be on the news when I'm out there target practicing at the same time a baseball game is going on literally across the street from my house. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Bodolay: Madam Chair, members of the Commission. I'm John Bodolay. I'm here twice tonight, once as individual near the Gresik farm out there just west of the school. I'm also a business owner, 20 years in business and currently just off of Enon by the school maintenance facility. So I'm here with 27 years of experience on Enon and Truslow, the Warrenton connector as it's become. And I'd just like to bring a couple points to you shortly. I think we know this isn't about the school at all. It's really not about the school, and it's a shame that the Commission is having to look at two points in here. I have no doubt that a school is needed. I'm a proud father of four daughters, the youngest which is a graduating this year at Colonial Forge. But I'm here from a safety point of view on that road. And I think you can hear it anecdotally from me. Just got a page last night about six o'clock, Truslow Road shut down for an accident. I don't know if any of y'all saw that. Also, in the last month, two accidents, one on each side of the proposed site; one into the woods, one into the... by the Fritter Farm, into the fields there. It happens all the time. January 3rd, we all remember that. The problems weren't just out on 95. There are also from me getting my house over to my work because of the cut-through traffic and the commercial vehicles that came and ended up blocking the road, taking several wreckers to get them out. So I think we know what the problem is. And I wish you all could make two decisions today, because I think it's obvious what one of them is, is should there be a connector going through from 17 and allowing additional traffic from both the students and from other traffic that's, that's going to congregate there at times. And it's just unacceptable. It's unacceptable as it is now, the road was not built for its intended use as, as it is today. And to add that is unconscionable to just add additional traffic from a school and especially considering the type of traffic that you're going to have with the kids there, you know, young drivers. That's all I have tonight. Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Kopsack: Good evening. My name is John Kopsack. I live in the Willows, which is in the Hartwood District, and I work for the applicants, okay. I teach right now at high school number four, which is Colonial Forge. I don't know where the studies came from. I live approximately nine and a half miles from my door to the door of Forge. The other night, once again, 95, wrecks, whatever people doing whatever they do to get around, coming down Poplar, okay, I go through it every day, too. It took me

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

an hour to go nine and a half miles. Kellogg Mill is falling apart. I mean, we I think we need to look at the residual that's going to happen all around. And we do live in an area where people try to avoid either 95 or 17. And I really think also, as long as we're talking about traffic, I know this is not a traffic night, but we have to look at safety, okay. Some of the folks that have already spoken talk about maybe a couple inches. There are areas along Truslow where there's a good foot drop. And if a 16 or 17 year old goes off the road while he or she is texting, that car is going to flip. I've gone through losing a student from Forge on unfortunately, it was on Kellogg Mill. But you know, these kids are just learning how to drive. And I think we really need to look at a safety factor also. And that's, I just want you to do this. And by the way, I'm only going to be there for 32 more days and I'm finally getting out of high school. Thank you. [Laughter]

Ms. Barnes: Thank you very much, Mr. Kopsack. Okay, is there anybody else that would like to address the Commission for this public hearing? Okay, seeing none. Would the applicant like to come up and address any of the comments, public comments?

Mr. Hampshire: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think it would be appropriate in light of the comments for me to make a, make a couple statements and then asked Mr. Ruff if he would address the study in maybe more detail. I think that, that what has to be recognized is that when a traffic study is done, it is done by professionals and it's done according to certain standards. It's done in conjunction with the Virginia Department of Transportation that decides what needs to be studied, what assumption should be made in the study, and then it's done according to the study. And then there's a process for VDOT to review it. With that introduction, I'll turn it over to Mr. Ruff to allow him to talk a little bit about the counts, and the fact that maybe they were done during the pandemic and any other things he wants to mention.

Mr. Ruff: Sure, thank you. I think... I'm glad that the folks from the area came out tonight. What you may heard and what we found during the traffic study process is that Truslow Road does have many deficiencies, and we are well aware of that. However, this is a land development process to... well, tonight is a just a specific process. But overall this is the traffic studies performed with the... for the traffic, for the school and the traffic for the school. Specifically, how does that traffic access a VDOT or public road? So it's the goal of the traffic study is not to address the entire underlying existing issues of a corridor, be that Truslow Road or Route 17. The goal is to say, here are the existing conditions, here is what it will be if this school does not come in the next five years. And then if we add that traffic to it, what is the difference and how can we bring that road, the public roadway back to its background condition. So in that, in that instance, we understand there are a number of safety issues on Truslow Road. As we've mentioned at some of the public meetings, that may be the case for the Board of Supervisors or others, but in this case, the school is responsible for their entrances, and they have proposed to put in a roundabout on Truslow Road. One of them, someone mentioned sight distance issues. A roundabout is a recommended improvement to address safety and to lower traffic speeds in an area. You do not need as much sight distance for a roundabout for those reasons. So, at the entrance to Summer Breeze, we do believe that this... some of the safety issues along Truslow Road will be addressed by the installation of the roundabout. In addition, you know, a roundabout at school, some folks have said that that is a little bit odd, but we have had success over the years. Roundabouts are becoming a more popular intersection treatment. I have worked on and designed and seen constructed other roundabouts at others high schools and schools in Virginia, and would welcome others to see those and see how they do allow students to learn how to drive a roundabout and to drive a unique type of intersection. They do learn how to drive a little slower. Again, there are a number of issues related to safety along the entire corridor. And I don't want to say that, as the applicant, we cannot speak towards all of the other safety issues that are existing. But we are attempting to make improvements for the

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

traffic that we will generate to the entrances to public roadways. It's a lot of long winded words, but. That's all.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Ruff, just curious, I know that VDOT has been aware of the problems on Truslow Road for years. And they have done traffic studies, extensive ones, that were conducted prior to the pandemic. Did you incorporate those numbers into your study?

Mr. Ruff: So we looked at some of the older traffic studies to make sure that the traffic volumes we collected were similar to what was...

Mr. Bain: Consistent.

Mr. Ruff: ... or consistent. So we found those to be consistent within 10%. So I know that some folks 10% may be a number, but within the industry with VDOT, we're finding that traffic volumes in the fall of 2021 were roughly, the interstates and major routes we're almost back to normal traffic levels before COVID and most roadways were within 10 to 20% of their pre-COVID levels. That's with schools being open and yes, there are a number of businesses and different folks at home. But we believe that is kind of a new baseline. And that's been kind of attributed in other traffic studies with VDOT.

Mr. Bain: I was hoping that would be your answer. I live in southern Stafford County, and I frequently go over the river. There are two roundabouts over there, one on Fall Hill Avenue, one on Lafayette. Both of those roundabouts are very poorly designed, operate in a very poor manner. I was just on Lafayette today, pardon me, there was a tractor trailer in front of me. He came down that road, speed limit's 25 coming down the hill, he came down at 25, apparently was not aware of this circle, saw the curve to the left and then the curve to the right, and slammed on his brakes and skidded for about 40 feet in order to be able to make the turn. Looking at the diagram or drawing that was shown, the proposed roundabout here also has a curve coming in or from whichever direction you're coming on Truslow Road, that first has to be taken care of and then you turn the other way. To me that's a very dangerous design. I urge you if you're representing the engineer that's doing that design to get rid of that double curve right there because there are gonna be a lot of people that won't realize that that's what's happening. And they'll come in at speed and all of a sudden, they'll ignore, you know, traffic speed limit signs, and all of a sudden they're going to have to do that S curve and it's going to be very dangerous. The other thing about the roundabouts that I deal with almost several times a week, they're extremely small in diameter. If you look at roundabouts in urban areas elsewhere, the diameters are four and five times the size of those two roundabouts I just mentioned to you. That gives traffic an opportunity to get into the circle, and actually be making a circular move before they come to another input of vehicles. It allows for a much easier transition. So if you're designing that, please increase the diameter of that circle; it's ridiculous. The one on Lafayette and the one on Fall Hill, both of them I have seen trucks jump up on the curb because they could not make the turn. And that obviously is not a desirable effect. So, again, this probably isn't the forum for this, but I don't think we're going to have another chance at it anytime soon. And in response to the comments from the public tonight, I think that's a very significant issue that has to be contended with. Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I have a question. I'm a product of the original Stafford High School where there was one entrance in and one entrance out. Why could we not eliminate Truslow Road totally from the concept? Make it a one way in off of Stafford Parkway and Warrenton Road, and not interconnect into Truslow Road at all. Most of the people in here have said that there's a problem with Truslow Road. Well, I've

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

been here 75 years, I'll tell you it is a problem with Truslow Road. I served as the Fire Chief here for 15 years. So Truslow Road has always been an accident looking for place to happen. So my concern is why use Truslow Road at all.

Mr. Ruff: I may not be the best person to answer the question. Really, we were brought into the process with that understanding in place...

Mr. Shelton: Understand.

Mr. Ruff: ... to provide access. So in the event, the best answer that I can give, you know, hopefully look for someone over my shoulder to help here. But...

Ms. Barnes: Can I have a point of clarification here? Somebody said that we're not going to have a point, or we're not gonna have a chance to do this again. I actually think we are going to have a chance to do this again. So I just... I want to remind the Commission that, you know, this is the art of the possible at this point here, not necessarily the art of the good idea. If that makes any sense. Just to just to remind you of that.

Mr. Ruff: I just want to say, yes, ma'am, that you're correct.

Ms. Barnes: We will have another chance to do that.

Mr. Ruff: Right.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: I have two questions. With the traffic study, at least when you're looking at big major road projects, there's also that they look at the INRIX data and show you where possible sidewalks go, where bike trails go. I haven't seen any of that included in this traffic impact study. And I'm curious why. In four years on FAMPO, every single one of our traffic studies came with something like that as well. So is there a reason it wasn't included?

Mr. Ruff: So through the, again, this is a site development, and I don't want to get into the weeds of what, where we are but with a site development process, typically the traffic study. So in this case, we performed the traffic study in advance so that we could get help provide additional information at this point in time. Typically for a site development, the traffic study would occur after the site plan had already been started going through review, so that the site point... all of the points were agreed to and then we could then study what improvements were then... were needed there. To your point, traffic studies, larger traffic studies that do look at a larger area do include, so we do include sidewalk connections and shared use path connections throughout the entire property that is owned by the applicant. But however, again as a land development project, we do not have control over outside properties and whether pedestrians or bicyclists would use roadways that do not have those amenities today.

Ms. Sellers: You didn't incorporate that data to show where these kids would be coming from. But you could.

Mr. Ruff: Correct. And we understand that there are neighborhoods that would want to walk to this location. However, again, we are not providing a safe and adequate way to let them get there. We are

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

on the property that is owned by the applicant, we are proposing safe and adequate pedestrian bicycling locations. But we can't, I can't assume that someone will want to bike or walk on Truslow Road. So I'm not going to speak to whether... we're not going to recommend that. I believe we've spoken during the public comment period. There was discussion from the County that there was interest to build a shared use path or continue the shared use path that is on Truslow Road, all the way down to this site. So obviously, at that time, when that would be a funded project, I know it is a part of the Comprehensive Plan of the Transportation Plan, but not a funded portion.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. So then my next question is, somebody brought up no shoot zones; probably isn't you. But that did... yeah, that did spark something with me. Because with that school coming there, what does the State Code say about no shoot zones? That could potentially impact their use of their land to shoot on their property.

Mr. Ruff: Well, there are only so many things that the schools can control. And certainly they... the schools can't control the activities offsite and whether somebody is shooting towards the school.

Ms. Sellers: What is this... there is a code. I don't know if it's State Code or a County Ordinance.

Ms. Barnes: Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, Commissioner Sellers, the County Code does regulate shooting. And there are shooting prohibited areas. The shooting prohibited areas are modified by the Board of Supervisors after a public hearing. And there are certain criteria in the code that has to be met to be qualified for shooting prohibited area. So that would be have to be a future action by the Board of Supervisors to prohibit that. That's one aspect. But also State Code and local ordinance prohibit somebody from shooting within a certain distance from a property line. And that's already in the code and would already be regulated if there's a complaint to the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Bain: I will, I will add something there because I just spoke with the one of the County Sheriff's the other day about this. He told me that the code ordinance says that you cannot shoot within 100 yards of a residence. And you cannot shoot across your property line without permission from the adjoining property owner. So that's what our code says right now, my understanding based on that discussion. So yes, it could be a frightening thing if you're having a ball game and somebody's shooting on the other side of Truslow Road, but it might be within the ordinance specifications. I don't know.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I can't remember. I remember reviewing it. And there were criteria where people would say, Hey, I think it's within a highway, right? There's like, I'm going to find that ordinance. And I'm going to look at it. But I... there is... that is something for us to keep in mind when we're thinking of the character of the surrounding area. And you do hear them shooting out there. I can hear it from my house. And I'm sure anybody who lives in the area knows they shoot out there, they shoot a lot.

Ms. Barnes: Well, this this might not necessarily be unique to that. I mean, Mountain View is pretty rural, too. So I'm not sure. I mean, if we have a problem with that down at Mountain View, that's not something that I've heard of. So I'm not sure that this would be necessarily any different. Okay. Okay, last... Could be.

Ms. Sellers: That one property is right on top of this property. Yeah. Yeah, I don't... I don't know where they are.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: Those are good questions, yes. Okay. I think we've... I think we've covered everything. Any last questions for applicant or staff? Okay. Okay. Now, I will bring it back to the Commission. And, Mr. Shelton, this is in your district. What would you like to do? How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Shelton: I think staff has done a commendable job in relating to the fact that it does meet the Comprehensive Plan in a number of areas, but I think what's been brought up tonight is more of a concern about transportation. And I'm not sure that this Commission can do anything about that. My suggestion, and it's just a suggestion, my suggestion would be to go back and look at the traffic plan itself and eliminate Truslow Road totally. But that's just my opinion. So I think Mr. White is here and you representing the School Board, I think you really need to take a look at the transportation part. I've been in Stafford County all my life and Truslow Road is not a very safe road; never has been, and probably in the VDOT plan, it never will be. So eliminating that entrance T totally and making a dead end, as most of our other schools are also, would be my recommendation. So I don't agree that we can move on with it.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah. Are you making a motion?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to deny.

Mr. Martinez: Madam Chair? Parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to separate the compliance review from the school and the road? Would we be able to vote on both? Or does it have to be together?

Ms. Barnes: Ms. Lucian?

Ms. Lucian: Mr. Zuraf did mention this earlier. If you desire to separate it, you could because it's two different considerations. But he did also clarify that they're tied together. So it depends on the Commission's desires, but it's possible if you wanted to separate them.

Mr. Martinez: Could I... what would I say? May I amend the motion? Does that...?

Mr. Apicella: It hasn't been seconded. Oh. So you could have a substitute motion.

Mr. Martinez: Oh, okay. I'd like to offer a substitute motion then that we motion to approve the school as for the Comp Plan Compliance Review and motion to deny the road.

Mr. Apicella: Can we do those in two separate parts?

Mr. Martinez: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Instead of motion to approve one and deny another, I would suggest that you make a motion to approve one or disprove one, and then move on to the second item, motion to approve or disapprove.

Mr. Martinez: Okay. I'll make a motion to approve the Compliance Review for the school.

Mr. Shelton: I second that.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: Okay, hold on, we've got a, we've got a motion and a... we've got a motion and a substitute motion. So first, we're gonna we're gonna go on the substitute motion. You guys are gonna, you're gonna challenge my Robert's Rules knowledge here. So, and you seconded that one.

Mr. Shelton: Seconded the substitute.

Ms. Barnes: Second the substitute, okay. So any further comments?

Mr. Martinez: My only, my only comment is that I understand that the... a school is needed in an area that does not have a school that's located near a number of students. And I don't want to delay the process as much as, as much as we can. Because in my view, you know, education delayed is education denied. And when you've got schools that are overpopulated, you're not, you know, students aren't getting the proper education in my, in my opinion. So. And I know that, you know, residents are concerned about the school location. And I hope that the site plan might be adjusted. But for now, I think in terms of what we're discussing for the compliance review, that that it meets that standard right now. Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Mr. Shelton, do you have any more comments?

Mr. Shelton: No, ma'am.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so as I understand it, right now, we've split this up. And right now we've got a motion and a second to approve the Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review, specifically for the school site, but not...

Mr. Apicella: We're not, we're not taking up the road part. We're only taking up the school part.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, the school site at this point. Okay.

Ms. Sellers: I have a comment. Because I'm gonna be a no vote on this. I do not believe that this is where the school... I do not believe it's in compliance. I think it's right on the edge of the Urban Services Area. You're barely getting into that Urban Services Area. I think there's better property that we could look at. So it's going to be a no for me.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman? So I'm going to go back to my original point that I've tried to make a couple of times. What we're being asked to do tonight is not to look at the merits of whether or not this school, proposed school should go on this site. But whether or not putting a school on this site is, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan. That's the only thing we're being asked to do. A school may never be built on this site. Whatever action we take tonight doesn't necessarily mean that we're endorsing a school. It only says we're only making a decision that what's being proposed, potentially putting a school on this site, is consistent with the Comp Plan. I've reviewed the criteria that's been provided to us by staff. And I don't see that there's anything inconsistent based on that criteria by putting a school on this site. I have my own view about the road piece. I'll speak to that when that item comes up. But again, because it does meet the criteria, I believe it is consistent with the Comp Plan to potentially put a school on this site.

Ms. Sellers: I want to point of clarification. There is no criteria to determine a Compliance Review. But it's the character of the site, the character of the surrounding area, those... there were three things

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

that Mr. Harvey mentioned. But that's not to be criteria, or it's not criteria. It's not metrics. It's not measurable. This is 100% subjective. And we are endorsing then saying this is a good site for a high school. And if you don't believe that, then I challenge you now to go back and look at previous sites and something that's going to get said here will get replayed later on. And so if you vote in support of this, you are saying yes, I think a future High School should go here, which is fine. But let's make sure that we're all on the same page here and saying this is a political process, we've now been brought into this political process. And so if you think a high school shouldn't go here, then you need to vote no. Not say, well, it's in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, and then be mad in a few weeks when all of a sudden it's said in a Board meeting somewhere else, that the Planning Commission supported it. So again, I do not support this here. I do not believe it meets the character of this location. The people around it do not want it. So it's a no for me.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, any other comments on this portion of the Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review? Okay. Alright, if that would... cast your votes. Okay, and that motion passes 6 to 1 (*Ms. Sellers opposed*). Okay. Do we want to... who would like to make a motion for the second portion of that, including the traffic portion? Since you split it up, do you want to do that?

Mr. Martinez: Yeah, since I split it up, I'll go ahead and finish it. I'd like to make a motion to deny the road in regards to the Compliance Review.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Discussion. Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: Yes, ma'am. So we've heard a lot of discussion from the constituents near that area on Truslow Road. I drive there as well. We have a number of folks on the Commission that drive there. We have a Fire Chief, a former Fire Chief for 15 years that has stated that Truslow is a major, major issue. And when it comes to safety, I'll trust the first responder any day. So I do not think that we should have a connecting road from 17 to Truslow. I think there's just, there's just too many variables that, that we just don't know for... especially with that lot that's not even being built yet. And I would say that, even though that there were a number of positives that the staff provided, in terms of it being consistent with the Comp Plan, one of the things is that, you know, we want the... one of the goals is to create more efficient patterns of traffic flow and circulation. And that just I don't see that happening with creating this additional, this connecting road. And again, my biggest concern is safety. The neighbors that live on that road have reiterated again and again that it's just a place where accidents waiting to happen. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Mr. Shelton? Okay, I have some comments that I haven't gotten to speak yet so. I understand that, and I completely agree with. I like Mr. Shelton's idea of I don't think there should be any connector on Truslow. However, I don't think that's what we're voting on today. I do want to clarify that just because we think that this is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan, yes, putting a connector road in there, in and of itself, isolated in concept is within the Comprehensive Plan; it doesn't mean we think it's a good idea. And those are two very separate things from me. So I will not be supporting the motion. I will be voting... it's one of those double negatives, I will be voting no to the denial.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I agree with you. It's not an issue in front of us whether or not it's a good idea to put a road connector here or not. We're only again being asked to evaluate. And I disagree with Ms. Sellers. The criteria is laid out. I don't have page numbers on my copy of the staff report but starting on the page that talks to transportation plan provides goals and objectives. I don't disagree that

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

there are issues on Truslow Road, I do drive that road pretty frequently and will probably take that road home tonight. And I believe that there could be road improvements along Truslow Road. The only issue in front of us is whether or not this connector road is consistent with the Comp Plan or not. I appreciate everybody's concerns. I hope they're going to be evaluated downstream, based on the feedback that you've gotten from the Planning Commission and from members of the public to hopefully mitigate those concerns. When this comes back to the County for further review, which it will, again, we're still whatever we do tonight, we're not guaranteeing that it takes place. We're only again, deciding whether or not this particular piece of the proposal that's in front of us, how we separate it, is consistent with Comp Plan or not. I believe it is consistent with Comp Plan. Do I think it's a great idea? Probably not. And hopefully we'll have more information going forward to decide whether or not it is appropriate. But this is not the place to do that.

Ms. Barnes: Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: Madam Chairman, I, if you don't mind, I'd like to ask either Mr. Harvey or Ms. Lucian, what are the implications if we vote to deny compliance on the road? Where do things go from here for the School Board and the process of designing and building a high school?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Bain, the process would be if the application is denied, and the applicant wants to appeal that decision, it could be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. And/or if the Board of Supervisors disagreed with the Planning Commission's decision, it itself could take it up as for reconsideration. But assuming that there was a denial and that decision stayed, then there cannot be a public road access to the school; it would have to be a private road access.

Ms. Sellers: That means the County's public school division maintains it, correct?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, any other discussion on the motion to deny Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review for the public road connecting Truslow Road and Warrenton Road? Ms. Sellers, go ahead.

Ms. Sellers: I'm gonna agree with you, Chairman on that, that this is, this road is probably in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. So while I do not believe the high school is, I do believe this road connection is. I don't ever see it happening. I think it's conceptual at best, but I do believe it's in compliance so.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, surprises. Okay.

Mr. Bain: And there will be an opportunity at subsequent Planning Commission meetings, to talk further and encourage the applicant further to delete that Truslow Road connection or provide a better design of that whole roadway internet.

Ms. Sellers: Wouldn't they have to go to FAMPO if it's a public road? It would have to get approved. I mean, it would have to go through the whole state process to put any of that in, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, Commissioner Sellers, FAMPO's involved with funding of transportation projects that are being built as part of the long range transportation plan for the region, and typically involves federal funds. In this case, this would be all County funds. So it would not normally be a project that would go to FAMPO.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Sellers: Oh, so it would be 100% here locally, okay.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Oh, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Harvey, one question. You mentioned this would be a private road, but aren't our other high schools private roads also and maintained by the School Board, as far as snow removal and debris removal and maintenance of the roads?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Shelton, I know that some of the schools are publicly maintained. I have to defer to Mr. White on the details about the high schools.

Mr. White: I'm going to defer to Mr. Anderson for an answer.

Mr. Anderson: Hello, yes. I'm John Anderson, Executive Director for Facilities and Maintenance. And we do certainly have high schools off of public roads. But sometimes the driveway is a private drive that we maintain and we keep the snow removed and take care of those roads.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, any other questions? I just want to emphasize to the public and for the people that are here and for the people that may be watching at home, not to be discouraged. This is, this is not our last stab at this. This is just a very, very basic, you know, the 10,000-foot kind of view, is this where it could go? Could we put a road here? Would it be consistent with our Comprehensive Plan? Once again, not that it's a good idea, not that any of us like the idea, and not that any of us would necessarily approve any... a road if it comes back to us when, and I believe this is coming back to us I think for a CUP at some point in time. So we've got a lot, we've got a lot more work to do with this. We've got a lot more stabs at this. I don't want you to think that what's happening here tonight is all she wrote. Okay. So with that we have a, if I can remember correctly now, we have a motion to deny the public connector Truslow Road to Warrenton Road denial, and a denial means that you believe it is against or not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. So if you agree with the denial, you would vote yes. This is one of those double negatives. If you don't agree with the denial, then you would vote no. Everybody clear on that? Okay, cast your votes. Okay, and that motion passes 5 to 2 [2-5 Mr. Apicella, Mr. Bain, Ms. Barnes, Ms. Sellers, Mr. Cummings opposed].

Mr. Apicella: No, the motion failed.

Ms. Barnes: I'm sorry, the motion fails 5 to 2.

Mr. Apicella: So, I believe you would, you need to take another vote and, with that, Madam Chairman, I'm going to...

Ms. Barnes: Would you like to make a motion?

Mr. Apicella: ... I'm going to vote to recommend... I'm going to vote to approve the Comp Plan Compliance Review for the connector road between Truslow and Warrenton Road.

Ms. Barnes: A second?

Mr. Bain: That wasn't the motion. He said he was going to vote to rather than move to.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I'll declare.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: I assumed.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman...

Mr. Bain: But the record has to show it.

Mr. Apicella: ... I make a motion to approve the Comp Plan Compliance Review for the road portion of the applicant's request that would connect Truslow Road to Warrenton Road.

Mr. Bain: I'll second.

Ms. Barnes: Any further discussion? Okay, please... okay, Mr. Shelton? Go ahead.

Mr. Shelton: Again, let me ask the school system to review the roads things.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, cast your votes please. Okay, and that motion passes 6 to 1 (*Mr. Martinez opposed*). Okay. And with that...

2. WAI21154259; Departure from Design Standards – Cranes Corner Industrial Park, Perchwood Auto Sales - A request for a departure from the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Screening, and Buffering Manual (DCSL) on Tax Map Parcel No. 38-25H (Property), zoned B-2, Urban Commercial, related to a 1,200 square-foot office building. If granted, the departure would permit relief from DSCL Secs. 110.2, "Street Buffers adjacent to Arterial or Collector streets," 120.1, "Parking Lot, Interior," and 120.4 "Street Trees." The Property consists of approximately 0.86 acres, located at the intersection of Perchwood Drive and Richmond Highway (U.S. Route 1), within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: June 26, 2022)**

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, the next item is another public hearing for the Departure from Design Standards.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, we also have, we had Mr. Counsell that was here to speak. Maybe he wants to come and speak at a different meeting? Just keep going? Okay, we're good, okay.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, I'd recommend that Mr. Counsell give his presentation after this next public hearing.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, that sounds great. Thank you. Okay, so onto the next agenda item and for that we recognize Ms. LeAnn Ennis.

Ms. Ennis: Madam Chairman and members of the Commission, item number 2 is for a waiver for Cranes Corner Industrial Park and the Perchwood Auto Sales. It's a departure for design standards. The request is for a departure of designs and construction standards for the landscaping, screening, and buffering of the DCSL manual, Section 110.2, Street buffers adjacent to arterial streets; Section 120.4, Street trees to allow plantings within utility easements along Richmond Highway and Perchwood Drive; and then Section 120.1, Parking lots interior to deviate from the planning requirements within parking islands. It's located on Assessor's Parcel 38-24H. It's 0.86, approximately 0.86 acres. It's located within the Falmouth Election District. And Mr. Robert Varma is the applicant. This is the location of the site where the star is. There is a... the same owner owns 25U, which is where the Liberty gas station is.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

There's also a... you can see in the front is a used car lot. And then this is... they're proposing we have a site plan that is currently under review for a detailing shop and I can't remember what the other little thing is. There's like three little shops, little areas in there that he's proposing on the site plan. The applicant is here so he can correct me. The parcel was granted a conditional use permit in June of 2021 by the Planning Commission for auto sales. The landscaping ordinance, as part of the site plan, the applicant is required to provide the landscape street buffer along the frontage of the property, in accordance with Section 28-82 of the Zoning Ordinance, which this requires that the buffers be provided, in accordance with Section 100 of the DCSL. Section 110.22 of the DCSL for Street buffers adjacent to the arterial or collector road, which requires a 15-foot wide street buffer with 50 plant units per 100 feet for all non-commercial residential developments, which must be exclusive of all parallel easements. Section 120.4, Street trees, requires 10-foot wide area with a minimum of 21 plant units every 100 feet. Section 120.1, Interior parking lot islands are required to be a minimum of 150 square feet and 12 plant units including one tree per island. If the applicant is unable to meet the identified requirements, a departure and design standards is required in accordance with Section 143.0 of the DCSL. The next slide you will see is the site layout of the site. There's on Route 1, which is this is Route 1. And we have storm drainage easements, sanitary sewer easement, and a water line easement that's there. This is Perchwood here and the ability to meet the specific street buffer, so they were required to have a street buffer here and a street buffer here. I'm gonna erase that. Nope. Pardon? Oh! Fancy! Look at how pretty. Anyway so there's a buffer... so this is, this is the water line easement, this is a storm drainage easement, and these are sanitary sewer easements up in here. So the problem with the applicant proposes they weren't able, they can only go parallel into the easement, they can't go this way into the easement. So, and that is the problem. Again, they can only go parallel into the easement. They can't run with the easement.

Mr. Bain: I'm sorry, you mean perpendicular.

Ms. Ennis: Yeah, that's what I meant.

Mr. Bain: Ah, okay.

Ms. Ennis: What'd I say?

Mr. Bain/Ms. Barnes: Parallel.

Ms. Ennis: Kinda, okay. The ability to meet the specific street buffer is impacted by a parallel... perpendicular water line easement along the site frontage as shown in blue. And then there's a buffer location unable to be located to avoid the easement due to existing easements for the water sanitary and storm sewer. Because they all abut... they all abut each other. So there's, so this is this is like 25 feet to here and then this is another 10 feet. So this is like 35 feet. The applicant proposes to meet the total, we worked with the applicant for almost nine months on this, trying to get the landscaping, you know, to work. They meet all the plant, all the plant requirements within the buffers, they meet the numbers that they're required to have, they just couldn't put in the kind that we typically have. Utilities, I provided a letter, the utilities only allows grasses in their easements, they allow no shrubs, no anything with roots, except for grasses. And if they have to go in there, they're not going to plant them back. So they did put all the plant units that I was required to have there in to this, these are all grasses. And this is a mix of understory trees, like dogwood and stuff like that. And then these are the islands, this was the island that we couldn't meet the requirements for because of the sanitary sewer easement.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Bain: So the islands that I'm seeing here that have circles in them will have street trees or understory trees?

Ms. Ennis: They meet the requirements, all of them meet the requirement except for this one.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Ennis: All their islands meet. This was the only one they couldn't meet. And they, they're only short by one point.

Mr. Bain: That's, yeah, that's not significant. I just...

Ms. Ennis: They did try.

Mr. Bain: ... I just think every opportunity they should have to plant a tree, they should take it since they can't plant them along the utility easements.

Ms. Ennis: Yeah. They've clustered, if you can see, they've clustered. So this is the store, this is the easement here. So they have clustered, Amy and I worked with them to try to get so they put all their plantings. This is... they widened their buffer, then more long, you know, to get into all the plantings that they needed. So they meet the requirement for the number of plantings, it's just not spread out. So it's not every 100 feet, that's the biggest thing. Staff recognizes the hardship created due to the location of all the existing proposed easements and the constraints to the size of the parcel. Staff believes the applicant's request meets the requirements for the departure and recommends approval of PCR22-01. And again, this is the site plan that I have. So that's why I put it in color so you can see the difference of the easements. But this is what the site plan is proposing. So the building is shown there and everything. This is what I reviewed.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Questions for staff?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'm just going to try to summarize what I think the departure request involves. So the County has landscaping, screening, and buffer requirements, where the applicant would be required to plant trees. Much of those areas happen to be over County utility easements. One of the graphs that you showed, seemed to me that almost 50%+ of the parcel as some kind of easement associated with it. The County won't allow trees or certain types of trees to be planted over utility easements because roots would damage the lines, the water and sewer lines. The applicant is requesting, I'm not sure if it's a waiver or departure or both, to plant mostly grasses, some smaller trees, as alternative landscaping, which the County utilities would be okay with. And the number of units the applicant has proposed overall would be in excess of those required to be put on the site.

Ms. Ennis: Yes. They are putting in more than what they're required on the landscaping.

Mr. Apicella: So is that a fairly accurate summary of what's going on here?

Ms. Ennis: That's almost on point. And it's a departure.

Mr. Apicella: A departure. Thanks.

Ms. Sellers: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Ennis: Yeah, it's... no, it's three, two varieties of grasses. So we're gonna have small and tall. So to give it a more illusional cluster.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, so it's not just like blue, Kentucky Bluegrass, it's like, the decorative.

Ms. Ennis: No. And it's not liriopse. It's... I can't remember the exact grasses...

Several people talking about the type of grass... inaudible, microphones not on.

Ms. Ennis: Does it not phonetically spell ly rope. I've called it that for 30 years.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you very much Ms. Ennis. Alright, would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. Varma: Good evening, Madam Chairman and everybody else. I'm pleased that you're allowing me to come in and present to you the hardship that we had and how we came across with LeAnn's help. And she did a great job in doing that. I do have my landscaping engineering...

Ms. Barnes: Can you introduce yourself and tell us who you are please?

Mr. Varma: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is Robert Varma. And I own the property at 1270 Jefferson Davis Highway.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Varma: If you have any questions, I am more than happy to answer, but I do have my landscaping engineer here to answer your questions, if you have any.

Ms. Barnes: Any questions for the applicant?

Mr. Bain: No, I think you've done an amazing job...

Mr. Varma: Thank you.

Mr. Bain: ... for this facility on this site, and to meet the landscaping requirements of a landscape engineer.

Unknown speaker from the audience: Architect.

Mr. Varma: I'm sorry, architect.

Mr. Bain: I was gonna say I'm surprised you didn't start...

Mr. Varma: See, I'm the engineer; I keep thinking engineers.

Mr. Bain: I know the difference and that's why I was wondering why he didn't jump up and say, I'm not an engineer! Alright.

Mr. Varma: Well, thank you very much.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: Anything else for the applicant? Okay, so now we'll open up the public hearing for this. This is an opportunity, and I'll do this very quickly because clearly, this is an opportunity for the public to comment on this public hearing item. Before you start your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's 1 minute left. Red means your time is up. If you would like to speak... blah... if you would like to speak please come forward. And seeing none, I will close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Apicella, this is in your district. What would you like to do?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to approve WAI21154259, Departure from Design Standards Cranes Corner Industrial Park, Perchwood Auto.

Mr. Martinez: I'll second.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, we have a motion by Mr. Apicella and a second by Mr. Martinez. Any further discussion?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I'm recommending approval of the applicant's departure request because it's ultimately in the public's interests. Clearly, Stafford County won't allow the applicant to plant trees over its utility easements, because it would damage those easements or what's below those easements, but will allow grasses as a reasonable alternative to meet its landscaping requirements. And I think in this case, the alternative plantings would be a win-win solution and forcing the applicant to do something that doesn't make sense is not in the public interest. So for those reasons, Madam Chairman, that's why I'm recommending approval.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you. Mr. Martinez, any further comments?

Mr. Martinez: No, ma'am.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, with that, please cast your votes. And the field of green. That passes unanimously, 7 to 0. Thank you very much and congratulations. And thank you for all your hard work.

Ms. Ennis: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you, Ms. Ennis. Okay, moving on to Unfinished Business, we have none. Mr. Harvey, when would you like to have our guest speaker come up?

County Transportation Construction Project Quarterly Update by Bryon Counsell, Director, Capital Projects

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Madam Chairman, we would prefer if the Commission would allow us to have Mr. Counsell come up and give your update on construction projects that are going on in the County. Again, I apologize; due to traffic situations he was a little late arriving, so.

Ms. Barnes: A situation we are all painfully aware of. Thank you. Alright, Mr. Counsell, welcome. Thank you.

Mr. Counsell: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, yes, thank you very much. A humble apology for causing your agenda to go stray tonight. I appreciate the opportunity to still come in and provide you with this information that I think for the most part you guys find useful in some of the other

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

decisions you guys have to make. But again, I apologize sincerely for throwing a wrench in the agenda tonight.

Ms. Barnes: Can you introduce yourself and tell us who you are?

Mr. Counsell: Yes, Brian Counsell, Director of Capital Projects for Stafford County. Presented to you tonight is a snippet of everything we have going on. It's the major projects. We could be here all night with all the smaller things that we do, but this was... these projects are selected for you guys to hear the status so you can hopefully use that information to support decisions that you, that you make for other projects. So moving on, this is for the third quarter of FY22 which was for January through March. This Lynnhaven Lane sight distance project is a, due to a lot of the development on the some of the unwidened parts of Courthouse Road, Lynhaven Lane was having trouble, the people that live there was having trouble... they were having trouble getting out onto Courthouse Road without causing significant slowdowns. So proffer money is being used from I think it's Shelton Woods, Jeff; proffer money is being used to create a better safer situation there at Lynhaven Lane at Courthouse Road. This is the wall's under construction there. You may have seen the wall being constructed there and we're having some issues with the contractor but they are going back to work tomorrow to start finishing that wall. We had some disputes and that is over and they are getting back to work. Flatford Road sidewalk project – this is going to connect Parkway Boulevard and Winding Creek Road. This is getting ready to go to construction. We had an acceptable bid, getting ready to start. Berea Church Road safety improvements – the right-of-way acquisition phase just completed. So now they're in utility relocation. So in about, oh, about six months or so after the utilities have been relocated, they will start. We will add it for... advertise it for construction. We anticipate everything to be finished in late 2024. Right outside the doors here, U.S. 1 Route 630. This project has been just a nightmare to complete the design and right-of-way acquisition. It's getting ready to go into utility relocation. We, similarly to Berea Church Road, we will hopefully finish this project with construction in 2024, late 2024, as we hope to advertise in early 2023. Further up north... further up Route 1 in North Stafford, we call this the U.S. 1/Telegraph/Woodstock Lane improvements. It's two kind of separate projects linked into one; one at the Woodstock Lane and one at U.S. Telegraph. We are almost finished with the right-of-way acquisition here. We've got a couple more properties we need to acquire. But we do believe this is gonna be finished a little earlier than the other two. And we hope to advertise this probably in the next four to five months, within the calendar year 2022. Another sidewalk project, Staffordboro Sidewalk Project, we are starting engineering on that. We hope to be finished by the end of 2024. This is going to connect, you can see in the diagram, the park... the VDOT Park and Ride lot there, with some of the communities to the north. Brooke Road reconstruction – this is one of the, one of the hotter topics that we have in the Transportation Department, how to deal with that. So we just started, we just accepted a proposal from the engineer to get this started. The plan is, is to move it to the north, move the alignment to the north, as well as elevate it between five and 10 feet. This project will probably go through about a year of design and planning, and then through some probably right-of-way acquisition and then go to construction. But we anticipate it to be finished by the fall of 2027. We certainly believe we can do better than that. But the way things are going here lately, and I'll talk a little bit about that, way things are going we don't know how what the exact schedule for this is going to go. We're seeking other types of federal and state funding to assist us with this project. And they come with certain types of strings and requirements. So we're leaving the schedule kind of open, and we're going to navigate it the best we can and as quickly as we can.

Ms. Barnes: Can I ask a quick question about that? What's going on with that emergency access that goes through those two cul-de-sacs? Is that still happening?

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Mr. Counsell: That, as of right now, the design is complete, and we're getting ready to enter the right-of-way acquisition phase. We are meeting with the Board on May the 3rd and the Infrastructure Committee, and then again on the 3rd and the 17th, where they will give us direction on what we need to do with that particular project. We call that the emergency access road.

Ms. Barnes: If you have plans to actually fix Brooke Road, do they still need to do that emergency access?

Mr. Counsell: We're going to seek direction from the Board on how they want us, what they want us to do. We're going to make a presentation at the Infrastructure Committee on the 3rd, present all this data to them, and hope they give us direction on which ones they want us to do, which one they want us to focus on, and if they want us to discontinue the emergency access road.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Counsell: If you have not been out there in the last few days, VDOT just recently completed some significant road raising in that area for about 1,000 to 1,500 feet, as well as putting in and replacing a culvert and putting in a dry well on the creek side. Our transportation staff, as well as VDOT staff, thinks that will eliminate almost all of the flooding. When Accokeek Creek leaves its banks, there's nowhere for the water out there to go. So only in those situations we think will there be flooding out there. So the work that VDOT just did should substantially improve, but not completely eliminate the need to close that road. So the project as of right now is still moving forward. We just discussed the emergency access road. So moving into some water and sewer aspects. There's a large force main that goes through the south part of the County along the Rappahannock River. This is the second phase to make that a parallel line. We're getting ready to advertise that probably sometime the end of May. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. We just ad... we did just advertise that and the bids came in about \$4 million more than our budget. So we are, you'll see that as a theme, you'll see it in the transportation projects as our estimates are going up. You'll also see it as a theme coming through the utilities projects for the rest of the report. And then I want to culminate my report today to give you a kind of an update on where we are in construction costs, the construction market, and the challenges that are being presented to all the localities in the state and the federal government with the current market. But this project, it's probably going to be delayed based on the cost while we determine what the funding ability is for this one and all the other projects that are starting to go to construction as well. Falls Run force main is running from Falmouth Bottom along River Road in front of Chatham. And that eventually goes all the way to the Cool Springs Road area and joins with the previous project, what we call Claiborne Run 1B. This one is going through the very windy adventures of federal review as far as the National Park Service goes, as it as it goes across property that Chatham federal government owns, the Chatham Estate. So we're hoping to get that navigated through by the end of the year. It's a very, very arduous process. The gravity interceptor, Falls Run gravity interceptor runs from 95 westward out to almost Berea Church Road. This is another project that is starting to... the construction estimates are really starting to escalate really high. This is another one that's probably going to fall victim to a slight one or two year delay while we recoup some of our funding options. This, this particular project is only necessary if Westlake and some of the other undeveloped land starts developing fairly rapidly. The schools, that was discussed earlier tonight, doesn't really impact this the existing line out there. So this improvement project here is more for build-out conditions, and isn't absolutely necessary until there's a more significant development out on Route 17. We have a large planned project for Little Falls Run Wastewater Treatment Plant. Like some of the other ones, this was estimated originally at \$21 million, then it went to 29, then to 35. Now it's at 42. Spotsylvania recently opened a couple of projects where they went 100% over their budget. We're anticipating this one's probably going to come in at about 60. So again, this one's going to be probably

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

delayed or dramatically descope at least temporarily or phased, phased so we can do a better plan on how to get the entire project done with the funding available. To support the Centreport area and all of the action that is being proposed up there, these 342 Pressure Zone Upgrade projects deliver water from Lake Mooney. We used to call it the New Lake Mooney but it's not that new anymore, it's been in service for almost 10 years now. This is the low service line to get water from the southern part of the County up to Centreport and eventually up to the northern part of the County. These projects are going to move forward no matter what I believe. This project is almost complete in design and almost complete with right-of-way acquisition. Hopefully go to advertisement later on this summer. 342-15... I'm sorry, I'm going to backup. This project goes from current Old Forge area up to the where the Enon tank, what we call the Enon tank is now on Enon Road, right across from Hull's Memorial Baptist or Hull's Memorial Church. Then 342-15 takes it from that same site and takes it up to the Centreport area. That is just starting; we've not even finalized an alignment for that yet. So we're working on that. It's what's called preliminary engineering. Hopefully that will start construction in probably the late '23 timeframe. Then there's the tank. There's a 2 million gallon elevated water storage tank proposed right now, and it's getting ready to start construction at the same site where the concrete tank is on Enon Road. That will be... you'll start to see action out there probably in the next a month or so as they start doing some grading activity out there. And there's a nice model of the elevation and what that site is going to look like in the bottom right corner of the slide. This wasn't supposed to be on there because I don't, I don't think this is pertinent to what you guys are interested in. But there is some planned renovations to the courthouse and the what's called the Chichester Annex Building that's out there. This has two phases. The first one is to improve the annex, to move a courtroom and some storage into there. And then once the court, the courts start occupying that building, we've got phase two that goes inside the courthouse and renovates a couple of courtrooms in there. And that is it, but I wanted to just kind of give you an update before any questions on construction costs. So I've been doing this for 35, 36 years now. And in that entire time, we can't recall any cost of inflation or escalation of construction costs being quite what it is right now. And it is affecting everything that my department does, and probably everything that you guys have experienced doing in your careers as well as here at the county. But so the things you see tonight on the report may change in the near future, they may get delayed, they may get descope. So the next time I come, I think it'll be the next quarter, Jeff, you may see some different things for cost and descopes and schedules.

Ms. Barnes: Is that what happened to the Flatford Road sidewalk?

Mr. Counsell: Well, Flatford is still going forward.

Ms. Barnes: Oh, still going forward?

Mr. Counsell: Still going forward. If you watched Ms. Light's presentation to the Board on those, that that was a mistake in there that the Flatford Road project was eliminated. It did indeed fall off the CIP because all the funding was already dropped, and everything is in prior year. So that's why it technically left. So there was just a mistake on the slide, but it is moving forward.

Ms. Barnes: That's good news. Thank you

Mr. Counsell: It is moving forward. With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Bain: I think it was last year, there was a trillion dollar infrastructure bill passed at the federal level. Are you anticipating getting a trickle of any of that money here that could help these projects? And a related question – yes, we have inflation, but like you've implied, the costs, bid costs on these projects

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

is much greater than what we've been seeing for inflation. Are the contractors anticipating the funding from the federal government to pour in and thereby allow them to walk away with a real bonus? And so they're upping their prices now in anticipation of those funds coming available.

Mr. Counsell: Well, the first part is, is staff, to the best of our ability with the time that we have, are seeking alternative funding in every nook and cranny that's available. There has been some success for finding programs but not a lot of success in finding qualification to participate. We are finding some smaller amounts that are available still coming from some of the ARPA and Cares Act from the state that are we're hoping can augment some of our budgets. Going to your second part of your question. I don't think the contractors are anticipating that type of action with money coming out, it may end up happening. Right now what we're seeing with contractors is the labor force is very tricky right now. There's a lot of demand for the services that contractors provide. They're having trouble keeping consistent employment with a lot of their positions. Also, there's a lot of, with material supply, there's a lot of unknown on availability. So about 30%, I would say, of every bid that we're seeing right now we believe is risk. The contractor is buying the risk to try to make sure that they have adequate staffing and adequate cash flow for materials and adequate time to get the materials. And that's causing, that's where the numbers are going is because of a buying all that risk. Every locality is seeing it. I don't know what if anything is immune to this right now, especially in the field of construction and engineering.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, any other questions? Okay. Thank you for waiting around and being flexible.

Mr. Counsell: No, thank you.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

3. Notification Process

Ms. Barnes: Okay, on to New Business, which it looks like we don't have any and we'll get to Planning Director's Report.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Madam Chairman. As you can see from the agenda, I've got a number of items to go over tonight. One is a carryover from our last meeting. Our last meeting, staff had mentioned that we were in the process of updating our public notification signs to better inform the public as to what the public hearing items are. And Ms. Stinnette has on the screen, if we can have the computer please, an example of what we're attempting to do. The yellow sign on the left is our tried and true Public Hearing Notification sign which tells someone driving by or walking by that there's a public hearing and what date it's at. And it gives our office phone number and a website which you can look up information. The sign on the right is something new we've implemented which has a QR code. And that QR code will actually direct them to the public hearing advertisement itself, and links to other additional information. So hopefully, it'll be more informative to the public so they have a better idea what the public hearing is about and plus, staff believes is probably a safer situation where somebody that's in

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

traffic can use their phone real quick to take a picture of it, and then get the quick link. Take a picture of the QR code that is and get the quick link to the information. And/or if they're walking by use their phone, and don't have to physically type in a number or look up a website. So that's one of the innovations we've been working on. And then at the last meeting, the Commission asked staff to take a look at what some other localities are doing as far as Public Hearing Notification with regards to actual written notice provided to people of Planning Commission and Board public hearings specifically for land use cases. And staff reviewed rezoning applications and zoning ordinances for 11 different jurisdictions; 10 counties and the City of Fredericksburg. And in looking at that information, Prince William County is the only jurisdiction that is more restrictive than state code. State Code requires that the adjoining property owners and the owners across the street from the property that's subject to a zoning change must receive a written notice from... about the public hearing. Prince William County has a standard where they've expanded that to say any property within 500 feet at the boundary of that rezoning area must get notification; plus if it's a situation where they're exceeding the height of a structure in the ordinance, then that distance goes out a quarter of a mile. I will note that in looking at these other jurisdictions, mostly they put the onus on the applicant to send out the notice. In Stafford, we have the County provide the notice, the sign, as well as the letters going out. And there's some history behind that. So if the Commission's inclined to revisit this some more and wants to consider maybe having a more rigorous standard for Stafford, I'd recommend that we form a subcommittee to have some more discussions because there's some pros and cons to various different aspects of it that we would need to discuss.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I agree. And I think that we don't need to make the... *inaudible*... up here on the dais tonight. We can form a quick subcommittee; probably get it done in a meeting or two. At least I'm hoping. Might be a little optimistic on that, but. I did ask some, and I'm not sure we haven't done this on my tenure up here, as far as a subcommittee goes, I have asked some people to form it. Do I announce that tonight? Or how do I do that?

Ms. Lucian: You have the authority to appoint them. So you can go ahead and do that now.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So I have asked Mr. Shelton, Mr. Bain, and myself to form a subcommittee to take a look at this and hopefully clarify and make this a little beefier for us. And we will get together and decide when to meet with staff.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, not directly related to the subcommittee, but at the last meeting, we brought this up. I think Mr. Harvey mentioned that the amount that we're collecting for public notices is not consistent with the current costs. How is that being dealt with?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Apicella, that's part of our fee schedule and the fee schedule is adopted by Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors. Our fee schedule was last updated in 2010. So it's based on postal rates from 2010 compared to today's postal rates...

Ms. Barnes: Oh, boy.

Mr. Harvey: ... under the state's code...

Mr. Apicella: So 10 cents versus 50 cents?

Mr. Harvey: Under state code it depends on the number of properties involved. Some will get certified notice, others can be done by first class mail. So it is costly.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 27, 2022

Ms. Barnes: So, do we have some latitude on what we spend for that? Do we have some latitude, then whether we do certified or first class?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Madam Chairman, depending upon the number of properties that are receiving notice. If I remember right, if it's more than 25 properties, we have the option to go to first class mail rather than certified.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. So again, my question is, how do we get that fee structure revisited by the Board of Supervisors?

Ms. Barnes: That might be another subcommittee?

Mr. Apicella: Well, I don't think that's... I don't even think that's something that's ours, because the Board sends out notices, too.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm just wondering, when, when can, when is it gonna get in front of them to...?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Apicella, the fee update is not an area purview for the Planning Commission. It's strictly with the Board. Staff has engaged a consultant to help us with development review processes for commercial development. And as part of that, they're going to be making recommendations for fee schedule changes. And this will likely be one of those things that become part of that process. But then also, going back to, in talking with the subcommittee, if it's desire to no longer have the County provide the notice and have the applicant provide a notice, then there would be no reason to collect that fee. So there, we'd have to work through the recommendations to figure out what's the most direct approach.

Mr. Bain: Would having the applicant provide that notice require an ordinance change? Or is that just an administrative decision at this point?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, this is not specified in the ordinance who in our Stafford code who sends out the notice. But it's been the Board's direction to staff a number of years ago that the staff would be providing the notice, because of a situation the Board ran into at a public hearing for a rezoning where the Board wanted to hold the public hearing and the applicant didn't. So the applicant failed to provide notice. And the Board was not happy with that. So the Board said, staff, you'll do it because we want to be in control of the process, not the applicant.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

4. Project Pipeline Report

Mr. Harvey: So that's my first item. The second item, Madam Chairman, was, you requested staff to provide a pipeline of potential projects and meeting dates when they can potentially occur. So staff will be providing that on a regular basis attached to your agendas going forward. And that's... keep in mind that's a potential public hearing dates for a number of these items. So we're right now looking at potentially three months out. We can't go much further than that, because of just the uncertainty of it. It's kind of like a weather forecast; you pretty much know when the next day or the next meeting, what's

*Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022*

going to be on the agenda. But beyond that, there's a lot of variables that can affect whether something's eligible for public hearing or not. Then the third item I have is...

Mr. Bain: Excuse me, just one second.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Bain: I had raised the question about whether or not any of the background information on these projects could be accessed prior to the Friday before Planning Commission meeting. Is it already on the website or on the County server that we, like we access now, when we get our Friday notification? Is there a way to get at least to look like at the GDP plan or some of the other pertinent information?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Bain, that's something we have to work on in more detail. In the case of say a rezoning or conditional use permit, the District Planning Commissioner and District Supervisor get notice when the application is filed with us. And we also provide a copy of the concept plan. But there's a time lag between when the application is filed with us, and we actually get it the public hearing. So typically, there's not really any good means to display that until the application is in its final form and we're publishing the staff report. So again, that's something that we'll continue to work towards and hopefully get more information out there to the Commission and the public in advance of the final staff report being issued.

Ms. Sellers: I have a question.

Ms. Barnes: Go ahead.

Ms. Sellers: When you guys, and I don't... I haven't looked at a Board of Supervisors agenda in a while but, you used to provide a list of like permits that had been drawn by district. Do you remember doing that in a staff report? It was always in the beginning, in the staff report to go to the Supervisors that said, this is what's basically been going on over the last month, and it shows growth, what permits have been given. And I'm not describing it very well, but I'll go find one. And it was like a chart to kind of... and it gave the Supervisor a good idea of where growth was taking place. Do you guys not do that? Or do you track the permits that come in every month?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Sellers, I do recall those reports; they were a monthly report that was provided by the County Administrator. They kind of gave a view of what was happening in all the Election Districts. That's changed somewhat, whereas now they're getting a strategic plan report. So it's not all the same information. As far as tracking development projects, we're in the process now of doing another update to our active residential development map and database, which should be hopefully on... updated on the web next week. We do that twice a year. And then you can access it through the Planning and Zoning webpage. As far as other tracking, we do a variety of different things, but they're more on an ad hoc basis rather than a regular basis.

Ms. Sellers: So are there any things that you guys track on a regular basis that might be helpful to us to kind of give us an understanding, not just what's going to be on our agenda, but kind of what's going on in the County? You don't have to answer that now. But more of like on a, what do you guys keep track of that you find interesting that might help us as we look at some of these things.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Sellers, we do on the Planning and Zoning webpage, have two different databases, which you might find interesting. One is a listing of all the new submissions that we've

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

received. And there's a quick link to the GIS map that shows you where they're located. And we have a similar database, too, for projects that have been recently approved. The difference being is that oftentimes, as you know, items take a while to get through the public hearing process. So it could be several months from the time something is submitted to when it's actually approved. So that's why we have the two different databases to help people understand what's actually being considered.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. Yeah, that would... I'll look at the website, because I think that would be helpful, especially for those of us in really fast growing areas like Truslow Road, and sounds like... sorry...

Ms. Barnes: Bookmark them on your computer. I have those... I have those two sites bookmarked on my computer and can pull those up at any time.

Mr. Harvey: And I can send the Commission links to all those reports and maps.

Ms. Sellers: And the last one, it would be helpful to see when the Board has their Infrastructure Committee and their, I think, I don't know the name of their committees anymore. But economic development and all those committees, you know, they sometimes get these packets and start discussing them. Sometimes months in advance if they're big projects where they will know what's coming up. Is it... is there a way we can have those added to the Planning Commission's whatever they met like last week, they met whatever committee they met last week to look at, could we have that same committee agenda added to our agenda, just as kind of like to know? I know, it's being lazy on my part, I'm sorry.

5. Lots for Stormwater Management – *BOS Referral*

Mr. Harvey: We could provide links in the agenda to those Board meeting items. For instance, tonight, we have a link to the next item I was going to mention about the lots for stormwater management. And that's pretty, pretty easy to do. So it's a quick access for you. So we'll work on that and see what we can do with regards to the Board committees. Some of it may be trying to interpret whether it'd be of interest to the Commission or not for some of those items. But, Madam Chairman, for my next item was dealing with lots for stormwater management. And that was an issue that's come from our Development Services Department who handles stormwater compliance, and also deals with construction issues for stormwater management. Our current code was written in the early 2000's when we were focused more on low impact development practices where we wanted to have water infiltrate into the ground and there was a lot of emphasis on treating the stormwater on the lot that it's serving. However, we've seen over time that we've had a number of situations where a homeowner may be having a facility located on their lot that serves more than just their house; it's serving several neighbors. And that's become problematic for a maintenance standpoint for that individual homeowner and also the homeowner's associations. So this proposed amendment is attempting to resolve that issue and make it clear that if the area is... for stormwater is serving more than just that lot that the facility is on, then it's got to be on a separate parcel owned and maintained by an HOA. And if the Commission desires, we can certainly have somebody from Development Services come and speak to it in more detail.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I read the Board package and the referral and the actual language changes. It doesn't seem to be significant. And so what again, I'm seeing that largely we're replacing imp with BMPs. And secondly, we're placing the financial burden of stormwater facilities on the community, rather than a single lot owner. Does that kind of capture the essence of what's being changed here, Jeff?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, sir.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Apicella: So, again, not being significant, I certainly don't think we need a subcommittee.

Ms. Barnes: Let me let Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: I'll take issue with that. I've got a couple of problems with it. They're minor, I'll say that. But I would like an opportunity maybe to discuss it with Mr. Saunders, and see if he agrees with my assessment, and maybe have a few minor changes made before we take action on it.

Ms. Barnes: Can you explain why you know so much about this?

Mr. Bain: Gee, I don't know why. No. I've worked as a stormwater management engineer for 42 years.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Bain: But if that's... if that would be acceptable to the Commission.

Ms. Barnes: Would that be okay with the Commission to let our resident expert maybe ask a few questions?

Mr. Bain: Let me talk to Mr. Saunders, who authored the changes, and at the next meeting, present...

Ms. Barnes: We can go from there. Do we need to defer? Do we need to do anything? Or do we just bring it up at the next meeting?

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, at your direction, we'll put it on next meeting's agenda.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, let's do that. And that'll give you enough time to touch base and clarify those things and then explain it to us.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, can I recommend if Mr. Bain has specific changes, maybe we can have this as option one, and he can come working with staff have an option two, and we can look at them together, try to figure out what we want to put forward to a public hearing.

Mr. Bain: I don't understand what you're saying.

Ms. Barnes: Maybe a regular version?

Mr. Apicella: So, we've got option one...

Mr. Bain: Oh, sure, sure.

Mr. Apicella: ... which is what was presented to the Board. And if you could maybe work with staff on an alternative option.

Mr. Bain: Certainly.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

Mr. Apicella: And we can decide which one maybe to put forward to a public hearing.

Mr. Bain: I won't... the alternative option 2, I would not propose unless Mr. Saunders would agree with it, you know.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, that's fine. And you can brief it or somebody can brief it at the next meeting. I'm just saying just to kind of keep the ball rolling.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, absolutely.

Ms. Sellers: Are we allowed to do that? If the Board of Supervisors sent down a referral, are we allowed to provide an alternative?

Ms. Lucian: This one gives the Commission the authority to make changes.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: That was really fast. I didn't quite get that. But okay.

Ms. Lucian: I was just saying that the resolution that sent out, that sent down this particular ordinance gave the Commission authority to make changes... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Apicella: The last paragraph says the Planning Commission is authorized to make modifications.

Ms. Lucian: It's not always the case, but it is here.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, that concludes my report.

Ms. Barnes: Alright. Thank you, Mr. Harvey. Ms. Lucian, County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Good evening. I have no report. Thank you

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: No news for us?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ms. Barnes: And Committee Reports. I don't think we have any active committees at this point. And that leaves it to me for Chairman's Report. And first and foremost and most importantly, I do want to recognize somebody today. Today is Administrative Professional Day. And I would like to recognize our own Stacie Stinnette. Administrative Professional Day recognizes and celebrates the work of secretaries, administrative assistants, and other office professionals for their contribution to the

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

workplace. And today, Stacie, we would like to recognize you and celebrate you for your support, hard work, and attention to detail, and all the other tasks she juggles to help prepare us for our monthly meetings. Truly, we would be lost without you. And I do have a little something for you. I thought this would be nicer; I was going to do it at the beginning, but I got overzealous. Darrell told me which one you like, so thank you very much!

Ms. Stinnette: Thank you!

Ms. Barnes: Okay, next I also want to welcome our newest person up here on the dais, Mr. Brady. Let's see, you're from Mountain View, is that correct?

Mr. Nast: That's correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And you will be joining us as a representative from the YES Program, the Youth Engaged in Stafford Program. And I do want to clarify. So this is new. We haven't had this for a couple of years. I'm not really sure what the role is of the student up here on the dais. Maybe Mr. Harvey can clarify that for us.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman, the role of the YES student is to observe and understand and learn the government process with the Planning Commission. If the Commission wants to seek input from the student, it certainly can but the student is not permitted to engage during the public hearing process.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Sellers: You should have said that at the beginning.

Ms. Barnes: It's okay, live and learn. We're learning. Okay. Thank you and welcome. And I hope these aren't too late, because I know you gotta go... oh, you're on the late start now at the high school. So no problem, you can stay up late then. Okay. And the last thing on my Chairman's Report is item number 6, meeting cancellation discussion. We had a little bit of a unique situation where we had two meetings cancelled in a row, and we were kind of up in the air as to exactly how to deal with that. And at our meeting on Monday, I asked Lauren about how to best go forward with that. I mean, if it happened once, it could possibly happen again. And Lauren mentioned that in the Board of Supervisors by-laws, they have a little snippet in there that addresses this specifically, and that it would be pretty easy for us to put the same thing in our by-laws, in case this happens again. So I'm hoping that you can give us some language perhaps for the next meeting and we can get that process rolling.

6. Meeting Cancellation Discussion

Ms. Lucian: Absolutely.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Alright, thank you very much. Okay, I think that's all for me. Other Business – New TRC Submissions. We've got Courthouse Woods. Oh, Chick-fil-A, Burns Corner Chick-fil-A. That's good. Walmart 610 Addition. Staffordshire Section 1A. And I think everybody got the eplans for that, correct? Okay. Okay. Alright. Lastly, approval of the minutes, the March 9, 2022 minutes. Do I have a motion to...?

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning Commission Minutes
April 27, 2022

7. New TRC Submissions
 - * Courthouse Woods - Aquia Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8. March 9, 2022

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Second.

Ms. Barnes: That was quick. Alright. And all in favor?

All members: Aye.

Ms. Barnes: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, the motion passes. And with that, we have no more business before the Commission and we are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 PM.