

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**September 22, 2021**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 22, 2021, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center and at remote locations throughout the County.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Joseph Valotta, Amy Taylor

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualification on any agenda item? Okay, I am again recusing myself from the Willow Run item as I've done previously. While I believe I can participate in this matter fairly and objectively, a relative of the applicant is building homes near my neighborhood. And for those reasons, I'm going to recuse myself. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one recommendation to move item number 4, the conditional use permit for the Embrey Mill Town Center to the first public hearing tonight.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, is that a motion, Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: I'll make that motion, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, motion and seconded. I'll just do a quick voice vote on that. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed nay? Okay, the ayes have it. Alright. I'll now open the public presentations portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to 3 minutes to comment on any matter except the public hearing items. There'll be a separate comment period for each of those as they come up. Before starting 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. Mr. Brito, please go ahead.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Brito: Good evening. I'm Joe Brito at Rocky Run Road. Anyway, can you put the... okay. In 2009, Stafford voters approved a bond referendum that had a number of parks and trails in it and one of the trails was the Belmont to Cannon Ridge Trail. Okay, that trail was in the bond referendum and it's actually a pretty historic trail. There's a lot of historic sites involved on it. There's Hunters Ironworks, there's Hunter's Island, there's, of course, the historic Belmont. And there's also this beautiful waterfall that you see in the picture that's on the trail. So this is you know, I'm calling it the Historic Waterfall

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Trail. So anyway, I'm asking you to put the trail in the Comprehensive Plan since the voters approved it. The Dominion Trail was put in the Comprehensive Plan, and I think this trail should be put in there, too. Also, can you change the slide? Okay. In 1999, the Cannon Ridge Golf Course, well actually it's Celebrate Virginia, was rezoned. Okay, and it didn't have any proffers but one of the conditions in the rezoning was 50% of the land would remain open space. Okay, and, that that land would be considered RBC, Recreational "Business Campus." So anyway, the land right now at the Cannon Ridge Golf Course -- the golf course is abandoned. And it has seven miles of trails, paved trails, it's next to the beautiful waterfall that we saw in the picture, next to historic sites, and it's abutting 1,000 acres of city land. So what I'm saying is, that should be a regional park, you know, a 1,300 acre park, that can be regional. And anyway, it's, like I said, it's zoned RBC and it's part of the open space ratio. So, by law, it can't be developed. The only people that can change that is the Board of Supervisors and there's no reason to change an open space parcel to residential use. So I'm asking you to put it in a Comprehensive Plan for recreational use, and it should be a public park in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Brito.

Ms. Hazard: Good evening Commission Members. My name is Holly Hazard. Tonight I am standing before you as the Chairman of the School Board, because this matter has been discussed with our Board in open session at our meeting a week ago. Tonight, I come before you to comment on the possible removal of the school-owned parcel of Clift Farm, the removal of it from the Urban Services Area. This was discussed with all Board members that evening. Both the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the School Board have all commented and committed to having schools on public water. Please, please remain true to this commitment. I know, whether or not where or when a school may be built on that property to me is irrelevant. It is school-owned property now that was designed to be made for a school. I have heard many reasons. Yes, it may or may not. However, as you all may notice, there is not a lot of land sitting around for schools. As we begin to look for them, we need to react to the growth, which we may have an update in about a month of our new numbers. That land right now is school-owned property. And because it is, it needs to stay in the Urban Services Area. Taking it out may require additional cost to the school system in the future, especially if it would need additional access that it would have to pay for depending on things moving in and out of the Urban Services Area. And lastly, I'm just going to end -- I hate to use examples -- but as Chair, I represent the Hartwood District. We have the distinction of having the only school that is on well and septic. Yesterday was a particularly horrible day at Hartwood Elementary; we had to turn off the water for at least two hours. No toilets could be flushed because of problems again with the pumping system. This has been an ongoing problem for any of you, and I know Mr. English knows many people in Hartwood. This is a long term problem that happens all... not all the time; we are trying to of course work through it. But these are issues we do not want to happen in our schools in the future. So I would ask that you remain... let this property remain in the Urban Services Area, let the School Board examine the best use for that property. But like I said, we don't have a lot of properties that are available. And I appreciate you all listening. And again, this is the comment from the entire School Board. I just wanted to make that clear. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Chairman Hazard. Is there anybody else who would like to comment on any item, including the Comp Plan Update, this evening? Okay, with no further persons interested in commenting, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting. Yes sir, would you like to... Again, this is just on any, any item that's not a public hearing, or any item that you want to talk about.

Unknown Speaker: *Inaudible, not at microphone.*

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Alright, again, so I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting and move on. I think we agreed that we were going to move the Embrey Mill item forward to the first public hearing. Mr. Harvey?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC18152265; Reclassification – Southgate Commercial Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on 8.16 acres zoned B-2, Urban Commercial, to limit the permitted uses to include mini-storage warehousing and accessory use for rental and dwelling for watchman or caretaker on premises, and amend the plans and building design, on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165 (Property). The Property is subject to a concurrent conditional use permit request. The Property is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cambridge Street and Southgate Avenue, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**
2. CUP20153251; Conditional Use Permit – Southgate Commercial - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow motor vehicle rental use and accessory use for watchman or caretaker on premises, in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165 (Property). The Property consists of 8.16 acres, and is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cambridge Street and Southgate Avenue, within the Falmouth Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent proffer amendment request. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**
3. RC16151330; Reclassification and Proffer Amendment – Willow Run - A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts to the R-2, Urban Residential - Medium Density Zoning District (30.15 acres); and from the A-1 Zoning District to the B-2 Zoning District (5.60 acres) on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 36-29, 36-37A, and a portion of Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-61 and 44-61A; and a proposal to amend proffered conditions on a portion of Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-61 and 44-61A zoned B-2, Urban Commercial (7.53 acres) (collectively, the Property), all to allow for the development of up to 90 dwelling units and 90,000 square feet of commercial uses on the Property. The Property is located on the north side of Warrenton Road, west of the intersection with Village Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**

*Discussed after item 4.*

4. CUP21153998; Conditional Use Permit – Embrey Mill Town Center Child Care - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a child care center in the PD-2, Planned Development-2 Zoning District, on a portion Tax Map Parcel No. 29-53B (Property). The Property consists of 1.56 acres, and is located on south side of Sunflower Drive, approximately 1,000 feet west of Austin Ridge, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Joe Valotta will be making a presentation for staff. The proposal is a conditional use permit for a childcare center in the PD-2, Planned Development Zoning District within the Embrey Mill project.

Mr. Valotta: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners. Joe Valotta, Planning and Zoning. The following is a request for a conditional use permit to allow a childcare center in the PD-2, Planned Development 2 Zoning District. The project site is approximately one and a half acres, located in the Garrisonville Election District. Edward Peet is the applicant and Clark Leming is the agent. The

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

site is located at the south side of Sunflower Drive approximately 1,000 feet west of Austin Ridge Drive. And this property was rezoned to PD-2 in 2001 as part of the Embrey Mill development, and as such, it's subject to proffers pursuant to Ordinance O1-08, which was included in the staff report. Although it's not depicted in this aerial photograph, this site is cleared and rough graded. No environmentally sensitive features have been identified onsite and single-family detached homes are located south of the site across Courthouse Road and the new Market at Embrey Mill was recently constructed to the west. And the remainder of the abutting properties are as of now undeveloped. And this GDP illustrates the entire layout, the overall layout of Phase 4 of the Embrey Mill development, with the planned buildings labeled 1 through 16. And the proposed childcare center would be located in building 1 in the northwest corner of the site. Building 1 is shown to be a single story construction of 13,000 square feet. And a fence would surround the building enclosing the outdoor play area. Building 1 would be directly accessible with buildings 2, 3, and 8 by means of a shared parking lot. And those buildings would most likely house restaurant and/or commercial uses in the future. The overall shopping center will be accessible through Sunflower Drive, Austin Ridge Drive, and Courthouse Road. Building 1 won't have direct access to any of those roads and will be accessible through the internal travelway. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the property within the Courthouse Planning Area and Targeted Residential Growth Area. The TGA Small Area Plan recommends mixed use development for the property and that recommendation allows flexibility for residential and commercial development. The Comprehensive Plan recommends a floor area ratio for commercial development within TGAs of between .4 and 1. And the proposed floor area ratio with this project is .19, which is below the recommendation. However, staff notes that with the state requirements for childcare centers to have outdoor play areas, the Comp Plan recommended FAR would be difficult to achieve. Taking a look at some of the proposed conditions, they would require the development to be in conformance with the GDP; they would require fencing around the outdoor play area; and require playground shading by means of trees and/or other types of shade structures. Staff notes the project is generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comp Plan. It's consistent with the planned and established development patterns in the area. Proposed conditions will help mitigate impacts to the adjacent roadways and the projected VPD, that's vehicle trips per day, the projected VPD is less intense than what could be developed under the current zoning by-right. And for negatives, the project does not meet the Comprehensive Plan recommendation for floor area ratios within TGAs. And staff recommends approval of the application with conditions pursuant to Resolution R21-336. And that concludes the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Valotta. Questions for staff?

Mr. Bain: I have a couple maybe. Do you know how many children the facility is going to have?

Mr. Valotta: Mr. Leming will correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe it's approximately 150.

Mr. Bain: A hundred and fifty. One of the things that I was concerned about, we say development according to the GDP. The GDP really only looks at the site of the facility and not the adjoining roads. And I'm not sure, I guess I'll ask Mr. Harvey or Ms. Lucian, can we also stipulate that those adjoining roads have to be fully completed, curb, gutter sidewalk, etc. as a condition before the facility is allowed to open?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, with a conditional use permit, we are restricted to conditions that would only apply to that specific property; we cannot have conditions that apply to offsite properties. So we could not regulate that through the CUP. However, from a practical aspect for them to get an occupancy permit, they need to have a paved roadway access.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Okay, okay. And the last thing I had, and I think you've already answered this, you said the site has been cleared?

Mr. Valotta: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Bain: So there's no chance to save any of the mature trees that were on the site, I guess.

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yeah. I believe the entire Phase 4 has been cleared so.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, yeah. Alright, that's all I had. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Okay, I've got a couple myself. So, what I heard was that just the play area outside would be fenced. Is there an area where the children will be outside that would not be fenced?

Mr. Valotta: I do not believe so, but I'll have to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I didn't see a building elevation or design in the plan. Do we have any sense of what that's going to look like?

Mr. Valotta: Again, I'll have to defer. One was not provided with the application. However, the Embrey Mill proffers do govern architectural renderings. So it will be whatever they do submit and whatever is reviewed with the building permit would be subject to those proffers.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And I thought I heard you say that the building would be one story. How do we know it's going to be one story? It just says on the GDP 13,000 square feet.

Mr. Valotta: I would have to look back through the file. I believe it's mentioned in the impact statement that it's a single story.

Mr. Apicella: So is that something we'd want to consider as a condition just to be in conformance with the request?

Mr. Valotta: We could add it, yeah, we could add it.

Mr. Apicella: I didn't see anything on hours of operation. Do we know? Obviously a childcare center is not going to be 24/7, but any sense of what the hours are going to be?

Mr. Valotta: I don't know. Again, I'll have to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: And last question, this is the kind of question we'd ask on the BZA. Is there going to be some kind of security access or system so that, you know, somebody from the general public just can't walk in to the childcare center that has no business being there?

Mr. Valotta: Sure. Yeah, again, I will have to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. That's it for me. Again, last call for questions. Mr. English?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. English: Do you know... it might be for the applicant... is this a like a name childcare or is it just private?

Mr. Valotta: I don't know. I'll have to defer.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, Mr. Valotta, you did a great job. Thanks.

Mr. Valotta: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. Leming: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I'm Clark Leming, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. And thank you for your courtesy in letting me move. My other client thanks you for your courtesy, too. I have Mr. Ed Peet with me this evening. He is the principal and has been working on Embrey Mill since the early 90s some of you may recall. I will... let me be, try to be responsive to the questions that you've asked. I think you've gotten a presentation on what it is. This was a conditional use permit that we're sorry we didn't have a plan for and didn't know this was coming when we came before you in the fall for a whole batch of conditional use permits. So this is this is yet another one. With regard to the trees, if you're familiar with that area, those are, those are not particularly good trees that were cleared. This had been timbered at some point, and so I think you can even tell from the aerial that these are scrub pine and, you know, not the kind of trees you would want to create shade in a children's play yard.

Mr. Bain: They're gone, so it doesn't matter.

Mr. Leming: Yes, that's right, that's right. But we didn't take out any, any important trees we think. Okay. Now with regard to the fencing, the playground is the area that is fenced, I don't believe there are any areas other than pick up areas where the children would be that would not be in a fenced area. In fact, I think we have some state regs that cover some of your questions, Mr. Apicella. The hours of operation are pretty well suited to Stafford commuters in the morning, and Stafford commuters coming back in the afternoon. You'll note there is a condition that says they can't be outside playing between dusk and dawn. So you know, this is as with most childcare facilities, not something that lasts long into the evening, and the kids can't go outside and play, they're not going to want to stick around anyway. So, hours approximately, I would say probably in the range early in the morning, about 6 o'clock, and you know, probably no later than 7 at night. Although the hours could change depending on the demand. Let's see, Mr. Bain, I also think that there are 140 students or young kids are anticipated for the facility. There do have to be certain security procedures under state law, Mr. Apicella, so that no one can just come and go with a facility like this. The architectural are covered by the proffers. And that was an issue that came up with the prior CUPs for which architectural were not presented for the individual uses but they're covered by the proffers and the architectural for the entire development, which are pretty extensive by Stafford standards. So those are the questions that I think that I heard and that I wrote down. I'm happy to respond to any other questions. And something I don't know, and that's a real possibility, Mr. Peet probably can respond to your question.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Leming. Questions for the applicant?

***Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021***

Mr. English: Yeah, Mr. Leming, is that going to be a private school? Or is it like a corporate... I mean, is it like a chain?

Mr. Leming: The name of the school – and yes, we did, I'm sorry Mr. English, Everbrook is the name of the company that's coming in there.

Mr. English: So it's a chain?

Mr. Leming: Yes, uh-huh. It's not a standalone.

Mr. English: Right. And they're probably not going to be open on Saturdays and Sundays, right, just Monday through Friday? Or maybe a Saturday?

Mr. Leming: I don't think we know for certain, but I think that's likely. I think most of the, most of the childcare facilities that I'm familiar with are just open on weekdays. I don't think you'd want to keep them from being open on a weekend, if there were a demand for that.

Mr. Randall: One quick question, what is the age, what are the ages of children that could be there?

Mr. Leming: The starting age for these facilities is usually 2 years old. So they would, you know, it's up until kindergarten. So primarily between 2 and 4. I don't know for certain that they don't make arrangements, specific arrangements for children that are younger, but those are the, those are typically the childcare age children. Now, school-aged children could come there after school.

Mr. Randall: That's kind of the reason I was asking is because, you know, in the summers, would those ages be able to be expanded so that you could have some coverage for the summers type things?

Mr. Leming: Sure. I think that's something completely within the discretion of the center and yes, they would want to do that; it's good business, but then it would depend on the capacity of the facility.

Mr. Randall: All those things, exactly.

Mr. Leming: And that's something else you may know is covered by state law, I mean, you've got a certain number of square feet per kid. So, you know, this is something that probably all of you realize is very heavily regulated because... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Randall: Kids are involved, yeah. And it would be a one story building?

Mr. Leming: Yes, uh-huh.

Mr. Randall: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Leming: And this would be the only thing in this building. So it's 13,000 square feet just for this particular use.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Bain: Just one thought. You're going to be serving primarily commuters that go probably on I-95 to the Northern Virginia area. I-95 is notorious for accidents and traffic jams that cause commuters to

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

be extremely late coming home. What are you going to do if somebody is in that traffic jam and 6 o'clock comes, 6:30 comes, and they're still stuck in traffic? What kind of provisions are made for that?

Mr. Leming: Well, you're getting into a level of operational detail that has the law here I'm not quite familiar with and I doubt Mr. Peet is either. But, what I would say is, that's a fairly common occurrence for these kinds of facilities. I don't think any child is going to be left or told to have to leave, because we're closing.

Mr. Bain: We've heard horror stories of exactly that, you know. That's the concern so. Okay.

Mr. Leming: I have confidence that, you know, the good sense of the proprietor here and operator would be to, you know, plan for something, something like that.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: I wanted to ask a question about the parking lot. And I'm not sure if I heard this correctly, but the parking lot will be shared? Or will that parking lot be primarily or only for the childcare?

Mr. Leming: Well, there will be a parking lot that is contiguous with other parking areas.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So someone could go to a... could be going to the restaurant next door and park over there in front of the childcare facility.

Mr. Leming: If there's a space available, I suppose. There's nothing that would prevent them from doing that. But unless you just want to get some, some more feet in for Fitbit, I think you park close to the facility that you want to visit. And the main parking that would go on there would be those that have business. Of course, those that are dropping off and picking up or not parking there. So I think it's mainly though the caretakers, and the staff of the facility that would be parking...

Ms. Barnes: So there's different area for drop off and pickup than just the parking lot out front?

Mr. Leming: Yes, uh-huh, yes. They're different parts of the building, yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I got a follow-on question to that. For the parking area that is contiguous, how many spaces are there?

Mr. Leming: Do we... well, if you look at the, if you look at the GDP, you know, if you look at building, the building 1 facility there, what you see is a parking area in between building 1 and building 2, and a certain number of spaces that are much more in the vicinity of building 1. So whether they will be dedicated spaces or not, I'm not sure. But it appears that there, in the total parking lot, are somewhere in the vicinity of 40 spaces. So, you know, there certainly would be at least half of those that would be on that side. I don't think the parking, the ITE for a facility like this is pretty small. I don't recall the actual number, but it's pretty small, because you don't have people coming and staying for a long period of time.

Mr. Apicella: Right.



***Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021***

Mr. Leming: It's mainly just the staff... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I just wanted to get a sense of how many spaces there were.

Mr. Leming: It appears here that there are at least – hard to see specifically – but it looks like there are at least a dozen spaces that are close to the building on that side of the parking lot.

Mr. Apicella: Would you all have a problem with a condition that indicates the spaces? I don't know how many there are; I think there's at least 1, 2, maybe 15 spaces, maybe a little bit less, that are immediately adjacent to the building be dedicated for this use?

Mr. Leming: Any problem with that? During the hours the facility's open?

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Leming: Yeah, I don't, I don't think you have a problem with that.

Mr. Peet: Just as long as we meet the... there's not some sort of zoning... *inaudible, not at microphone.*

Mr. Leming: Yeah, there are parking requirements, of course, for uses, but I don't think there's a problem with...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, my concern is the age range that you talked about, 2 to 4, kids running across parking lots, it'd be probably smart to have spaces close to the building.

Mr. Leming: We hope the kids aren't going to come out the parking lot. We hope they're going to be picked up, you know, at the front of the building, not coming into the... Oh, you mean, just in case somebody else is driving through the parking lot at the time of the pickup?

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Leming: Okay. I don't see a problem with what you're proposing.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Leming: If you want some specific language, I would just... I would think something along the lines of the applicant shall designate no fewer than 12, shall we say, parking spaces for the use of the facility during operating hours?

Mr. Apicella: That was all very good. I'm halfway through that; the applicant shall designate no fewer than 12 spaces... I'm going to say closest to the building...

Mr. Leming: Closest or adjacent to the building that would be so designated during operational hours.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Alright, any other comments, questions, thoughts before we let Mr. Leming go? Alright, thank you sir.

Mr. Leming: Thank you all very much. And again, thank you for your, your courtesy in letting me go first.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I'm going to open the public hearing on this item. If you'd like to speak, you have up to 3 minutes. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means you have 1 minute left. And red means please wrap up your comments. So if anyone would like to speak on this item, please come forward now. Seeing no one rush the podium, I'm going to close the public hearing on this item, bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Randall, this is in your district, I just would ask if you're going to make a motion, the last point that was discussed about the parking spaces close by if you might consider that if you make a motion.

Mr. Randall: I did take some shorthand. And so if I can read my shorthand, I will see if I can put something in place. Yes, I would like to make a motion to approve or recommend approval, Conditional Use Permit CUP21153998, Embrey Mill Town Center Child Care, with an additional condition as such, applicant shall identify no fewer than 12 parking spaces adjacent to the building for dedicated use during operating hours. Joe, did you get that? Alright, do I need to say it again? Because it won't be the same if I have to repeat it. Okay, did you catch it all the first time? That's all you're going to get is one time. Okay, good. That'll be good. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Bain. Any further comments, Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: No, this is, this is well, well needed there. I think you're going to have a capacity issue as soon as you open it up. I think it's going to be a great addition to that area. So thank you.

Mr. Leming: Thank you all.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Just one thing, mentioning that, should we add a conditional use limiting it to 140 students?

Mr. Valotta: No, I think by State Code they have to do that... *inaudible, not at microphone.*

Mr. Bain: Okay, good point. Thank you. That's all.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any comments from anybody else? Alright, seeing none. There's a motion recommending approval of the conditional use permit for the Embrey Mill Town Center Child Care Center, as modified with the condition read by Mr. Randall. Please cast your vote. Okay, that motion carries 7-0. Mr. Randall, I'm going to turn the Chairmanship over to you for the next item.

3. *RC16151330; Reclassification and Proffer Amendment – Willow Run*

Mr. Randall: The next item is the public hearing for the... Mr. Harvey, I'll turn it over to you for the next public hearing, how's that?

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next public hearing is a proposed reclassification and proffer amendment for a project known as Willow Run. Mike Zuraf will be making a presentation for staff.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening members of the Planning Commission, Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. So I'm here to present the staff report for the Willow Run zoning reclassification. So this is a request for a reclassification. There are two parts for this request; first is a zoning reclassification from A-1, Agricultural Zoning District and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the R-2, Urban Residential Zoning District and from the A-1 district to B-2. And then the second part is a proposal to amend conditions on property that is already zoned B-2, that's 7.5 acres. All of these actions would allow for the development of up to 90 townhouse units and 90,000 square feet of commercial uses. The overall site covers 43 acres and the applicant is Rich Ward, and this is in the Hartwood District. Here is the location of the site shaded in blue. The property is located on the north side of Warrenton Road and west of the intersection with Village Parkway in this location. So this just kind of helps to kind of clarify some of what I was explaining there in the intro. The blue shaded areas of the site or the portions that are being rezoned to a different zoning district. And then the red shaded area is the proffer amendment area. It's already... that area is already zoned B-2; it's staying B-2 and basically new proffers are going to that property. So here is the existing zoning layer and zoning map that you can see the existing zoning and what's around. The light green shading represents A-1, Agricultural zoning. And then the light red represents B-2 zoning. Adjacent properties to the west include a mix of A-2, Rural Residential, A-1 and M-1, Light Industrial zoning to the south. Across Warrenton Road is more A-2 zoned property. Also you have R-1 zoned property where the University of Mary Washington is located, and then the B-2 zoned property catty corner from this site is where Walmart's located. To the east is more B-2 zoned property; that is the partially developed shopping center where Royal Farms is located. And then to the north is A-1 zoned property which is undeveloped. That is part of the original Willow Run proposal and I'll get into that a little bit. The two properties that are zoned B-2 currently, the one property was zoned back in, all the way back in 1990 to B-2. And then another, the other one in May of 2007. Both had proffers pursuant to old ordinances and no development or anything has occurred on those properties since the time of that, that original rezoning. Here's the aerial view of the site. At the bottom corner of the property there is Stafford Plaza Drive which is the private entrance, private drive that was built to serve that shopping center, and then whatever may develop here and that was built at the time when Royal Farms came in. And that is a private drive within an ease... access easement on the corner of this property. And then there is an existing single-family residence and associated outbuildings that are located in that cleared area on the center, in the center of the of the property. The remainder of the property is generally wooded with a mix of mature deciduous and coniferous trees. You have Falls Run, a perennial stream that meanders along the rear property boundary and crossing onto the adjacent property to the north. There's wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and Critical Resource Protection Area located along Falls Run. The site topography slopes moderately downward towards Falls Run with some steeper slopes closer to the stream. So the Generalized Development Plan submitted with the application shows the subdivision of 90 townhouse lots, as well as development of up to 90,000 square feet of commercial. The slide shows the zoning reclassification portion of the site. The residential component would be located to the rear of the property and the commercial component along the frontage of with Warrenton Road. Access would be provided via a proposed public street, public street A that's shown on the plan. That would be from Warrenton Road, and then there's the private street access via Stafford Plaza Drive located on the eastern property line. The public street A would bisect the two commercial areas and connect to the residential area and then meet back up with Stafford Plaza Drive in the northeast corner of the site. The townhouse lots would have frontage along parts of this public street, as well as several internal private streets. There is sidewalk shown within the residential area and along both sides of that public street. And then also there's a total of five commercial buildings that amount to the 90,000 square feet, and that's depicted within those commercial areas. The specific use...

Mr. English: Can you draw a circle around it? Can you draw what you're talking about?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: So the commercial... we never know what's going to work. Can you change the setting to slide? Okay. Alright. So here's two of the commercial buildings, and then there are additional commercial buildings which I'll get to at the next slide in this portion and then the...

Mr. English: Mike, I'm sorry, the one that you drew the first circle round – is that going to be like a strip mall?

Mr. Zuraf: This building here?

Mr. English: Yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: It represents what a typical strip mall looks like. You see individual suites and then a single standalone building.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, and so as I pointed out, this slide represents the proffer amendment portion. This includes... it's located at the corner of Warrenton Road and Stafford Plaza Drive. It represents three of the five potential commercial buildings. It does have one right-in/right-out access point proposed from Warrenton Road, and that would be one of the proffer restrictions to only allow one right-in/right-out access point in this location. And then you have the three retail buildings in this lo... in these locations.

Mr. Bain: Is there a reason we would even allow one right-in/right-out? I mean, Stafford Plaza Drive and public street A to me would be more than an adequate access to those buildings and the buildings to the east. Well, on this drawing it's actually north. They don't have a right-in/right-out access, so their only access is public street A. I see no reason to allow that right-in/right-out drive unless there's some capacity issue.

Mr. Zuraf: I don't think there would necessarily be a capacity issue. It's more so probably the I guess access to the store. I'm guessing you typically would have your storefronts...

Mr. Bain: Yeah, but when you think about how many driveways there are along 17 in that area, vehicles coming in and out almost every two or 300 feet, it seems, it just, it adds danger to the movement of traffic. The Stafford Plaza Drive is signalized; I don't know if public street A will be. I hope it will be. So I don't see a need for that. My personal opinion. I don't know.

Mr. Zuraf: I'd probably have to defer to the applicant, that's how they proposed it. And I'm guessing it's access to those stores from Warrenton but. And one moment, I've got a little technical error here.

Mr. McPherson: I didn't see a turn lane there, Mike. Would they be putting a turn lane in?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: It's hard to tell.

Mr. Zuraf: Right; in this location.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, so yeah, a little bit about the project history. So this was initially reviewed by the Planning Commission in the spring of 2019. The original concept for Willow Run included a large parcel to the north across Falls Run extending to Truslow Road. The development scheme was modified several times and is no longer being pursued. The following... this GDP identifies the last site layout that was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission. It did include the same 90,000 square feet of commercial development. It did have 394 total dwelling units and include, which was made up of 60 single-family units, 111 village units, and 223 townhouse units. It did include the dedication of a 30-acre public use site also. And again, now the development area is limited to this lower portion. So the Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use map identifies the property within a commercial corridor and within the Suburban Area Land Use designation. It also has a portion of the site designated as Resource Protection in the blue shading. The commercial corridors are intended to encourage commercial activities where there are adequate transportation facilities to accommodate these proposed uses. Suburban areas of the County are areas where single-family detached units are recommended with typically quarter to half acre size lots. Also, apartment and townhouse units may be appropriate in certain situations. Dwelling units other than of this type may be allowed on a case by case basis provided they're compatible with the existing nearby development and do not exceed 3 dwelling units per acre. These areas are intended to serve as infill development in the proximity of established communities. Resource Protection designation reflects where sensitive environmental resources are located and recommended for protection. The proposed development is generally consistent with many of the recommended development standards for the Suburban designation, except that the plan recommendation of the fact that dwelling units other than single-family units may be allowed on a case by case basis, provided they're compatible with the existing nearby development. The project doesn't necessarily comply with that criteria. The townhouse units would not be compatible with the existing nearby development. All the nearby residential development in this area includes single-family detached neighborhoods.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, can you go back to that one real quick? As far as the commercial overlay there, the commercial corridor overlay? In the staff report, I think it's maybe the fourth page of the staff report, it indicates, I think it indicates the Highway Corridor Overlay with two purple lines going up? And it looks very different on the staff report than it does with that orange stripe there. I'm not sure the, you know, how extensive that commercial corridor is because it looks to me like on the staff report that the entire property is almost completely within the commercial corridor.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, yeah, those are two different layers so that the highway corridor that you're referring to is a zoning overlay.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And that has specific design requirements. This is the Comp Plan recommendation and so the designation of the commercial corridors, in this case, kind of stop here at this site. And so I guess commercial development may kind of come around and be proposed further to the north and west along Warrenton Road, but and that's I guess why the zoning overlay kind of is in place to kind of capture that if it does happen.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, so this application was submitted prior to the enactment of the current proffer legislation pursuant to the State Code, which limits the County's ability to negotiate proffers when considering a residential zoning reclassification or proffer amendment. Since the latest legislation does not apply to this application, these are December 2015 proffer guidelines that were in place prior to the

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

more recent proffer kind of methodology that we go through. So these guidelines may be used for the purpose of evaluating proffers for public facility impacts and mitigation. The guidelines in this case suggests some total monetary contribution of proximately \$41,000 per townhouse unit divided up among the different facility types. And...

Mr. Bain: Mike, sorry. In the staff report, you did identify specific allocations for the proffer amounts. But there was nothing mentioned for education. So now are we going to see an education proffer associated with this application? Or will there not be?

Mr. Zuraf: Currently there is not.

Mr. Bain: There is not.

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Bain: Sad. Very sad.

Mr. Zuraf: So in the staff report, we go through kind of a summary of the public facility impacts. What I have listed here for each type of facility is, you know, proffer guidelines, the comments on potential impacts, and how that is proposed to be mitigated for schools. This, these proper guidelines are carried over from that chart that I just displayed. So you have 18,000 for proffer guideline recommendations. In the school evaluation, there'd be a negative impact on high school capacity in this area. There, as noted, there were no cash contribution mitigations or other types of mitigations proposed for schools in this case. For public safety, you see the proffer guidelines. The suggested amount is determined there would be additional, the additional population would add to service level deficits. Mitigation includes a proffer contribution of \$1,188 per unit and exceeds that proffer guideline recommendation. For general government, there would be needed general government facilities that are not scheduled to be completed until year 2033. That's related to the need for additional courthouse space. And that's planned after the projected build-out of this development. The mitigation proposed would be \$1,600 per unit.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, can I ask a quick question about right here, it says would negatively impact capacity at Colonial Forge High School, but there's nothing in there about Hartwood Elementary School, which...

Mr. Zuraf: So yeah, in our evaluation, we did kind of identify, I guess the way we kind of look at that now with the capacities that exist, and what's available... what current capacity exists and compare it against the projected number of new students. And so there's currently enough capacity to accommodate the additional students that would come from this neighborhood. But at the same point, these are the old guidelines which don't necessarily follow that same function. So there would be additional students at both the elementary school and middle school as well.

Ms. Barnes: With a school that that's having the issues with the infrastructure as it is, it seems like any new student would be an issue here.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And then with libraries, there are estimated library needs in the I guess kind of roughly estimated in the Comprehensive Plan for the year 2023. There's a proposed proffer contribution of

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

approximately \$500 per unit for library mitigation. With parks, there's estimated Park need of five acres based on the estimated population from this development. As far as proffers, there are proffered recreational improvements for the neighborhood and then a cash contribution of \$1,400 per unit. With transportation, there are the proffer recommended proffer guidelines and to note also, there will be required transportation impact fees for any residential development on this site of approximately \$3,000. So you'd have that as a partial mitigation. Also, recommended improvements would maintain acceptable levels of service at some but not all of the affected intersections. There's levels of service downgrades at some of the intersections, even with recommended improvements based on the traffic study that was submitted. So staff would recommend all recommended improvements should be incorporated into the proffers to minimize negative impacts. So looking at the proposed proffers, the ones that would apply to the proffer amendment area, specifically that smaller portion of commercial area would limit access to Warrenton Road. In the site we kind of reviewed off that right-in/right-out connection, and then prohibits several uses otherwise permitted in the B-2 zoning district from going on that property. In the remainder of the area where the zoning reclassification is, there would be the cash contributions of \$4,700 per each townhouse unit allocated to those different types of facilities. Require one playground as shown in the GDP. It would require the construction of the extension of Stafford Plaza Drive through the... along the edge of the site and also to the north of the Falls Run to the other property that was previously part of Willow Run. Also require maintenance and access agreements on Stafford Plaza Drive. Permit one additional entrance from Warrenton Road. Allow for no more than 90 townhouse units. Establish different design standards for the townhouse units. Also require HOA covenants restricting the amount of rental units to no more than 10% of the total number of units. And require conformance with the General Development Plan. With the overall evaluation, the positive aspects; the commercial component is consistent with the Comp Plan land use recommendations. The residential density is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it reflects a density not to exceed 3 dwelling units per acre. And the layout of the development would minimize impacts to sensitive environmental features on the site. With negative aspects, the townhouse units are not consistent with the Comp Plan designation with regard to the Suburban land use recommendations and established scale of residential development in the area. The public schools, parks, and transportation impacts have not been adequately mitigated. And future right-of-way dedication and road improvements are not guaranteed. And then the project is not in full compliance with the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan. Overall, with the recommendation staff does not support the proposed zoning reclassification to the R-2 zoning district as the townhouse units are not consistent with the Comp Plan. And I'll turn it back to you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Randall: Great, thank you Mr. Zuraf. You don't have any other slides, right? You don't have a backup slide with the schools and specifically a layout for the schools? I have it in the staff report. You didn't have a slide for that, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Do we have any questions from the Commission? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: You may not know the answer to this question, but I'll ask it anyway. When they say that they are going to require the HOA to have no more than 10% renters, how exactly is that enforced or worked? Does that work in an HOA? It seems that might be hard to really enforce.

Mr. Zuraf: That was a carryover proffer from when this originally came through and it was discussed back then. And my understanding is really it's the County is not going to be able to enforce that, you know, so it's in the proffers. But there would not be a way for the County to enforce it. Whether or not the HOA can enforce it, I don't know.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: So it could turn into a complete rental unit and there'd be really no way for any of us to even figure that out?

Mr. Zuraf: I can't say one way or the other. I'm not... I'm not certain how the HOA covenants could be...

Ms. Barnes: That might have been a little rhetorical. The other one is I just wanted to just to make this very clear that this is inside the Urban Services Area.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: But it is not in a Targeted Growth Area.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Randall: Yes, Mr. Bain.

Mr. Bain: In the staff write-up it talks about the water and sewer line. Basically, it sounds like they're planning on Westlake development, extending the line out beyond their site so that they can tie into it. Are they contributing anything to the cost of that extension?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to defer to the applicant because, yeah, I know that the... I'm sure they've been in taught talks with Westlake because Westlake has to get the easements through their property. So I'd have to defer to the applicant as to how that agreement might work.

Mr. Bain: And if Westlake doesn't develop for 20 years, they're stuck. Unless they assume...

Mr. Zuraf: Well, they themselves could...

Mr. Bain: Yeah, unless they assume the total cost to get it to their site.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Bain: Okay. I think that's a serious problem. Let's talk again about that entrance, right-in/right-out only entrance. I presume this has been run by VDOT and that they didn't object to it. But like I say, I have a concern about it. Do you, and this is probably for the applicant, just how far is that from Stafford Plaza Drive and then the public street A? I mean...

Mr. Randall: *Inaudible*... your microphone.

Mr. Bain: Oh, I'm sorry. You can't hear me? What are the distances there?

Mr. Zuraf: I will have to... I can check...

Mr. Bain: We'll let the applicant answer that. To me, that's just asking for trouble. And then I was a little concerned about the public street A; it says that it's going to be restricted to right turn only, so they could only go north on 17 or west direction, if you look at the drawings. But if somebody was on 17,



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

coming south, they would be allowed to turn left into public street A. And that gives me concern. Obviously, it's there now and the people that live in that area are making those turns. But once these buildings are constructed, and the residential areas constructed, there could be a significant increase. And I am very concerned about allowing uncontrolled left turns across 17. As we saw with the previous applications, it really gives me heartburn to think about the number of accidents that could occur there. Why not delete that median crossover entirely? They're saying that if people are coming out of public street A and can only turn right, they'll go to the next signal intersection and make a U-turn. Well, they could do the same thing if they're coming 17 going south, they could go down to the other road, it seems to me, with the same amount of disruption. So I think that should be strongly considered to delete that median crossover entirely. Let me see, I had one more note if I can find it. Well, I'll pass and get back to it again when the applicant comes up.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Bain: Thanks.

Mr. Randall: Alright, Mr. McPherson?

Mr. McPherson: Mr. Zuraf, one of the proffers was one additional entrance. Is that referring to the right-in/right-out for the B-2 area? Or is there potentially a different one?

Mr. Zuraf: It is the... that's that right-in/right-out. And then the access point of public street A.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you. So it wouldn't be a different one?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. McPherson: Just wanted to check.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Any other questions? I do have a couple of quick questions then. Was there any suggestion about when the commercial would be built in reference to when the townhomes would be built?

Mr. Zuraf: No, I am not familiar with what the phasing might be with this project.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. So the next question that I have for you is, I've noticed in your staff report, and again, I apologize to those who are watching because we don't have this in a slide. But according to what we have in our staff report, the schools, Hartwood Elementary School, it looked like to me that we have used designed capacity for elementary schools, rather than our program capacity. So we should make sure that from here on in that whenever it comes to elementary schools, that we are using program capacity, because that significantly changes... for example, and I'll just bring it up, I happen to have the cheat sheet that the schools gave us. I carry it around for whatever the reason. And elementary school design capacity for Hampton Oak... Hartwood Elementary School, the program capacity is 582. Right? Not the 649, but the 582. And so that may change significantly any mitigation steps... I'm sorry, that will change significantly or could change mitigation requirement for Hartwood Elementary School, notwithstanding the problems that were discussed or mentioned before, when you use program capacity, which is what used by the schools rather than the design capacity. And so that also is a mitigating factor that we should consider. And, you know, just to note to staff to continue when it comes to these types

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

of things to use program capacity for the schools, or the elementary school. I'm sorry. Alright, do we have any other questions?

Mr. English: One question for Mike. Why don't they do the 2015 guidelines? Why don't they just do the 2015? I mean, yeah, 2015.

Mr. Zuraf: Because this application was in beforehand.

Mr. English: So that's the reason they just went with...

Mr. Zuraf: It allowed them to make proffer, provide proffers for the other facilities like libraries and general government, which is not allowed. That may be one reason.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Would the applicant like to come up, please?

Mr. Ward: Good evening. My name is Richard Ward, I'm the applicant.

Mr. Randall: Yes, would you like to answer any of the questions that are presented or make your own presentation?

Mr. Ward: Yeah, sure, I took some notes. I have... Mr. Bain has a keen eye for traffic, as well. And so on a couple of his comments, to address the right-in and right-out, we have a Traffic Impact Analysis, which we did for this project, and they asked us for additional right-of-way on the side. So not only are we building an additional lane that runs the length of the project, so you would make a right turn out of Stafford Plaza Drive, you could stay in that until you went to the right end, you could stay in that till public street A, until you got past public street A. They've also asked for additional right-of-way because I guess VDOT is planning on making 17 even wider at some point. So to handle the right-in/right-out that would never be in the flow of any of your traffic. The other thing, another keen eye, was that the... in the Traffic Impact Analysis, the left-hand turn that you referenced, that gets closed during construction. The first thing is that Peach Lawn Drive that's on the right-hand side, so nobody heading south will be able to make that left-hand turn. They asked us during our construction it would be part of our VDOT permit that we close that median. So both of those...

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Ward: ... Forever. Yeah, forever. Once we did our job, that left turn would get closed and nobody would be able to make a left turn onto Peach Lawn heading north and nobody would be able to make a left turn into drive A heading south.

Mr. Bain: Oh, okay.

Mr. Ward: So VDOT's on it, I guess.

Mr. Bain: The description was a little bit different so...

Mr. Ward: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: ... in the staff report.

Mr. Ward: But in the traffic impact analysis, that's the recommendation. That's what VDOT is gonna sort of hold us to. I think the elephant in the room here about the education proffers and the transportation proffers is that, if I go back a little bit in the history of this rezoning, maybe not all of you were here but when there was a nice little lady got up and she looked me dead in the eye and she said, Mr. Ward, why don't you build a school? And I went, okay, so in my first application we took the 35 acres off to the side because Hartwood Elementary was the greatest need. We have water and sewer onsite, and we were going to dedicate that 35 acres to the County so they could build Hartwood School 18. Since 2019, Stafford County has engaged a broker to negotiate with me to buy all 118 acres to the north side of Falls Run for not only high school number 6, but also elementary school 17. I know the fiscal budget doesn't have you building elementary school 17 soon, but if they purchased both sites, you would actually have Hartwood Elementary off of water and sewer. And you guys could push how fast you build a school and raise money to do such. So there is a negotiations between myself and the Stafford County School to buy the north side. It is why I revised this application to just handle the south side. You asked about the transportation and the school proffer. Well, you'll notice that if you put the slide up, there's a road to nowhere. Stafford Plaza doesn't go to nowhere, it goes to elementary school 17 and high school 6. We know that there is no problem in this County greater than the overpopulation of our schools. I don't think any of you can say that we don't have overpopulation in this County in our schools. So this rezoning takes... of 90 townhouses and some commercial isn't going to build you two schools.

Mr. Randall: So Mr. Ward, if I could interrupt you just a minute.

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Mr. Randall: I'm looking at... that right there. Can you draw or have Mike help you draw where you're talking about please?

Mr. Ward: So this is the old... I've got to point?

Mr. Randall: No, you can do it on the screen.

Mr. Ward: Some high tech stuff Stafford's got.

Mr. Randall: It's got to work first.

Mr. Ward: I had an overhead projector when I was a kid, the teachers had one of those.

Mr. Randall: You're dating yourself.

Mr. Ward: I could share but I think Stafford, and it's not dedicated, is that this is number 6. This is elementary 17. And there are countless fields over in this area. I broke it; it went off.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, that's all I need. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that...

Mr. Ward: So there is a conceptual layout by the School Board that has sent this. Like I said, we are in negotiations. My attempt here was to help them get the road from 17 to the site. I think they have grand plans about 4 lanes on Truslow Road. I think there is other things in the works that are above my paygrade. But this here, my in essence, the way I viewed this, my proffer to the school was to build this

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

road. And it's a couple million dollars to build a road across a stream. It's not an easy lift to get across the RPA. And this would offer 2 school sites. One, the high school 6 I think you guys are supposed to have built by 2025. Good luck. Cross our fingers. And that I think 17 is what, '30 or '27?

Mr. Randall: I think it's 2026.

Mr. Ward: 2026. So these would... approving this rezoning would give you guys the road both to and from high school 6 and elementary school 17. That's my proffer for education and transportation. Any other questions?

Unknown speaker: That's not in writing, is it?

Mr. Ward: Building the road is.

Mr. Bain: Let me make sure I understand what you just said. So with this rezoning, you are proffering to commit to sale of those properties.

Mr. Ward: That's a different... that's a... I can't do...

Mr. Bain: That's why I'm, you know, with this rezoning, we have no legal commitment from you that that sale will go through.

Mr. Ward: At one time I offered Supervisors this land for free. And for something else. They told me that that was not possible. So this does get a public facility built. I know that the approval of it doesn't lie here. But you guys are step one, so I can't go here before I go to the Board of Supervisors, and I can't sell the land. There's a little bit of a chicken in the egg, you know, that good common sense development and government working in a public-private partnership would offer that to us. But I have to be here. And I have to explain to you that the reason I'm building the road to nowhere is for two schools.

Mr. Bain: How far will that road actually go? Will it actually cross the stream as a part of this LDP?

Mr. Ward: Correct.

Mr. Bain: GDP?

Mr. Ward: Correct. And somebody else made a really good comment about phasing, right. One of the things that I would proffer, not here today, but at the Board of Supervisors is that no townhouses would be built until your school was built. I don't want to have any negative impact on your schools. I understand that that's not... that we already have an overcrowding issue. Right? I mean, this could have been another Cardinal Forest, it could have been another residential neighborhood, right? There was something that came out in the Free Lance-Star about the search for high school number 6, and they put a big huge bubble as to where they want it. And I was like, oh, that lady at the rezoning said she wanted a high school and look at that, we're right inside the bubble. And so to me, Mike Smith reached out to me and then his consultant reached out to me and said, you're one of the parcels. So they've sent a letter of intent to continue negotiations recently. I think this was supposed to happen pre-COVID. And then the wheels of government slowed down and then what you guys and the Board of Supervisors have had to go through through COVID is, whew, something else.

Mr. Bain: Yeah. Can you address the issue of water and sewer extension?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Ward: So if you look, sewer is, I think it's right here.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Ward: And water is, we are... water is going to be right here. And water is also right there. So obviously with the high school you would need... you would need to – top right – you would need to loop your water system. You also made an interesting comment, mostly it came from you, about Westlake and the easement. So Westlake would like to build the sewer through our property. I'm not in objection to them doing that. They have a couple of options; they can do a force main down 17. Your Utilities Commission likes for it to be a gravity sewer, gravity sewer. You also, since it is on your Comprehensive Plan, they will build it and they will get pro rata credits back because it is on your master plan. They don't get them back until... they only get credits for it. So like let's say they have to pay a pro rata for their sewer or water district. And let's say that Stafford says this, I'm using really round numbers, a million dollars to build this, right? They get a million dollars of credits against their pro rata once they're buying their... getting their building permits. So they wait 20 years until they get that back. But the infrastructure goes in to do it as well.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Alright, great. Great. Thank you.

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Mr. English: Mr. Ward, so in reference to your building phase, when would you start that with your commercial part? When would that start?

Mr. Ward: As soon as I have high school students.

Mr. English: So you're not doing anything till the high school is built. So say the high school was never built?

Mr. Ward: I, I don't think Stafford would buy the land... well, I mean, you might be a Supervisor. You might have something to vote on that at some point.

Mr. English: No, I'm just asking you. I'm just asking you. I mean, if it was 10 years down the road...

Mr. Ward: I don't think we need another truck... I don't think we need another tire repair shop or another Royal Farms.

Mr. English: I'm not saying that. I'm just asking you, I'm just interested in the commercial. I mean, I'm okay if you started commercial tomorrow.

Mr. Ward: We would like to.

Mr. English: Yeah, that's what I'm asking you.

Mr. Ward: Commercial's a funny thing because it works on demand.

Mr. English: Right, okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

Mr. Ward: It truly does work on demand. And we believe that the reason that I'm doing the amendment is because if you heard Mike Zuraf, and Mike, thank you, good job on the education here. The amendment is that it was originally rezoned in 1990. We then... it got rezoned by... *inaudible*... so I'm the contract purchaser of that property subject... and that was rezoned for a Lowe's in 2006. 2008 hit, we didn't get a Lowe's, this property has sit idle, but it is zoned because it has no drive-throughs, you know, no this, no that, no whatever. So that needs to be reclassified so that we could move Chick-Fil-A up there or put something else in there when this becomes a hub. If you look and drive by Royal Farms, Steve Klevenoff is one of the other property owners and he's only bringing credit tenants. This is going to be, if it becomes the high school – and I say if – incredibly prosperous hub. We think that this area right here at Stafford Plaza Drive will be very nice, and a destination with the Walmart, with the Starbucks, and all of that other stuff with the high school right there.

Mr. Randall: Okay, do we have any other questions?

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

Mr. Randall: Please.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so just that I'm getting this straight.

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Ms. Barnes: You want us to take into consideration something that hasn't happened yet? That we quite literally know nothing about? I mean...

Mr. Ward: Do you find it weird that I'm the one telling you?

Ms. Barnes: A little bit.

Mr. Ward: Me too.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Yeah. And that, to me that, you know, that's kind of a leap of faith that can be hard to do. If we really don't, I mean, to me, we have to take this application independently on its own merits, right here compartmentalized. I understand what you're saying, but, you know, stuff happens.

Mr. Ward: I fully expected for you guys to deny me, send me to the Board, and let them make the hard decision. But that is totally up to you. But it's would be unfair for me not to explain to you...

Ms. Barnes: I don't know that I've ever had such a candid developer speaking to us.

Mr. Ward: We're getting old. We don't have much time for the... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Ms. Barnes: I like the honesty, thank you.

Mr. Ward: Right?

Mr. Bain: Let me just ask. There are a few negatives that staff has pointed out...

Mr. Ward: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: ... with your application. Looking at them, for the most part, they're not significant. Some tweaks to your plan could overcome quite a few, three of the four. Is that something you would be willing to consider doing and coming back to us with a revised plan?

Mr. Ward: Well, we're currently at 50% open space that requires 25. Can we look at the negatives, again, Mike?

Mr. Bain: Townhouse units are not consistent with the Comp Plan designation with regard to Suburban land use; I'll let Mike talk about those. Right-of-way dedication and road improvements are not guaranteed. I don't know that we normally get those kinds of guarantees, especially for something like Route 17. And it's not in full compliance with the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan. Maybe Mike could shed some more clarification.

Mr. Ward: I think we do dedicate the right-of-way that's asked for it in the TIA. I don't know that we have ever proffered that in a plan. Like it comes into the plan and they say, I think Amy could comment on that. She's like, give us the right-of-way and we say, okay.

Mr. Bain: That's why I want Mike to clarify.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, there are actually some new changes to our, to our Zoning Ordinance. And it's not as easy now for us to just say give us the right-of-way. So it's really more important now to have it proffered because that, that's no longer... we no longer have that ability to do that so. The Neighborhood Design Standards Plan, that could you know definitely be addressed with some additional standards, you know, that we would need to work with the applicant on that.

Mr. Bain: Something you could work with the applicant on?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Ward: So the GDP is proffered. And on the GDP, it shows us giving the right-of-way, it shows us building the road all the way across. So I think the one thing that you would probably ask is that you don't build any townhouses until the high school is open. We've owned this land for 30 years; the Ward family's owned it for 30 years. We built the Willows to the north. We're also commercial developers at the Riverside Business Park. So we also own 1,000 acres up by Stafford, Abel Lake. So we're... my father bought land here long back in the 70s and 80s. So we're familiar with it, we understand and if that means we wait till the high school is built, then we wait; it's okay.

Mr. Bain: We can't ask you to do that. You have to take that upon yourself...

Mr. Ward: I was gonna make something for the Board of Supervisors to chew me up on.

Mr. Bain: Sure.

Mr. Ward: Which may be these two guys in January, who knows.

Mr. Randall: Enough of that already, enough of that. Jiminy Christmas. Do you have any other...

Mr. Ward: I could jinx you; I don't have much luck... *inaudible*.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Any other questions? Alright. Then let's... thank you very much, Mr. Ward, I appreciate it. We'll now open this up for the public hearing.

Mr. Ward: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Randall: Thank you. We'll now open this up for public hearing. Again, those speakers who are coming before us, you'll look at the red lights, you'll get 2 minutes till the red light goes off, and then a yellow light, and then a yellow light 1 minute, and then the red light I ask you to... to the green light, yellow light, red light. So please give us your name and your address. And then give us your comments, please.

Mr. Blake: Good evening. It's a privilege to be here tonight, and I thank you for your time. My name is Carroll Blake. My two nephews and I are owners of some land across Warrenton Road, right by the college, from here. I have three major concerns. One concern stems back from many years ago when I was here at a Planning Commission meeting when I thought it was a Home Depot but understand that it was a Lowe's, it was planning on going in this very area. And one of the major concerns that night was the runoff from that area going into the run. And what effect would that have on Cardinal Forest. And a lot of questions were answered... were asked, a lot of answers didn't forth come. And they sent it back to be studied further. And I never heard any more of that. But I do know that no Lowe's was ever built there. So I don't know if those questions ever got answered. But when you've got this much land that's now gonna have runoff into a stream, that can have some serious consequences. The second thing I'm concerned about is traffic. Traffic on 17 is undescrivable. Understatement. With 95, I have seen traffic built up on 95, backed up getting on 95 in front of this property many times, even pass Poplar Road. And now you're talking about closing, if I understood you right, closing the Peach Tree entrance there, which means now you've got to go up to Holly Corner to turn around which is already can be a busy intersection, people coming in and out of Holly Corner Road. So you've added to the possibility of accidents, things of that nature. And the third thing is water and sewer. I was in an area of Stafford today up around 3 miles down Poplar Road, 3 or 4 miles down Poplar Road from... *inaudible*... store. And I happened to notice their fire hydrants up there. Very rural area. There's no fire hydrants around 17 up there. So is water and sewer... I mean, if you're going to have it in the rural areas, why don't you have it on one of your main thoroughfares in Stafford County? Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Thank you. Next?

Mr. Brito: Joe Brito. Good evening again. For over 20 years the Route 17 corridor was designated for commercial uses. All the land between Falls Run and Route 17 was designated in the Comprehensive Plan for commercial use. Then in 2010, that all changed and over 9,000 acres of prime commercial land was changed to Suburban Residential. Nine thousand acres. So we have a commercial corridor, prime commercial corridor, that should be designated for commercial use. And I hope when you do the Comprehensive Plan, you can designate it for commercial use. And I just don't feel that, that residential is appropriate for the area. I do want to thank Mr. Randall for bringing up the issue of design capacity for the schools; that was good and I hope that the Planning staff will start doing design capacity rather than program capacity. Also, Mr. Ward is an honorable man, but I've just seen too many things. You can't... anything that's said at a meeting means nothing. There's only one thing that means something, and that's the Ordinance. If it's not written in the Ordinance, it doesn't mean a thing. So when the Ordinance is approved, it's law. The proffers are law when they're approved. So if it doesn't have things like right-of-way dedications, or a road for a school, or, uh, it really, really means nothing when it's said at the meeting. It's, it's the document, the document is law. As the... I was involved with the rezonings before Royal Farm. I didn't vote for a conditional use permit for the Royal Farm, but I did rezone the



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

area for commercial use. And I believe there were proffers in that rezoning for the right-of-way and the turn lanes. And the people at Cardinal Forest were very concerned about the runoff because a lot of the houses back up to the stream there. And that is a big issue. And as far as school proffers are concerned, if it's not written in the proffers, it means nothing. So I just kind of, I feel like it's an insult not having school proffers. And I don't want you to set a precedence by approving something that doesn't technically have school proffers. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Thank you very much. Do I have any other speakers on this? Thank you.

Ms. Ference: Hi, my name is Lisa Ference. I'm one of the properties that is adjacent to the proposal for Willow Runs across Truslow Road. So thank you for the opportunity to come and express my concerns for the rezoning of Willow Run. As you're aware from previous meetings, the neighbors like myself have been opposing this rezoning since its proposal and today is no different. So although it is smaller in area, the density and the design of the townhouses are not compatible with the adjacent parcels that are R-1 and A-1. This is not a Targeted Growth Area as we heard before, it is designated Suburban. So townhouses are only supposed to be considered if 60% of the linear footage of the property adjoins, abuts the same type of dwellings. And this does not. If it is approved, and the deal that we heard about the School Board possibly purchasing the property to the north, if that deal does not go through, this could set the precedence that, that there is already townhouses there and then it could be built further north. It doesn't meet the Stafford County's Comprehensive Plan. And the end of that road, just north of Falls Run, does indicate that further development is anticipated for that. So the townhouses do not fall into that category. A through street on Truslow Road would add significant traffic, and it also would funnel traffic that backs up on 95 all the way to that location up onto Truslow Road. And I do not believe the County has any plans for widening or straightening Truslow Road, and it would add too much significant traffic. And as stated before, it does impact the education and transportation that is not adequately mitigated in the proposals. And the concern also is that the rental properties of 10% of the townhouses could not be enforced. Once the property is built, I believe the HOA can vote to do anything they want at that point, with their properties. Excuse me. So for this reason, I urge you to deny the R-2 Residential rezoning of this property. Furthermore, and I'm guessing this might be the first time you heard about this, I also urge you not to consider this property for a new high school. The noise pollution, the light pollution, and specifically the traffic concerns on Truslow Road, if that road is continued through and a traffic circle would be installed at the northern part on Truslow, would definitely adversely affect the adjoining properties like my property. Since as far as we know, Truslow Road is not being considered for widening and straightening, the road can't currently handle a lot of the traffic that is currently bypassing 17. So it's not going to be able to handle the additional school buses.

Mr. Randall: Great.

Ms. Ference: Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Randall: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Mr. Howe: Hi, Jim Howe, from the Hartwood district. Mr. English, I think you're going to be our Supervisor here soon. Good luck on that. Look, we've been here before talking about our opposition to the Willows Run development back when it was 400-something units. And we've spoken to the Board of Supervisors as well. We think it was a terrible idea for a couple of reasons. One is, you're now cross-connecting 17 to Truslow Road. Truslow, as we all know, is a train wreck. As Lisa just said, it can't handle the current traffic. If you want to see just a, just a craziness, stop by on a Friday afternoon, especially in the peak summer travel months, and you'll have all those New York license plates just

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

zipping down Truslow at 60 miles an hour, you know, trying not to flip over around the curves. It's kind of crazy. So adding to that this idea, and thank you Mr. Ward for the transparency, that's a first we've heard that, you know, he's poised to sell this land to the, to the School Board to put a high school with, you know, dozens and dozens and dozens of school buses, going to the high school and the elementary school all at the same time in the morning to really botch things up. Can't wait for those Friday afternoons on Truslow Road. So, so good luck with that. We will obviously fight like crazy to keep that property from being developed into a high school and elementary school; it just makes no sense. There's got to be a better plot of land than putting this on Route 17 in between that and that little backwoods country road. So we'll take that up with the School Board, but we're glad that that finally kind of emerged as what might be happening here, because that's quite frankly, we've read the newspaper articles, but it's the first time we've heard that someone's actually negotiating perhaps to sell this property. I would say that though, there's a really nice solution to all this, that we've you know, brought up to Mr. Ward before and I hope he does really consider it. You know, that plot of land north of Falls Run – I'm not talking about what he's looking at now with these 90 units – but everything north of Falls Run is really the last stand of forest between Poplar Road and I-95. And this County has a great history of trying to preserve for conservation purposes, you know, some little plots of land here and there to make sure that we don't just become one giant Fairfax County. Okay, that's the core ethos of this County is to retain kind of our rural heritage. So, you know, turning that part of his property north of Falls Run into a perpetual conservation easement would be a great thing, it would be an amazing legacy for the Ward Corporation to be able to, to walk away and say, hey, we just didn't build houses, we help preserve the balance between man and nature, you know, by kind of dedicating this 100 or so acres, not for a school, but for, you know, allowing the forest to thrive for another thousand years. It would be a wonderful thing. And you know, the County has a great Purchase of Development Rights Program that I hope Mr. Ward will consider once the high school gets shut down. So thank you very much.

Mr. Randall: Thank you. Do we have anybody else who would like to comment on this as part of our public hearing? Yes, sir. I think you're the last one.

Mr. Stilton: Well, you've got to be somewhere.

Mr. Randall: If you're not going to be first, you might as well be last.

Mr. Stilton: Come with the heavy money. Name's Roger Stiltner, I live right across from... well, I don't know what we're talking about now. I came down with this, this sheet of paper based on this. And now I hear that there's all kinds of crazy possibilities. So I don't know. I will say one thing. It may not sound in context, but I moved into Stafford 1976. And I was told when I moved into Stafford up on 610 in 1976, don't worry; 630 is going to be 4 lane. And it will be 4 lane soon. 1976; 4 lane 630 is still not 4 lanes. Yes, there are sections that are 4 lane. But here it is a zillion years later. So when somebody tells me Truslow Road is going to be 4 lane... okay, lots of luck. Pretty much ditto on the townhouses. The 90,000 square feet of commercial space, I think it's a good idea to get some commercial space in there. That would be great. That's an ideal place for it. But right across from the Giant, most of those storefronts are empty. Right behind Giant, most of those storefronts are empty. So guess next day, next week, next month, yes, there may be a surge of people coming in. But I don't know that the 90,000... I guess it would depend. And of course, I understand nobody will, can tell what's going to come in. But 90,000 square feet seems like a lot of land. Or I mean, I'm sorry, a lot of commercial space. My concern, now that everything else has been said, thank you all very much, appreciate that, my concern is phase one, I look at this as phase one, taking this bunch of land here 50-some, 43 acres or something like that, and getting those townhouses preceded in. And after this, if, if he doesn't build, or doesn't sell the land for the high schools and the elementary schools, then there's this land laying fallow. And I know

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

he's not going to grow corn on it. I'm pretty certain of that. Then he comes back for rezoning. He says, well, look, I'd like to put some apartments in down here. You let me put them in up here. And so now we have a situation where we have housing dwelling units in here that are not appropriate. And I go back to my earlier comment, ditto on that. I had a lot of other little bitty things here, zoning... *inaudible*... and stuff like that. But I just don't think it's a good idea to develop around the wetlands. I was in the DEQ for many years and it's just kind of crazy what can happen with wetlands, and how much trouble people will get into. And I just don't think it's wise to fool around with that kind of stuff. What could they do with that land? I'm not being snide or not trying to be mean or nothing. But I think he's 20 years behind the times on what he could do with that land. I think there needs to be some other kind of just change. Something else. *Inaudible*.

Mr. Randall: Thank you, really appreciate it. We appreciate the three seconds. Yeah. Alright, do we have anybody else for public hearing? Alright. That being said, I don't have anybody else, we will close the public hearing and give the applicant a chance to come back and talk for a second.

Mr. Ward: Thank you. Kind of refreshing we had I think 50 last time and now we only had 5 people here against, so that's a bright spot. The first gentleman – runoff water and sewer and drainage. And traffic. Traffic will be the hard one. But let's talk about runoff. One of the reasons that townhouse is selected is over the whole site, we wanted to do 50% open space on the site with what is allowed is would create a much greater impact on the land. There is a, you are near a stream, we are staying out of the RPA. None of our construction would impact any of the sensitive areas whatsoever. As far as water and sewer, we would be looping water through the site.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Ward, could I have you back just a second?

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Mr. Randall: What will happen to your runoff? Where do you expect your runoff to be directed? Where would it be channeled to? And in the end, where would it go?

Mr. Ward: Can I go to the page? That one's, that one's good, right there. So there's currently a large stormwater basin in this area that could partially be used, which is oversized for Falls Run. Right, and this is old, so you're not... can we go to the new one? This is the old one there. Can I swipe? I can swipe. Yeah. Okay. So you'll see these things, right here. These are all and these all get designed. Stafford County has one of the only counties in Virginia that has a more stringent stormwater management for quantity and quality than anybody in Virginia. Like your water is clean. We have engineering guidelines that handle the runoff. This runoff currently, nobody's managed yet.

Mr. Randall: Right. Exactly. And so all surface runoff that you'll see coming from this area will go into one of those five locations, is that correct?

Mr. Ward: These are estimates. Again...

Mr. Randall: But again, managing stormwater, dry or wet, they'll be in those... *inaudible*.

Mr. Ward: Often when you sell a commercial pad site, they often have underground because of their site is 100%, like a parking surface or something, they will have their quantity and quality handled underneath the surface.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Okay, and that's all...

Mr. Ward: These are really for the residential.

Mr. Randall: Sure. And those are all, those are all directed by the County, correct?

Mr. Ward: Correct. So the, the gentleman asking about fire hydrants, this would all have fire hydrants, all have water, all have sewer; we'd be looping it from Truslow and back around.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Ward: Yeah. And so I think the hard one's traffic, and I know traffic is probably the thorn in everybody's shoe in Stafford County. I mean, it's, it's brutal and conversations with people smarter than I, traffic engineers, I said, how do you, how do you solve traffic, right? And he gave me three really like bullet proofs to kind of like make it simple. And one of them, he says, you widen roads, you build more roads between point A and point B, right. And then the one that kind of struck me was you reduce the length of time people are in their car. So I know that people would be negatively impacted. And you guys have really hard decisions when it comes to making, you know, land use things. But currently, every student down here gets in their car, and they drive to Colonial Forge. Every person doesn't have this cut-through to get to Walmart; they go out to Poplar, they go down to Berea Church. So to me, we're widening 17, we're adding a road connecting Truslow to 17. And then we're reducing in the long term, we're taking those kids that drive to Colonial Forge, and we know that... I won't mention what's happened in the past over by Abel Lake, but we are taking those kids that live in, that currently live in South Stafford and we're letting them go to high school five minutes away instead of 25 minutes away, and we're taking them off of windy roads. Now, I'm not saying that being in Stafford on a weekend in the summer isn't like being in lockdown because you can't get to 95 and you can't get anywhere. We've all sat in that traffic. It's brutal, right? So, but the State of Virginia and the federal government has put \$5 billion into the north and south lanes of 95. I'm kind of hoping it fixes it a little bit like the mixing bowl, I'm kind of hoping it makes it better. I think the big thing is the trans urban project is extending 95 down to Massaponax. So I'm hoping that that big heavy flow gets through. I think the big thing that we all had to look at which I was excited because we also own commercial land by the Riverside Business Park, which is the south east corner of 95. So when redoing that intersection, I'm hoping that the two lanes that can now get onto 95 on the VDOT project and catch their own lane before anybody can get into it, you'll soon within two years be able once they build that across the Rappahannock get from 17 to Route 3 without ever having to get on 95. It's the VDOT project, I've gone to most of their informational meetings. So I expect that long line of truck maybe not to go away southbound on 95 but to somewhat be dissipated a little bit. So if you look at traffic, 90 townhouses and 90,000 square feet, I'm just telling you that we thought about how we reduce the length of time that people are in their car. Because if you can take people from 25 minutes to five minutes to get to high school, right, you're winning. If you can take people from Truslow to 17 without having to go Berea Church and Poplar, you're also winning because you're adding road C when there's only A and B. And I know Berea Church is getting upgraded as well, so that's even a positive. So we're adding roads, we're widening roads, right? And we're shortening the length of time that kids and parents have to be in their cars. And that's a quality of life thing. So for me, we talked about, the first guy, he's got runoff, he's got water, right, he's got traffic. So that's how we address that. There's always going to be a Mr. Howe that wants you to just give away what's yours. I find that truly unAmerican and total BS, okay. Like for us to own something for 30 years... *inaudible*... to put a conservation on it, the funny thing is he bought a house from me. He bought a house from my brother-in-law. So at that point, he didn't seem to have a problem with

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

much. Okay, he seemed to be just fine with moving in where there was trees. So you're always going to have some of that. Thank you guys for your time. If you have any more questions, I'm happy...

Mr. English: Mr. Ward, where do you live at? Do you live in Stafford?

Mr. Ward: I don't, but our family's been here for 20 years.

Mr. English: Do you live in Maryland or...?

Mr. Ward: Arlington.

Mr. English: You live in Arlington?

Mr. Ward: Correct.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Ward: It's not my choice. Sometimes you have women that tell you where you're going to live.

Mr. English: No, I'm just asking... I'm just wondering, okay. Well, you know, how the traffic is up there then.

Mr. Ward: Oh, we've got our different problems. It's cool. Everybody's got their traffic problems anywhere in the State of Virginia. Yeah. But again, my dad is the original developer that brought Geico here. He brought them to 100 Riverside... my dad was the original developer that brought the original largest employer to Stafford County. And they, then they got too big and wanted their own shell, so then they moved up 17. So the Ward family has been around a long time. Thank you for the compliment, Mr. Brito, I appreciate it, as well. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Do we have any other questions, any comments? Mr. English?

Mr. Cummings: I have a comment.

Mr. Randall: Please, Mr. Cummings.

Mr. Cummings: And I don't know where to start. I really appreciate all the comments by the folks from Stafford, the citizens. I really appreciate the applicant and the comprehensive way that he's looked at Stafford's problems, developing the property, look to develop a public-private partnership, and tried to address all of the concerns and even went beyond in certain instances. But it does bring to light a problem or challenge that we have here in Stafford, one I've been banging on and trying to for a while without much access. We can't continue to do development the way that we're doing it in a piecemeal manner, especially with the traffic and us being our growth issues. And we can't keep looking at the conservation issues in a bubble. They're all connected. And we have tools, we have technology that can help us get some of the data to address these problems as well as resources...

Mr. Randall: Dexter, could you speak into your microphone? Thank you.

Mr. Cummings: Yes... as well as resources in the community like Mr. Brito and this gentleman here. And but we're not having those conversations, and we don't have the tools to help us have it in a

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

meaningful way. So what does that mean for development like this? Right? You've already seen down the road what's happening in terms of this process. And so but I think that there's a way for us to address and I think it's on the horizon. But I think, more importantly, for tonight, it gives me a little bit of hope. Because I saw some of the citizens even looking at you and nodding at some of your points. So I think that there's definitely a conversation that needs to be had about what tools that we can bring to this development. Yes, they might be more expensive in the short run. But we have to find a way to do that, as well as developing master plans. And I don't know whether we need just need to rewind, or take a, just take a pause and decide how we really do want Stafford to look and with the citizens input, because again, there's no climate, we haven't talked about climate, we haven't talked about sustainability, we haven't talked about smart yet. Right. But all those things should be imbued in our Comprehensive Plan, including climate and smart. More importantly, because I think that's the piece that we keep missing. And so I'm, you gave me hope. And this dialogue between the community and the developer, I think really does give me, gives me more zest to do this job. So I know it doesn't help with the results. But I think that if you're willing to work, I'm willing to work with you to try and as citizens of Stafford to help advance us both because Stafford is an important piece of this Northern Virginia card, whether you're talking about climate, whether you're talking about economic development, and the missed opportunity that the gentleman talked about, with respect to the 17 carta. It is an amazing commercial property that has been without thought, really, forethought, or looking way down the road, what it could actually be for this area. And so I'm looking forward to that conversation. And I just... you, you brought this out in me right now. So thank you.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you. Any other comments? Alright, Mr. English, this is in your district.

Mr. English: Yeah. This thing's just got too many loopholes in it, too many things that I don't like about it. No proffers for the school. And of course, Mr. Ward has stated stuff, but like you say, if it's not in writing, if it's not in the proffers, it's no good. So I'm making a motion to deny RC16151330

Mr. Randall: Do I have a second?

Ms. Barnes: I'll second it.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so we have a motion to deny RC16151330 and a second by Ms. Barnes? Yes. Sorry. Do you have any other comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No, no, I just... like I said, the traffic, again has issue and I'm a little concerned about the runoff. And again, the traffic is the main reason and the schools are the second reason that I just can't, can't support this.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: That's probably been the most interesting application I think that we've seen in a long time. And I really appreciate the candor. Seems like you know what's going to happen. But I'm with, I'm with Mr. English. I don't think we can stuff another kid into Hartwood, and I can't take into consideration something that really hasn't happened yet. So we have that chicken and the egg thing going on. So for that reason, I won't be supporting it either.

Mr. Randall: Do I have any other comments? Alright, I have, I do have a couple of quick comments. We need, we need schools, we need a property for schools. I very much appreciate what you're saying. If you have an idea of 120 acres that can be used for a school in the Urban Services Area down near 17,

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

she's right back there. Please go talk to her. We're desperately looking for a place. This may be one of only a few places that meet their criteria. And so I appreciate what you don't want. But there will be something there. And so we have to figure out what's the best way to do it. I do agree with my colleagues in that, you know, we can't, we can't necessarily go on hope. I have some ideas of what I think should happen there. I think there should be some, and we need to do it quickly. Obviously, every day we wait is another child that's not being mitigated, that's not being taken care of. That the 2025 completion of high school is in jeopardy. You know, we can't wait any more for that to happen. So whatever needs to happen needs to happen quickly. And so yes, I'm going to also say no to this, because I think it's incomplete, the picture, and that we need a whole, we know the whole picture. I'd love to be able to say that the high school has already been approved, that the road is going to be used and built as a proffer to help with transportation and help with the schools. And as we've done in the past, you know, we have... the County has taken those types of in-kind donations as proffers to help mitigate, right, in a 6 or 7 million dollar bridge or road to the schools. You know, that's a great proffer. But right now, I don't have a school to talk about. And so I can't really necessarily accept that as part of this project, and ensure we wouldn't want to... we want to ask for that money and then turn around and say, oh, and now that you've given this money for the schools, now go ahead and build the road. Well, at that point in time, I'm not interested in building the road. Now Stafford's on a County for a 5 million dollar road and bridge over that RPA. And so we are kind of the chicken and the egg thing. And so at this point in time, I'm going to have to deny it, but we've got to get the school things taken care of. So, alright, that being said, we have a motion and a second. And that is to deny this application. Everybody cast your vote. We have 6 yeases to deny with 1 abstinence (*Mr. Apicella abstained*). I'll turn the time back over to the Chair.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Randall. I believe we have some technical difficulties that are trying to be worked out so because I'm going to call for a 5 minute recess.

*Break: 7:54 PM.*

*Reconvened: 8:01 PM.*

5. RC21153768; Reclassification – Banks Ford Self Storage - A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-100, 44-98A, 44-98B, and 44-98C (Property), consisting of 3.95 acres, to allow for the development of a warehouse, mini-storage facility. The Property is located on the south side of McWhirt Loop, approximately 100 feet east of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**
  
6. CUP21153821; Conditional Use Permit – Banks Ford Self Storage - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a warehouse, mini-storage facility in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-100, 44-98A, 44-98B, and 44-98C (Property). The Property is located on the south side of McWhirt Loop, approximately 100 feet east of Banks Ford Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 31, 2021)**

Mr. Apicella: Alright, I'm calling this Planning Commission meeting back to order. Mr. Harvey, next item, or items on the agenda.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, staff will be presenting a zoning reclassification and conditional use permit for project known as Banks Ford Self Storage, and Joe Valotta will make the presentation.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Valotta: Hello again, Mr. Chairman, Planning Commissioners. There are two requests being considered in conjunction with this project. The first is a rezoning of approximately 3 acres from the A-1, Agricultural to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District. And the second request is for a conditional use permit and this is all to permit development of a mini-storage facility that would be located in the Hartwood Election District. Don Hart and Perry Sisson are the applicants, and Justin Franklin is the agent. The site is located on the south side of McWhirt Loop, approximately 100 feet east of Banks Ford Parkway. It's partially located within the Highway Corridor Overlay District and currently has split A-1 and M-1 zoning. The applicant is proposing a split B-2 and M-1 zoning. And the portion of the property hatched in red is the portion that's subject to the requests being considered. Surrounding zoning districts include B-2, Urban Commercial to the north and west, and M-1, Light Industrial to the south and to the east. Currently, there are two single-family detached dwellings on the property. They would be demolished prior to the construction of the new use. The rest of the property is primarily wooded, and no environmentally sensitive features are identified onsite. In terms of adjacent uses, there's a Place of Worship to the north, across from, across McWhirt Loop and a contractor's yard located to the south and east. This GDP illustrates the layout of the storage facility. It shows 14 buildings of various footprints for a total of 140, approximately 146,000 square feet of floor area. The largest building located at the front of the property near McWhirt Loop would be 3 stories in height and house the rental office, as well as indoor rental units. And the rest of the buildings onsite would all be 1 story each and the storage units would be accessible via roll-up garage doors. The facility would be enclosed by perimeter fencing and access gates. And the internal travelways surrounding the 1-story buildings would all be one way, and one way traffic movements and access gates should help mitigate impacts to internal traffic flow. This GDP also shows vehicle tracking paths for tractor trailers, large box trucks, and passenger vehicles in order to demonstrate how different vehicles would move within the travelways. Since the property is located within the Highway Corridor Overlay, the Ordinance requires that the building is developed in compliance with the standards in the Neighborhood Development Standards Plan. That review would take place most likely in conjunction with the building permit. At this time, staff does note that the rendering submitted do comply with some of the features, or some of the recommendations in the NDS Plan, including the use of metal paneling and split face block as primary materials, brakes and fluctuations in the roofline, and a clearly defined customer entrance facing the primary road. The applicant is proposing 2 proffers; the first proffer would require the development to be in conformance with the GDP, and the second proffer would limit daily vehicle trips to the property to 400 trips per day as calculated in the ITE Traffic Engineering Handbook. Some of the conditions being proposed would also...

Mr. Randall: Mr. Valotta, I'm sorry, quick question about that. So, they get to 400 and the doors lock? I'm just saying how they will limit that. Has it been proffered... has been given to you, some idea of there's a counter in and out, once you get to 400 at 4 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon, the doors lock? How would they limit the number of... how do they proffer limiting the number of vehicle?

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm gonna, I'm gonna jump in there.

Mr. Randall: Please.

Mr. Apicella: First of all, the use itself, the self storage use has a cap based on the I-whatever manual, right? So if they go with that particular use, we know it's going to be even well below the 400. This is a cap, basically, if they choose to go a different route and not pursue a self storage, right, they can do some other use in that zoning district if it were rezoned to this category that they're asking for. But a use that, again, does not exceed the 400.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yes, the projected vehicle trips for the storage facility, I don't have the number on hand, but I believe it's somewhere in the neighborhood of 150, possibly less. So there would still be a pretty wide margin between what theoretically could happen based on data and then the limit that they're...

Mr. Randall: So they're limited based on applicable uses, not actual trips itself.

Mr. Valotta: Well, the first proffer ties development to the GDP and the GDP shows a storage facility. So that would require the development, or require that the property be developed in that manner. And then with the second proffer limiting the trips, that would, that would also help ensure that it's developed as depicted on the GDP. And then it also, it also extinguishes the requirement for a TIA, a Traffic Impact Analysis.

Mr. Randall: Sure, no worries. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Valotta: So taking a look at some of the proposed conditions, again, requiring general conformance with the GDP. The conditions would limit the height of the buildings with exception to the first, to the 3-story building, building heights would be limited to a single story; hours of operation will be limited. I'll check the report real quick to let you know what those hours are. So, per the conditions, hours of operation would be limited daily from 6am to 10pm, then conditions would also prohibit storage of vehicles and boats on the property. With regard to the Comprehensive Plan, the Comp Plan identifies the property within the Warrenton Road Planning Area and Targeted Residential Growth Area. The Small Area Plan for that specific TGA recommends Business and Industry use of the property. And Business and Industry designated areas are intended to support large scale uses that would serve broad markets inside and outside of the County. It's not likely that a mini-storage facility in this location would function at any sort of regional or countywide scale. However, staff notes that given the size of the property, the potential for the large scale development envisioned in the Comp Plan is somewhat limited. And staff also notes that the proposed commercial zoning is more compatible with the Comp Plan recommendation than the current Agricultural zoning.

Mr. Apicella: Joe, could you remind us what's, what's nearby? What are the uses nearby or the zoning classifications nearby?

Mr. Valotta: Sure, so we'll just go back. So the property again, it's currently zoned A-1 and M-1, Agricultural and Industrial as illustrated by the green and the blue colorations. And to the north of the property, it's all B-2 zoning and then, also, to the west of the property is B-2 zoning, and to the south and to the east the zoning is M-1, Light Industrial. In terms of uses, it might be difficult to see from this aerial but there's a Place of Worship, a church, on this large parcel here and then there's a contractor's yard that abuts the property to the south and to the east here.

Mr. Apicella: And across the street, or close to... it's not exactly across street is a Lowe's, right?

Mr. Valotta: Yes. West of the side on the other side of Banks Ford there's a Lowe's.

Mr. Apicella: Right. And there's some other B uses along Route 17 in that area.

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: *Inaudible*... while that slide is up. It appears that there's is it a driveway that runs in that little sliver that is B-2 zoned?

Mr. Valotta: Correct?

Mr. Bain: Will that remain as a driveway?

Mr. Valotta: Yes, it would be, it would be improved to...

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Valotta: ... to service the use. That's the approximate location of the entry point to the property.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Alright. But it's all totally on their property.

Mr. Valotta: Correct. Yes, this is the same owner.

Mr. Bain: It would be their responsibility to maintain it, too, then I guess

Mr. Valotta: Yes, yes.

Mr. Bain: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Valotta: So moving to the staff evaluation, staff notes the plan is generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comp Plan. It's consistent with the established commercial and industrial development pattern in the area. The proposed commercial zoning is more compatible with the abutting zones than the current agricultural zoning. And the proposed proffers and conditions will help ensure that any negative impacts are mitigated. Staff notes no positive... or no negative features, excuse me, no negative features. And staff recommends approval of the reclassification application with proffers pursuant to Ordinance O21-39, and approval of the CUP with conditions pursuant to Resolution R21-303 contingent on approval of the reclassification request.

Mr. Apicella: Joe, is it, is it fair to say that if they pursue the self storage route, which is again identified in the GDP, and I think that as you said, it's somewhere between 125 and 150 vehicles per day max, is that on the lower end or the upper end of what could occur on a 3-acre B-2 parcel?

Mr. Valotta: I would say it's on the lower end. There are some other much... there are some other uses that are much higher intensity that could develop. Fortunately, they would also require a CUP, something like a drive-through use. But that... a drive-through or a gas station in that location would generate much more traffic.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, even under B-1, if they went for a B-1, there are obviously uses in B-1 that would be far greater than a storage facility on that tract.

Mr. Valotta: Much more intense possibilities, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Other questions for the applicant?

Mr. English: I have one question for Joe. McWhirt Loop, that road comes out there, it's 2-lane, correct?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Valotta: Two lane, yeah.

Mr. English: Maybe Amy can answer this. There's no problem... I mean, there's no... or maybe not. Are they gonna widen that road anytime soon?

Mr. Valotta: The Comp Plan currently does not identify it as a road that needs improving.

Mr. English: Right. So there would be probably, maybe to the applicant, maybe, there's gonna be some tractor-trailers are gonna be coming in there. Correct, probably?

Mr. Valotta: Possibly, yes.

Mr. English: Okay. And there's a narrow road, right?

Mr. Valotta: Yes.

Mr. English: Okay. That's all for now. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, sure. Go ahead, Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, Mr. Valotta, so can you go back to the GDP for me, please? Yes. Now, we talk about a single entrance. Was that single entrance a staff requirement?

Mr. Valotta: Yes, it's... the ordinance requires it, yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so if I wanted to have a dedicated in and a dedicated out so that we wouldn't have to make the, the, the sharp right turn then the sharp left turn, we couldn't do that.

Mr. Valotta: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question please?

Mr. Randall: Sure. If we wanted to have a dedicated turn lane, a dedicated in which would be north-south, I don't know what it is, at the top, closer to the top of the page. And that would just be straight into the property and then at the bottom, they would just come straight out of the property and you wouldn't have tried... people trying to come in and out in the same location. Would that not be something that staff would be applicable... would be good with? Or is that something that we couldn't do?

Mr. Valotta: Sure. So that's something that I think could be explored. In order to do so we would need to amend the current proposed conditions. I believe one of them is limiting the property to a single...

Mr. Randall: Yep, absolutely.

Mr. Valotta: So, and then that's something also, I mean, if the applicant is amenable to it, that's something...

Mr. Randall: No, no. I will talk to the applicant about it. I just wanted to make sure that, as far as staff was concerned, there wasn't a requirement that says we couldn't. It was simply in the conditions that we currently have, that we can definitely talk to.

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Joe, the next slide, I think, is the architectural renderings. Yeah. That confuses me a little bit. That building has a very large footprint. Is the entire building going to be 3 stories? Or is it just like the office tower area and select areas? Or is the whole thing 3 stories?

Mr. Valotta: I would need to defer to the applicant for specifics on the building dimensions.

Mr. Bain: Okay. Makes me wonder what they're going to have in there. Alright, I'll wait for them.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to piggyback off that. So 3 stories? What's the what's the height?

Mr. Bain: Probably about 40 feet I would think.

Mr. Valotta: I do not recall offhand. Let me check my staff report.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just curious how that compares to other buildings in the area in terms of height.

Mr. Valotta: I don't have an exact height, so I would need to defer to the applicant. But in terms of general character of the area, a low rise commercial building would be architecturally compatible with what's already out there.

Mr. Apicella: And do we... so, for the 3-story portions of the building, again, is that just merely offices? Or is there some storage units proposed in those as well?

Mr. Valotta: There will be storage units in there as well. It's the rental office as well as... I can't say for certain, but I assume it would be the rental office on the first floor, and then storage units on the first floor, second floor, and third floor.

Mr. Apicella: Do we know if there are elevators?

Mr. Valotta: I don't. I need to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks. Any other questions? Alright, Mr. Valotta, thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. Franklin: Good evening. My name is Justin Franklin, with Fairbanks and Franklin. We're the engineer and representing the applicant. So, let's talk about the questions you had, if I got them all. So the first thing I guess was the separate entrances. Mr. Randall, you're asking about that. We'd actually like to do that. But the problem with doing that is the proximity, we'd be violating two of VDOT's requirements. The access management space in between the entrances, and also the proximity to the intersection. It'd be too close. It would violate both requirements. So that's why we limited it to one. And just so you know, it's not atypical to have a single entrance point. The reason being is because it's one keyed access for the customers, both in and out. So that actually consolidates, regulates the traffic flow into the facility better.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Okay, so yeah, the question whether those would be waivable or not, I don't know. So looking at your GDP then, show me where the gates, the key gates will be. Can you draw them in for me, please?

Mr. Franklin: Sure. If I know how to use this. How do I do this? Okay, alright. So the exit is right here. And that should be automatic from the inside. So it's tripped by a vehicle sensor. And then on this one, it's here. This is the inbound one so that you have the parking available and before you have to enter the gate. Typically, those are slide gates, as opposed to up and down. So this one would slide this way. And this one would actually have to open, be a folding gate going like this, and maybe a single panel. I'm not sure. This is very similar. It's the same regional, or same national company, Extra Space Storage, as the one that's in the Furnace Road development near the Neighborhood Walmart. So from aesthetics functionality, that kind of thing, it's basically the same, or would be the same.

Mr. Randall: Okay, and so you said that single entrance... inaudible... if I can read that is 30 feet? Is that what it says?

Mr. Franklin: I need to actually get my glasses. Yes, 30.

Mr. Randall: Okay, is that standard? Is that your standard double entrance?

Mr. Franklin: That's actually 6 feet larger than the standard. VDOT limits commercial entrances to 40 as a maximum, and then 24 as a minimum. So that's somewhere in between.

Mr. Randall: So, it's 6-foot more than the minimum.

Mr. Franklin: Correct. That could be widened, but we ran the vehicle through. So what you're seeing is the vehicle paths for basically an Interstate semi-trailer, which is, would be infrequent at best. That's like the Mayflower trucks, you know, cross-country moving. So that narrowest point, the reason why we showed the areas we did is to pick the narrowest, tightest, most constrained point to demonstrate that it works. And so that's why we show the largest... that that represents the vehicle envelope, the shaded area, for Interstate semi-trailer. The one that's furthest to the left is actually like a box truck. That would be like a typical U-Haul truck. And then the smaller vehicle is, based on the modeling, is called a passenger vehicle, but that's essentially a 20-foot long vehicle.

Mr. Randall: Okay, now... I'm ready to talk some more about this. Do you have other questions you wanted to get to first and then we'll come back to this?

Mr. Franklin: Yes, I do, actually.

Mr. Randall: Let's do that. Let's finish the questions and then we'll come back to this.

Mr. Franklin: Sure. So the other question about 3-story; it's approximately 36 feet, about 10 to 12 feet per story, it is an elevator building. It's conditioned, the 3-story building is conditioned, the office is on the first floor and the storage facility units would be on all 3 stories and the 3 stories does include the whole building. It's not just a mezzanine.

Mr. Bain: Would those be cages or partitioned storage units?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Franklin: They're fully enclosed with like, the garage style door, the roll up with the lockable mechanism.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. McPherson: One question for you. As I'm sure you know, occasionally people do rent extra space storage for illegal activities, potentially cigarette and drug selling, illegal drug creation, occasionally. So do your employees guarantee to inform the police if they see suspicious activity? I assume that's probably a standard thing for Extra Space Storage.

Mr. Franklin: I can't speak to that, because I'm not, I'm the engineer. I'm not with Extra Space Storage. So to me, I mean, any illegal activity, I would... that has to be part of their policy. I can't imagine that wouldn't be.

Mr. McPherson: Well, occasionally you see it in the news about cigarette or drug trafficking, things of that nature. So it's always important to know that they would work with law enforcement if needed.

Mr. Franklin: Certainly.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions, or did you have anything else?

Mr. Franklin: I didn't have anything else to respond to, unless I missed something.

Mr. Bain: One, one quick one. The office area -- will it have provisions for staff to stay overnight or anything like? Or is it just a desk counter type?

Mr. Franklin: No. It's just a desk counter particularly for people that either have problems getting into their unit if the lock's stuck or whatever, or for people that want to initiate a new monthly type contract.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Can we go back to the GDP then?

Mr. Franklin: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Yeah. We talked about this before. I'm still not sold. But I see that on this, to my north, to the top, I have a 3,000 square-foot single story and a 5,000 square-foot single story. You see where those are?

Mr. Franklin: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Are those also outside storage units?

Mr. Franklin: Those are outside with the roll up doors.

Mr. Randall: With the roll up doors.

Mr. Franklin: Correct.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Is there a reason why we haven't pushed those all the way back to the, to the boundary line so that we can make that left turn? My concern, a much more... a much larger area. You're talking about a turn radius, where it's great on some and it's horrible on others. You know, if I rented a unit right there, a 3,000 square-foot single story unit, and I have a truck there for two hours while I'm loading or unloading, does that preclude anybody getting around me? It probably would if they're, if they have to park a truck right there at that 3,000 square-foot single story. So, I don't know how much room is available. As I was looking about this, I was like, well, why don't you just put it right on the... why don't you just put it right on the border? Why don't you just put it right on the border, make that whole other section asphalt, and then you don't have, then you have plenty of turn radius. And then people can park and they can spend as long as they want unloading or loading. And there's no rush on anybody making that left turn, when they get in the property. Same thing with the 5,000 square-foot. Move it all the way to the end of the property, it's just wasted space over there anyway. Asphalt the rest of it. And now you have a big wide turn radius into any of those any of those units. You know, I'm not sure I understand exactly the reason why we left all that space open and we didn't try to make this as user friendly as possible.

Mr. Franklin: Well, so let me kind of back you up. So based on the last meeting, I went back and I looked at all the modern... when I say modern, I mean facilities that have been built within the last, say, five to 10 years in Stafford County in this general area. Aside from the one at the Furnace Road development that I was mentioning before, that's the Extra Space Storage, this particular facility actually meets their standard, which I mentioned before, and actually, the drive aisles exceed every single other storage facility in the county. So we are doing better in your opinion. You know, when you asked the question, can we do better, we already are. Can we push the buildings back? Sure. But I, you know, if it's not needed, we ought to preserve the green space. We do need landscape buffers. And I'm not sure, you know, that's why there's multiple facilities. If it were a problem, Extra Space being a national company would have already built it into their prototype. I would presume I mean, we're showing worst case scenario with these turning movements.

Mr. Bain: Where will your stormwater go?

Mr. Franklin: There's actually an existing stormwater facility, that's regional. That's already part of the BMP inspection requirements. It's already a recorded facility.

Mr. Bain: I remember, sorry.

Mr. Franklin: Yeah. And part of the engineering would be to analyze that existing facility to make sure that it complies. And if it doesn't, then we would be required to meet the state and county requirements.

Mr. Randall: Alright, I don't have any other questions. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Any other questions? Alright, thank you, sir.

Mr. Franklin: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm going to open the public hearing on this item. If you're interested in speaking, you have up to 3 minutes. When the green light appears, that's when the clock starts. Yellow means there's 1 minute left. Red means your time is up. So if anyone's interested in speaking on this matter, please come forward now. Seeing no one, I'm going to close the public hearing, and bring it back to the Commission for further discussion and potentially a motion. Mr. English, this is in your district.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. English: Yeah, I have grave concerns about the McWhirt Loop with more traffic on that road and it's those business owner, they're tractor and trailers, it's two lane, we don't know when this road's going to be widened or anything like that. So on that I'm going to have to make a motion to deny RC21153768.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's a motion to deny. Is there a second?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I'll second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further comments Mr. English?

Mr. English: No, I think that's my main reason for denial.

Mr. Randall: No, I don't have any comments.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Yeah, just briefly. The businesses along McWhirt Road don't generate a lot of traffic individually. They're small businesses. A storage unit doesn't generate a lot of traffic. I've dealt with several of the businesses along there and have never had a trouble with traffic in that area. So I don't really think traffic is a significant consideration. The surrounding roads that vehicles can use are more than adequate, other than 17 obviously; we've been talking about that. But in terms of getting in and out of that McWhirt Loop, it's really not a problem. So I would not agree with Mr. English on his concern.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Bain. Anybody else?

Mr. McPherson: I am also not concerned about the additional traffic and I think Extra Space Storage is generally useful for people who live in that general area.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. I'm going to have to agree with Mr. Bain and Mr. McPherson. I appreciate the sentiment, Mr. English, and of course I drive down 17 to McWhirt Loop. Certainly as businesses go, and that's kind of why I made the point, if you're going to have a business there, self storage does not generate as much traffic as other potential businesses could. Again, on a 3-acre parcel, that's pretty, pretty big for a potential business entity or entities. As staff indicated, continuing A-1 on that site really doesn't make sense. Staff noted the surrounding uses our industrial and business. So it just seems to be a compatible use. I know some folks have had some concern about how many self storage places are we going to have in Stafford County, and particularly on 17. It's really not, for better or worse, one of the criteria we can use in deciding whether or not something should or should not be approved. So all things being considered, it's certainly not the worst thing that can go on that site. I think it's probably going to be useful to some people. And I think it as again, as businesses go, it's compatible with that specific area. So for those reasons, I'm not going to support the motion, Mr. English. Okay, last call for comments. Okay, so the motion on the floor is recommending denial of the reclassification Banks Ford Self Storage. Please cast... let's see. So if you're voting in favor of the motion, you're going to vote Yes. And if you're not going to vote in favor, you're going to vote no. Okay, so the motion recommending denial fails on a vote of four to three (*Mr. Apicella, Mr. Bain, Mr. McPherson, Mr. Cummings opposed*). Is there a counter motion?

Mr. Bain: I will make a motion to approve reclassification RC21153768.

Mr. McPherson: Second.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further comments, Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. McPherson? Anybody else?

Mr. Randall: Yes. I should have made a comment before. I think the GDP needs to be fixed. I don't have a problem with the shortage unit there. Just because we can doesn't mean we should. You know, if we can, if we have room to put more space in there, then let's do it. You know, the fact that we've done... we haven't done it anywhere else is a poor excuse, in my opinion. If we have the opportunity to make it wider, let's make it wider. If we have the opportunity to take one of those out so that we have more space so that people aren't cramped – I've used some of those before. I've used some that are great. And they have wide spots, and you can turn anywhere else. And my truck that has a horrible turning radius doesn't have any problems. And then I've been in some where it's like a sardine can. And you're like, yeah, here they are trying to stuff as much as they can in here just so they can make money. Right? We're past that. Right? Let's get it something that's, that's comfortable, that's good, that's applicable, that meets what we want, which is, if we can make it better, if we can move that out and bump it out, if we can take one of those out because we want to make sure that there's room for everybody, that four people can go in there at one time that happen to have the same space, they don't have to wait. Let's do it. The fact that we've done it before and it's been just fine everywhere else, is a bad excuse. So I'm sorry, I don't mean to get... but that doesn't work here anymore. At least with me. So that's the reason I'm going to continue to deny. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, any other comments? Okay, I'm just going to say for the same reasons I voted no on the recommended denial I'm voting yes on the recommended approval. So with that said, the recommendation in front of us at this point is for approval of the reclassification of Banks Ford Self Storage. Please cast your vote. Okay, that motion carries four to three (*Mr. English, Ms. Barnes, Mr. Randall opposed*). Mr. English, I'm going to pass the baton back to you; this is in your district. So, on the CUP what's...

Mr. English: On the CUP21153821 also the same as for the reclassification because of the road, I'm recommending denial also on that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Is there a second?

Mr. Randall: Yes, I'll second that.

Mr. Apicella: Alright. Any further comments, Mr. English or Mr. Randall? Anybody else? Okay, so there's a... that's true. If someone would like to make a substitute motion recommending approval, they could.

Mr. McPherson: I can go ahead and make it. I'd like to make a substitute motion to approve CUP20153403, the conditional use permit. Oh, my apologies. CUP21153821.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments Mr. McPherson?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: Same as before.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bain? Anybody else? Okay. So the motion, substitute motion in front of us is recommending approval of Conditional Use Permit, Banks Ford Self Storage. Please cast your vote. Is that how you intended to vote, Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Oh, I'm sorry. No. Can I revote?

Mr. Apicella: How do we do that? I think he made an error, Ms. Lucian.

Ms. Lucian: That's fine. you guys can... inaudible, microphone not on.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Okay. Again, the motion in front of us is recommending approval of Conditional Use Permit Banks Ford Self Storage. So if you're in favor of the conditional use permit, you would vote yes. If you're opposed to it, you would vote no. Cast your vote. Okay. Motion carries 4 to 3 (*Mr. English, Ms. Barnes, Mr. Randall opposed*). Alright. Thank you very much everybody. Items 7 and 8 are deferred until October. So next item on the agenda, Mr. Harvey.

7. RC20153402; Reclassification – Orris Estates - A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 43-74A, consisting of 12.78 acres (Property), to allow for the development of up to 25 single-family dwellings. The Property is located at the terminus of Manorwood Drive, approximately 350 feet east of Royal Crescent Way, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: December 17, 2021) (History: September 8, 2021 Public Hearing Continued to October 27, 2021)**
8. CUP20153403; Conditional Use Permit – Orris Estates - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a cluster subdivision with increased residential density of up to 2.25 dwelling units per acre in the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 43-74A (Property). The increased residential density would allow up to 25 single-family dwelling units on the Property. The Property consists of 12.78 acres, located at the terminus of Manorwood Drive, approximately 350 feet east of Royal Crescent Way, within the Hartwood Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent zoning reclassification request. **(Time Limit: December 17, 2021) (History: September 8, 2021 Public Hearing Continued to October 27, 2021)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, next item on the agenda is Unfinished Business, discussing the Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update. Mike Zuraf will be leading the discussion for staff. Staff notes that we have some other participants in the audience that are interested in the discussion over whether or not the Urban Services Area should be adjusted in the Clift Farm Road area. And staff would ask consideration we made to discuss that topic first.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so Mr. Zuraf, can we start with the Clift Farm discussion? And if you have something to brief, go ahead, I do have some questions that I'd like to ask on that.

9. Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so just as a reminder, you know, we went through this, the proposed modifications to the Urban Services Area at your last, your meeting last week, your special meeting. And one of the modifications involved reduction of the Urban Services Area to exclude properties along Clift Farm Road, including property owned by the School Board. That modification, in addition to removing that property from the Urban Services Area, also then would change the Future Land Use designation from Suburban to Agriculture/Rural. And so there was discussion last week about this with a representative from the School Board staff and there was a desire to kind of get some, go back and get some additional input. And we have the School Board staff here. We also have Economic Development staff here as well to add some commentary. And one of the questions... one of the issues brought up was the proximity to the airport. It was mentioned that in relation to the Stafford Regional Airport, the site is kind of on the fringes of the airport overlay. It's partly within the kind of outer conical zone and then the kind of fringe of the approach to runway – I forget which runway number it is – but, so how that relates to the Comp Plan. We have our land use recommendations that that relate to different uses that provide guidance and as it relates to schools, it kind of is identified as an additional review kind of recommendation that is just going to be scrutinized a little bit better, but it doesn't, you know, outright say a school's not recommended in this location. The other point raised was that it is also in the kind of pattern of private landing strip in Dogwood Air Park, which is just immediately to the west. And so that was pointed out as well. And we don't have any kind of overlay related to that or land use guide guidance related to that landing strip. That's kind of the basics. And I think at this point, maybe we'll turn it back for questions and maybe discussion with the other folks who are here.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Well, I have some questions to start off with. So, just so we're all on the same page, the property, how big is the property? Do we know?

Mr. Zuraf: Approximately 180 acres.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And it's technically owned by the School Board, not the County of Stafford.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So one of the concerns that was raised by my colleagues and some members of the public was what would happen if the school board decided to sell the property for development? So if, and I'm not suggesting the School Board's going to do that, but if they choose to sell the property tomorrow, what's the maximum yield that the developer could get on that parcel based on the 6 units per acre?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it likely would be 3 units an acre under the Comp Plan would be the realistic...

Mr. Apicella: Three units an acre? That's a lot. It's... isn't it 6?

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, under A-1... under... okay. The maximum Comp Plan designation, yes. So, I apologize. So that is 30 dwelling units.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And so if the developer purchased the property they could build homes by-right, whether the parcel is inside or outside the USA, is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So that itself is not a contributing factor to whether or not it should or should not be in the USA. Would you say that's fair? Under either scenario. If the property is outside the USA, what would

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

the requirement be for a developer on a parcel that's inside... I'm sorry, if it's outside the USA, could they develop the property on water and septic?

Mr. Zuraf: Water and septic or water?

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, yeah. I'm sorry, on private well and septic.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. They would be required to develop it with private wells and septic drainfields.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And if they're inside the USA, what's the requirement?

Mr. Zuraf: They would have to connect to public, the public water and sewer system.

Mr. Apicella: And where's the nearest connection points for public water and sewer?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it's going to be... I'm not positive. Just to the west is the Hickory Ridge subdivision. And so within that neighborhood is where the closest connection would be.

Mr. Apicella: But it's not immediately up to...

Mr. Zuraf: No, not immediately up to the property line.

Mr. Apicella: ... the property line. So it would cost some money for a developer if it were inside the USA to extend the lines to the parcel.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Is the parcel in the cluster map?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Wait, let me check.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, it is. It's in the Urban Services Area.

Mr. Zuraf: I was pretty certain it was, but I just...

Mr. Apicella: So again, it could be those, if they wanted to build up to 30 units, they don't necessarily have to build it right up against somebody else's property, if at all they chose to do that.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: And in order to do anything that's not by-right, including any business or industrial uses not allowed in the A-1 district, what would the parcel owner need to do?

Mr. Zuraf: They would have to request a zoning reclassification.

Mr. Apicella: And there's certainly no guarantee that coming forward with a rezoning is going to get somebody something other than a by-right use on an A-1 parcel if they own that property.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: And, of course, that whole process requires scrutiny, and it probably involves public participation, and I'll call it political approval before any change happens.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: The school system, do they have the ability to build schools on that property now? There's no other requirement that they'd have to go through? They don't have to do a CUP, they don't have to do a rezoning. They're currently authorized to put schools on that property?

Mr. Zuraf: Unless they need a use permit for height. That might be an issue depending on the type of school that they're building.

Mr. Apicella: And if someone, again, going back to the thought process of whether the parcel is inside or outside the USA, if it's inside the USA, and they... and someone does not connect to water and sewer, you mentioned that normally they could build up to 30 units on an A-1 property, but they did not connect to water and sewer, public water and sewer, how many units could they build?

Mr. Zuraf: Sorry, can you repeat that?

Mr. Apicella: I'm just kind of going through a logic trail here. Somebody buys this parcel. They don't connect to public water and sewer as required. How many units could they build?

Mr. Zuraf: Zero.

Mr. Apicella: Zero. So it's almost counterproductive, in my mind, to take the parcel out of the USA, because you can't build on it. If it stays inside the USA, the only way you could build on it without connecting to public water and sewer, again, which has some cost associated with it, would be to put it outside the USA, and you can build by-right 30 units if the soil, if they can find, you know, the wells and the soils allow it, right.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So zero inside the USA potentially versus 30 outside the USA. I'm not saying that's going to happen. I'm just saying that's one way of looking at this.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Everybody, I asked Mr. Zuraf, and Ms. Stinnette to provide a copy of what's allowable in A-1 by-right; what can be done by CUP and a special exception. I think that's helpful for context about what can happen on that parcel under those scenarios. Is there anything you wanted to say? You looked like you wanted to say something Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: No, no.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So there's not...

Mr. Zuraf: If you have questions about that, I don't have that list in front of me.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I call it my cheat sheet but there's not a lot that could happen. Really, you could only do single-family homes, if you wanted to do residential. And if you wanted to do more than 30 residential units or some business, again, you have to go through a rezoning process to take it from A-1 to some other zoning category.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So other questions for staff on the Clift Farm parcel?

Mr. Randall: Yes. Mr. Zuraf. One hundred eighty acres, was there any other land that was added to the, added to the Urban Services Area outside the 180 acres of the school property?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, other properties to the south of that school property. When this was expanded in 2009 timeframe?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Yeah, properties to the south of that school property located along Clift Farm Road were, all the way down to Leeland Road, were added.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So if we were to include the school property in the USA, does that... is there still a connection to the current USA so that we wouldn't necessarily be creating an island per se? Can I leave that in there, attach it some way to the current Urban Services Area, and then take the rest of the property out...

Mr. Apicella: Can you pull up the map?

Mr. Randall: I don't know if you have a map.

Mr. Apicella: Because I don't see the island that Mr. Randall sees, per se.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Randall, if there is a situation where we have this, the county school property connected to, still in the Urban Services Area, and adjacent to other areas in the Urban Services Area, but the need to extend the sewer and water goes outside the Urban Services Area, then that would be problematic for that situation. And that's the likely scenario since right now the current water and sewer inside the Urban Services Area is on Morton Road, so essentially, the service would have to come down Clift Farm Road to the where it intersects with Leeland Road and come back up Leeland Road to Morton Road to make the connection. So if you take out parts of the properties along Clift Farm Road, you could be in a situation where you're no longer allowing for the extension of water and sewer to that property without going through a separate review.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I appreciate what you said, but I can't visualize it. So if there's any way we could pull it up.

Mr. Harvey: We're working on that now.

Mr. Zuraf: Can I have the computer please? So does this help?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: As long as your drawing skills are worth anything. If your drawing skills are good, and you can draw somewhat of what we're talking about, that'd be great. Yeah, exactly.

Mr. Apicella: But I just want to be... the parcels to the left of the School Board property, what is that?

Mr. Zuraf: That is Hickory Ridge subdivision.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, and that's inside the USA.

Mr. Zuraf: That's inside, yes.

Mr. Apicella: So there's clearly a connection point from the School Board property in the USA, if it stays there, and another parcel, big parcel, that's also in the USA. I'm just speaking to the issue of this island. There's not... we had this in Brooke; I think that's what Mr. Randall is speaking to. It's not like the Brooke TGA, for example, that was outside of everything, not connected to anything, it was all by itself.

Mr. Randall: Right.

Mr. Apicella: That's not the same scenario that we would have.

Mr. Randall: And it may have been, it may have been a poor choice of words on my part. So tell me what you've just drawn. You've just drawn the boundary of the school property. Is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: That's the southern boundary of the school property.

Mr. Randall: Of the school property.

Mr. Zuraf: So this school property basically covers all of this up here.

Mr. Randall: All of that area.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And so now, taking what Mr. Harvey just mentioned, walk me through... we're going to make two assumptions here. One, and this is so everybody can see, the area closest to Leeland Road, right, is currently already under a specific... another separate project. Is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Right. And so that Urban Services Area separate project is still being worked on and we may see it later, okay?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Bain: And it will have water and sewer.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Brought to it.

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And then we have the school property at the top.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Randall: Alright. So we have heard a couple of times, and they've been very vocal about it, as most residents are when they think they're, that there's an issue. Those eight or nine property owners that are between those two have come to us and said that they would prefer to be outside of the Urban Services Area. They have given us several good reasons. I see no reason to go against that, right. Maybe when a time comes. So does that pose a problem for the County? If I take... the Clift Farm project's already there, I leave the school project in the Urban Services Area, does that cause a problem if I take that particular section and I make that section light green, for example? Maybe I should be asking Mr. Harvey...

Mr. Zuraf: I was not, I was not listening to my boss earlier when I was looking for a map, so...

Mr. Randall: So now, Mr. Harvey, now you can help Mike draw the lines that you just mentioned to talk us through why that's a problem.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Commissioner Randall. As been shown on this graphic with the x's, that essential area with the x's would be outside the Urban Services Area from what you described. Therefore, we have a situation where in order to access water and sewer to the school property, you'd have to run water and sewer lines outside the Urban Services Area, which is prohibited by policy, and also may be prohibited in some instances by code. So, it could potentially create future additional steps that we'd have to go through in order for the schools to develop their property for school purposes, or if the property is going to be developed for any other government related purpose.

Mr. Bain: Could you not run water and sewer across the stream? We cross streams all over the County with water and sewer and tie into the system in that adjoining neighborhood.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, from what we know there are some constraints that there are no utility easements stubbed to the property. So that would require the County acquiring easements across property owners property or an open space, if it's available, and if that's a viable connection point. Also, we would have the concern in the Hickory Ridge neighborhood because many of those lots are served by low pressure sewer system and could not accommodate the sewer capacity that would be needed for at least one school on that property. So it'd probably have to have its own dedicated sewer line.

Mr. English: Jeff, the question... doesn't water, I mean, water and sewer, does it run down Morton Road? Would it stop at Morton and Leeland?



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner English, there is water and sewer on Morton Road. It ends close to the intersection, and I can't... at Cherry Laurel Drive if I recall correctly. So it's fairly, you know, it's fairly in up on Morton Road.

Mr. English: Okay, so it doesn't go the full length of Morton Road. I thought it did.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. It doesn't come.. the sewer doesn't come all the way to the intersection with Leeland; I believe water might.

Mr. English: Okay, I think it does, but...

Ms. Barnes: Jeff, can I clarify something? You said that if we pulled that center chunk out, and we would have a problem possibly extending the water and sewer outside of the Urban Services Area, and then back into the Urban Services Area for the school property. You said there are several steps that we can take?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, it could either require a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review, which would be a separate public hearing with the Planning Commission, or a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make a special exception for the situation.

Ms. Barnes: But it's possible.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: So we could do this, it might, it might make a couple of steps. We could leave the school in the Urban Services Area, take that center chunk, those folks there that kind of got dragged in, probably didn't even know it, and still be able to leave the school property in the Urban Services Area, we could do it. It would require some extra steps, like you said, but it is possible.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And just to recall the discussion that we had, I think it was on the 7<sup>th</sup>, my dates are... I can't remember, or the 15<sup>th</sup>, when we went through this and we had the school system online, they did not have an objection to taking the, I'll call it that middle section, out of the Urban Services Area. Is that correct? As I recall the conversation?

Mr. Zuraf: That's my recollection.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further questions?

Ms. Barnes: Well, I think that for the sake of those folks in the center, that it may, it may produce a little extra work on our part in the future, if that land is ever... if we ever took water and sewer out there. I think it'd be worth it for those folks in the middle there for us to be able to do that; to take it out of there.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, what I recall is nobody objected to taking those folks out. The only issue that was... I think that's where we were headed. The only issue was whether or not the School Board property would stay in or go out. So that's kind of really where the discussion is. Do you think it's worthwhile to bring up... I know the folks from Economic Development wanted to talk and/or the folks from the school system?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Well, the question is, if we just... if the decision is made to leave it in, do you need to come up and convince us to leave it in?

[Laughter]

Mr. Apicella: Well, let me just kind of poll the folks here.

Mr. Randall: If we're on the fence, by all means, you can talk to us all you want. But if we think that it's... we're okay taking that section, middle section out and leaving it in for all the reasons you're going to come up here and tell us about it, you can still talk. I'm just saying that there's, yeah, it may be or be brief. How's that?

Mr. White: I'll be really brief. Our interest is in leaving the school property in the USA boundary. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Wow. I'm sorry that you waited so long to say that.

Mr. Holden: Members of the Commission, John Holden, Economic Development and Tourism. If there were to be other sites, and this site has been looked at for other specifically data center sites, because it has been identified by Dominion as one of the top sites in the County. If the school weren't to have it, for example, that's one reason we would, from an economic development standpoint, have... desire it to be in the Urban Service Area. Secondly...

Mr. Apicella: Because you need water for a data center, right?

Mr. Holden: Yes. And that leads to my next point, just so you're aware. If the middle area were not in the Urban Service Area, and there were extra steps to go through that, that increases the time to get something permitted, which is for data centers the most important thing. So you make it less competitive as a site, if that were to be a possible site, because it would take extra steps and time to get it permitted to have it be a site used in that manner. Secondly, to come from another direction would probably be significantly different costs. We've had some estimates done on this. It's about \$2 million to get water and sewer into that site for data center use from the current way it could go. If we were to go a different direction across streams or something else, I think that would be significantly higher. So just so you're aware that if it were not used for a school, economic development-wise and county-wise, we would like it to be considered as a data center. That's a whole nother subject with the School Board, of course, and the County. And if the intermediate area were not in the Urban Service Area, it would lower the marketability of that site as a data center site.

Mr. Apicella: So, can we pull up the slide that you had just a second ago? So I hear what you're saying, Mr. Holden, and I appreciate where you're coming from. But put yourself in the shoes of these people who are really in an island at the moment and cannot subdivide, because they're required to get water, public water and public sewer, again, which is cost prohibitive for them at this point in time. So they've asked for relief. I think we all sympathize with the situation that they're in. They didn't ask to be put in the Urban Services Area. It was just a convenience, I think, in drawing the map. It was easy to draw the map this way. So I feel their pain. And I understand why they want to get out of the Urban Services Area. And I'm inclined to and I appreciate the predicament it puts you in and maybe we can have a conversation if there's anything we can do now to fix that problem up front. I don't know if that's possible. But I'm trying to find a win-win solution here. And...

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Holden: I wanted the Commission to be aware of that part... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Apicella: Right. I definitely...

Mr. Holden: ... which I'm not sure you'd been aware of.

Mr. Apicella: No, I do appreciate that. And I understand and appreciate it complicates things. But it's already complicated for the people who are already there. And...

Mr. Bain: And the way I look at it, to put a data center or any other use of a business nature, you're looking at a long time period for reclassification anyway. The time period to resolve the water and sewer issues, probably a minor component, because that's something that could be done even during... after approval of reclassification.

Mr. Apicella: It can be done concurrently, right? We can do a Comp Plan amendment at the same time.

Mr. Bain: Sure, sure. I don't see it as maybe it's a minor element. But if that's the live or die decision, then that data center shouldn't have gone there anyway.

Mr. Apicella: No, we do appreciate the perspective of Economic Development and what you're trying... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Randall: Yeah. I want to make sure we're clear. We want to be positive for data centers. Alright? So yes we want to be positive for data centers. So yes, I understand. I understand your comment. And again, I'm not sure how soon the decision will be made between the schools, whether they need it or not. It's been a long time since they've had it. Whether or not that happens quickly. But to the point of my colleagues, I think there's something we can do to, once that decision's been made, that we're not going to do one way and we're going to do something else, then we can probably pivot fairly quickly to mitigate any issues that you may have.

Mr. Holden: As I said, I just wanted the Commission to be aware of this... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. Well, we appreciate it.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Mr. Holden.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So, what I'm hearing and I think it's a consensus is that we would, we would ease the pain of these poor individuals who have suffered and have been unable to subdivide their property by taking them outside the USA. Is there anybody who disagrees with that? Mr. Harvey, is it, given the issue that Mr. Holden raised, is there anything we could do at this point, as part of the Comp Plan update to address it now? Or is it only something that could be addressed, no pun intended, downstream?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, there is language in the Comp Plan where we have limited sewer and water services areas. We could add additional language to address this specific situation, maybe in that area. But it would be more so dealing with the text than the maps as far as what we'd have to change. I see Mr. Smith is here from the County Administrator's Office. I'm not sure if he wanted to say something because he's moved up toward the front of the audience.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Nobody caught that, right, except Jeff.

Mr. Smith: Hello, Mike Smith, Deputy County Administrator, also former Utilities Director. I will just note that if you take that section out, there will be almost no way to get water and sewer back to there, as mentioned before, because we can't come through that neighborhood with a dedicated water and sewer and then cross that creek because we'd have to take out too many houses. It would be impossible to do that as far as economically, whether it was a school or a data center. And the idea is that if the school decides that they do not need this property as a school, they would declare a surplus, the Board would have the opportunity to obtain that, as they then build a new high school somewhere, nobody knows where. And then that could then be marketed, and the Board could reclassify that ahead of it being marketed so that it can be done. So, if you take that section out, and if there is development coming in those blue x's, that water would be right there next to those people so they could still subdivide. So taking those people out of the Urban Service Area doesn't necessarily, at this time, give them any more advantage than it would if that development came in, or if a County development came in down the road.

Mr. Apicella: Right. But at this point in time, they cannot subdivide because they're in the USA, and they're held to the requirement to hook up to water and sewer in order to subdivide.

Mr. Smith: Right. And I don't know what the size of those parcels are or if they have any... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, they're all subdividable. So you're saying, logistically, there's no way to run a water line if we take these parcels out?

Mr. Smith: Right. There's no way to do it that is feasible economically.

Mr. Apicella: Well, what does that mean, feasibly economically? Is there a price tag you're talking about? A threshold?

Mr. Smith: I would raise the price by three times, so it just... it wouldn't happen.

Mr. Randall: You mean doing it across the stream.

Mr. Smith: Not just across the stream, because you have to come through that neighborhood. So you'd have to buy out several of those houses. And you'd have to... because all of those are low pressure sewer systems, so they don't have the capacity. So you have to increase all that capacity. And so you'd have to take out half of those houses... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, we're willing to agree to that. We're saying if you came up Clift Farm Road... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Mr. Randall: If you came up Clift Farm Road, I'm not talking about that, I'm not talking about the...

Mr. Smith: If you came up Clift Farm Road, then yeah, you'd have to put all those areas back in the Urban Services Area. So you take them out and put them back in.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, that's what we're anticipating.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but they could have already subdivided by that point in time and gotten the relief that they're looking for, right.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Smith: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Thank you very much.

Audience member: *Inaudible, not at microphone...* pipes down the street.

Mr. Apicella: So, what I heard was, from Mr. Harvey, there may be a way that at least textually we might deal with the issue. Do we want to give staff the authority to look into that and make that change if they think it's something that would help facilitate water and sewer going up to the school system, to the school site, or whatever that site winds up being? Is that something we could charge them with now? I don't think we could draft the language here at the dais.

Mr. Randall: We just need to identify where, where that language needs to be. And then, you know, we can, we can maybe have others work on it while we're doing other things.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, we have that section in the beginning of Chapter 3 in the beginning of the Land Use Plan; that does reference the water sewer, the sewer service area that's outside of the Urban Service Area out in the Hartwood... Rock Hill area, and several of the rows... the rows kind of subdivisions out there.

Mr. Randall: Well, let's identify when we get there. I think to the point that we've made then, I think the decision that we're going to drive forward is to leave the school property in the Urban Services Area, and take that center section out that's in the green. Now, what does that mean, what does that mean for advertisement? Is that going to be a problem if that's the decision that's made? We can advertise it that way, correct? And then the Board could do what? The Board could leave it in?

Ms. Lucian: Which part are you talking about?

Mr. Randall: The center part.

Ms. Lucian: The center part?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, if they decide they want to just leave that whole section, they could leave it in...

Ms. Lucian: Yes.

Mr. Randall: ... without... because it's currently in, right? Is that correct?

Ms. Lucian: Right. If you advertise that you're going to take it out, they can make the decision to put it back in.

Mr. Randall: Alright.

Mr. Cummings: I have a question. I'm tracking with everything. And I'm... with the revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, the revision to language is around a value that we're trying to address. Because I want to make sure that we're just not doing ad hoc.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I don't think it's a value. I think it's a situation that we're trying to accommodate with some language changes...

Mr. Cummings: But my concern is...

Mr. Apicella: ... to make that happen.

Mr. Cummings: But my concern is making ad hoc changes or to address an ad hoc problem and making that change into the Comprehensive Plan without it sort of reaching an overriding overarching value, and the competing values right now, or goals are commercial viability, potentially education, you know, what the county... and we have to sort of try to find a way to, to reconcile it a little bit in terms of, in terms so that we can determine what language we actually use in the Comp Plan modification.

Mr. Apicella: I hear what you're saying, I don't disagree. In some ways, we're playing Solomon here, right? We're trying to accommodate two divergent needs, right, the need for these folks to get out of the Urban Services Area, while retaining the ability of either the school system or some future other use, requiring water and sewer to occur on that now school site. And, you know, again, we're trying to do it so it doesn't detriment one side or the other.

Mr. Cummings: And all I'm saying is, we don't need to... we need to be careful about how precise or to this particular situation we make the change. I think there's enough...

Mr. Apicella: So you're saying don't make it general, make it specific?

Mr. Cummings: No, no, I'm saying the opposite. I'm saying let's, let's think about the larger value and goals that we want, and put in view, and put that language into the Comp Plan.

Mr. Apicella: My concern would be about the unintended consequences of making something too broad. We know what we're trying to fix here. It's a very specific set of circumstances, in this particular case. But it could happen elsewhere. And if we open the door, we don't know what the ramifications are. Unfortunately, we're, we're in a bad spot here. We have to advertise at... we have to decide to advertise something for a meeting in October. We don't have the ability of knowing what that language, unless it can be come up with on the fly, which I doubt, I think it's going to take some legal review, I think we, the best we can do is give a general charge to staff and our counsel to develop some language to allow what we're trying to have happen between now and the advertisement and fit within the parameters of the advertisement. Am I making sense? Again, we always have to be careful about unintended consequences. If we had another two weeks, and we could see what that language looked like, great. But we're up against a wall against a, you know, hard wall that we can't get past. So either we fix the problem, or we don't fix the problem. And then it, you know, it's something that's going to linger out into the future and become problematic, as Mr. Holden said, if and when they try to do something else with that parcel, even if even if it stays as a school parcel.

Mr. Cummings: So the problem we're trying to fix is to alleviate, to give the homeowners the ability to subdivide.

Mr. Apicella: Based on the fact that since they're... Yes, if they stay inside the USA, they're not going to be able to subdivide, it's too, too expensive for them to do it.

Mr. Cummings: And that translates into a Comp Plan amendment or...

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: We change the map. That part's easy. We just change the map and take them outside, those, I don't know how many was it, 7, 8 parcels out of the USA.

Mr. Cummings: Okay, alright.

Mr. Bain: And they're, they're looking for family subdivision, not general subdivision.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, family subdivisions are not... they're exempt from the water, mandatory connection requirement in the USA. But non-family subdivisions are not.

Mr. Bain: I was not aware of that. That, to me, that changes things. Because the citizens that have come before us have implied they were looking for family subdivisions. And if that's the case, then we don't need to change the boundary. If they can do a family subdivision and have water and well and septic...

Mr. English: Even if they're in the USA.

Mr. Bain: ... even if they're in the USA, then there's no need to change the boundary.

Ms. Barnes: I don't think they were aware of that either.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Well, I mean, obviously they've reached out to us. I wish Mr. Roulette was here, because he was the advocate for that group of people. I don't know that that's the case 100% of the time for those eight parcels.

Mr. Randall: If I could, I think that was just one aspect of it. You know, they're not there because they wanted to be there. They're there because they got added to it. I don't think we should surmise why they do or don't want to be out. But when they say they want to be out, I think we just take them out and we'll deal with it. Right? I don't think we need to try to figure it out right now why their only reason they want to be outside. They've mentioned that they want to be outside, they gave a couple of reasons. We don't know that's not the only reason. So let's take it out. Let's make it done. We need to move on. We got two hours more work to do with this Comp Plan so...

Mr. Apicella: Easily. Alright...

Mr. Randall: ... let's do this.

Mr. Apicella: ... so, again, we're all agreed what I'm hearing. Take the other parcels out. And when we get to that point in the document, we'll re-address the issue and the charge to staff to work on some language to address the future needs of the school site, and allowing them some ability.

Mr. Harvey: And, Mr. Chairman, if I could direct you to page 3.4, or 3-4 in the document at your desk. That's where it discusses the limited water and sewer utility areas. And I'd recommend that we add a third water and sewer utility area and refer to it as Clift Farm Road and have a narrative in there explaining that this area is located between two segments of the Urban Services Area. It's not planned for higher density development. However, water and sewer by necessity needs to run through here. And that water and sewer be designed that it would not accommodate more than what's currently planned for in that area, or something to that effect.

Mr. Apicella: Does everybody agree with that?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So let it be written.

Mr. Apicella: I was just going to use that.

Ms. Barnes: Let it be.

Mr. Harvey: That would result in us also creating another map showing that area, too.

Mr. Apicella: Right. So that's the second piece of what we're asking you all to do. So everybody's comfortable with giving the charge to staff to do what we just said and to use some language that close to what Mr. Harvey said. So a map change and a language change. Got it? Are we good?

Mr. Bain: Go for it. Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Alright. So I think we've addressed the school Clift Farm parcel. So we want to go back through the document starting with Chapter 1.

Mr. McPherson: Are we only going to be re-reviewing things that we changed or didn't talk about last week?

Mr. Randall: This is the final document. Everything needs... everything we're going to go through here is to make sure that it's good to go for approval, for announcement tomorrow, advertisement tomorrow. So yes.

Mr. Apicella: So again, just to kind of put a square on this, we're going to go through it, but we're not going to go through every single change that's already been discussed at the previous meeting. We're going to talk about the changes that have been made since then, right. We all agreed to the document as it was written, but for some additional changes that we asked for. Are you able to do that based on the way that you've drafted the document?

Mr. Zoraf: Yeah, you know, I didn't know if you wanted a quick summary of each chapter or just kind of focus on the changes or things that need to be...

Mr. Apicella: Well, we had a work session, So I think we...

Mr. Zoraf: We've kind of gone through it, yeah, okay.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, and that was open to the public. So let's again, time being what it is, let's just try to work our way through it as quickly as we can.

Mr. Zoraf: I'm fine with that. Alright. And so at the last meeting, Chapter 1, there were no comments or requests for any changes. So we will move to Chapter 2. Here, there were a few changes requested. And so yeah, we have the same process where we have the yellow highlighting for new language that was added. And I did not highlight every single little change if there were like it was mentioned, to change a word or add a period or something, I didn't highlight any of that. So the first new bit of information is page 2-2. That was something that, data we didn't have up till just recently, that identified economic information as far as the number, the percentage of employees who commute out of the county. So basically added the latest data that we have to show that the trend is heading downward slightly. As far as the percentage of employee, of workers in the county who commute out.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Mike, you can just say we updated the data. I think that's good.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Randall: Hold on. Hold on. Sorry.

Mr. Zuraf: See?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Of course it would be Bart.

Mr. Randall: Well, if you're going to do it, you've got to do it right.

Mr. Bain: Give us time to read it, but then we'll move on.

Mr. Randall: So, you say it will diversify and expand over the last two decades the number of workers commuting out of the county has reduced, right? I don't like language, but as reduced. In 2000, 71% commuted out of the county. In 2008, this number improved? How does a number improve from 71 down to 58? It doesn't improve.

Mr. Zuraf: Improve as in fewer people commuting out.

Mr. Randall: Is that... I'm not sure that's the term that you want to use. It doesn't improve to go down, unless you write it and we didn't write that way. So it lowered, it reduced, it decreased. My guess is this number decreased to approximately 58%. And then decreased again to 55.5% according to US Census. Alright, that's all I have.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but I think the overarching point here is that over time...

Mr. Randall: Yep, it's going down.

Mr. Apicella: ... it's going down. Do we, can you say something along those lines? And I'll trust that you capture it that way? That's the point you're trying to make.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Yep.

Mr. Zuraf: Go to page 2-10. This was the new policy referring to utility scale solar energy, and there was a desire, a request to add in additional parameters to clarify that the facilities would be sited to avoid development. Yeah. And so... let's see.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, you captured what I asked for.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: It looks like you got what I asked for on 2-15 adding Route 1 and 17 as pass-throughs.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: 2-12, did we update 2-12?

Mr. Zuraf: So 2-12 is that, those are the data tables in the appendix, which some of the, one of the things that I still need to complete. And so that will, the appendix data will basically change that... likely modify that number of 92,000. So that's a number that needs to be updated.

Mr. Randall: Will that be a substantive change to make that change? Or will it be done tomorrow before we advertise it?

Mr. Zuraf: The ad does not need to go out tomorrow. We have a week.

Mr. Apicella: Right, no, but just to clarify, because I've had this conversation with counsel. Data, facts, figures, that's not a substantive change. That can be changed all the way up to the date of the public hearing.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright. No, no, that's fine. Okay. I just want to make sure we're clear on that. And then do we want to announce that you have another week and why do we have another week?

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, yeah, so well, just... yeah, what's going to happen is the intent is to have a joint public hearing on the plan with the Board of Supervisors on October 19<sup>th</sup>, which there's another joint public hearing at that same meeting. So this will piggyback with the other case.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so this gives you, this gives you a couple extra days to...

Mr. Zuraf: Gives an extra week to finish...

Mr. Randall: To finish up the substantive changes that we have.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So, I just need to lock myself in a vault to get this data numbers all complete so.

Mr. Randall: Roger that.

Mr. Zuraf: Then page 2-25, another point where we again have the reference to utility scale solar and adding in the references to public drinking water sources and ensuring setbacks from residential uses. Okay. Then I think that is it for Chapter 2.

Mr. Randall: Mike, make sure you holler at us when you get to the trail section, please.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. So, while we're, you know, the first part of Chapter 3, as we've already discussed, the section that begins on page 3-4, we will go ahead and add in an additional limited water/sewer utility area discussion and specific text to refer to that section of Clift Farm Road that will be out of the Urban Service Area, and some reference to highlight that area on a map and to explain this is an area where water and sewer will be allowed to traverse to and maybe explain to get to the property to the north.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. Harvey, what was the title for that? Would it be the Clift Farm water and sewer service area?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Commissioner Randall, we need to include both water and sewer. So it'd be different than Rock Hill and Hartwood because Rock Hill is sewer only, Hartwood is water only.

Mr. Randall: That's why I asked to make sure that we covered both of those.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, sir.

Mr. Randall: Okay, and then does the Commission need to see the writing for that? Do we need to have it emailed to us? Are we good with having...?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, we can't do that, because then we're having a meeting. So again, I think we're giving the charge to staff to be able to draw up the language in large part based on what Mr. Harvey already said.

Mr. Randall: Well, we can have the language drafted now. We're going to be here for a while.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think it... I really think it needs some legal review, just to be sure. I mean, I'm pretty sure Mr. Harvey gave us a close approximation to what it's going to look like. Mr. Harvey, what's your view on this?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, staff will take the direction of the Commission. Our preference would be for us to be able to come back from this meeting with direction, prepare the wording and map that was requested, and rely on that direction from the Planning Commission. If there's some minor tweaks or adjustments, we could talk about that at the October 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. But, again, it's going to be more than likely an issue of word preference, not substance.

Mr. Apicella: Right. Can everybody live with that?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, so that first packet of Chapter 3, all the way through page 3-27, there were no other changes. Then we have the next part of Chapter 3 that begins with Section 3.6. Here, the first change of significance is to page 3-26. We had added in a more broad discussion of potential TDA development, promotion, and incentives to encourage development in the TDAs. So I'll leave you a moment to read through that.

Mr. McPherson: Do we need to define what the simplify application requirements would be?

Mr. Apicella: So what I read is, this is number one, not all inclusive. And number two, something that's going to be worked on in the future to kind of hammer out what those, you know, these are more generalities. And then there would be some policy developed to implement this.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, yes, and that's where we added in reference to work through the Planning Commission and Board if there's anything

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Yes, this was a major focus that we had trying to figure out a way to make this go quicker. So no, this is a great area to start a couple of times because we definitely need to work on I guess codifying what it is we have in here as actionable items for this. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: And we can again further engage the development community on...

Mr. Randall: Yeah, for sure.

Mr. Apicella: ... what works for them.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, that'll be good.

Mr. Zuraf: So page 3-48, these again, more data crunching. The sections in each of the of the Targeted Development Areas where we estimate different facility needs, that's something that still needs to be updated. And that's tying back to tables from the appendix that need to be updated. So that's the... you'll see that in each of the TDAs, I'm not gonna point each one out.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, is 361 next?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, same thing. That's the next one. 3-68's another one. We fixed the TDA maps for Berea and Falmouth Gateway to remove the other adjacent Targeted Development Area. Just a map correction there. Those are on, or on around 3-66 and 3-71.

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. Zuraf, on 3-67, you have a section here that's grayed out that's got, it's highlighted. Is there a particular reason why?

Mr. Zuraf: That was carry over some, we tried to clear out all old comments, and sometimes it doesn't clear out. And so this just picked up some... there was an old comment from the work previously done. So that all will be removed.

Mr. Randall: Okay, great, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So I do have a substantive policy issue here. I'm looking at the map for the Falmouth Gateway, just as an example. And I see a lot of...

Mr. Randall: What page are you on?

Mr. Apicella: I'm on page 371. And they're different... there's different color coding to designate the types of uses that we would expect on these different areas. And what I... what'd really concern me is what's happened in the past, is someone takes a look at a couple of these yellow lots, parcels and says, okay, I can start building a bunch of homes and I don't have to do anything else. And I'm hoping that we've sufficiently indicated elsewhere in the policy that that's not the case; that you need to look at these other areas and do some mixed use. Have we done that sufficiently?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, we added in that...

Mr. Apicella: I just want to be sure we're on the same page, because I don't... staff and the Planning Commission and ultimately the Board, that there's no discontinuity here or in continuity, that when somebody comes in with a yellow only zoning request, that that's not good enough.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Well, in the introduction to the Targeted Development Areas, we have a whole new paragraph that identifies the need to mix residential and phase in residential development with commercial.

Mr. Apicella: A mix of residential and commercial.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right.

Mr. Apicella: Not just mix of residential, but... alright, so we are on the same page.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Alright.

Mr. Bain: Just a comment. I know this is a draft map, but boy, it'd be nice to get some road names included on those. There's only one road, Old Forge Drive I see.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. Okay, alright, page 3-82. This is the spot where the Boswell's Corner Targeted Development Area, the request was to add narrative to basically identify and clarify that this TDA has a different purpose than the other TDA. It's more commercial development oriented, and then follow the same construct as the others. And ran out of time and didn't get that one done yet. So that will be new language that will be added.

Mr. Apicella: So just to throw it out there, ask my peers. Would you have great angst if we just added the word to targeted commercial development area? Or does that just really mess up the works?

Mr. Bain: That messes it up. Because then you can't use the TDA acronym... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Apicella: Aww, darn it.

Mr. Randall: Make it the same construct, make the focus at the top more of a commercial versus a residential, and go from there.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, so I think it's bottom line upfront, right? So that nobody gets confused of the primary purpose of this... *inaudible.*

Mr. Randall: And that's what we've done with all the other TDAs at this point. We've listed at the very beginning, you know, what is it that this consists of. We have a near term and a far term... near term and a far term emphasis, you know, follow the same construct, but I... yeah. I think it should look relatively the same for outline.

Mr. Zuraf: Next was, okay, oh, page 3-102.

Ms. Barnes: That was my addition, I believe.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so this is adding in language to recommend larger lot sizes at the perimeter of the Urban Services Area.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Can you bold that or something? Or put a little note by it.

Ms. Barnes: I don't like this wording, I hate to say it. I would just like to see where it says one-half to one acre lots or larger towards the boundary of the Urban Services Area. And that's it. I don't want to put the whole one acre, I mean, that seems more specific than it needs to be. So one-fourth to one-half acre lots or larger towards the boundary of the Urban Services Area.

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Ms. Barnes: No, no, no, that's up here. It says typically on one-fourth to one acre lots or larger towards the boundary of the Urban Services Area. And to me that just, that's actually really simple and allows for larger lots.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, you got enough direction there?

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, so right actually in that first sentence, one acre.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah. I would just put a comma, yeah, or larger towards the boundary of the Urban Services Area. Let's pepper in some nice larger lots for some folks in there if we can. That's all it is.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Got it. Then page 3-111. More solar. Same issue. Added the reference to avoid residential developments and public drinking water sources.

Mr. Randall: So 104, Mike, go back to 104. That's gonna come out, that area that's grayed out. It's got some red.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: So is it safe to say that anything now that's got that is it's coming out, it didn't come out initially?

Mr. Zuraf: Right. Yeah, that will be removed.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, thank you.

Mr. McPherson: And Mike, I see that on 3-111, the Jefferson Davis Highway was replaced with US Route 1. So I assume, we don't have to look at every page, but I assume Jefferson Davis Highway everywhere in here had been replaced.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I did a search and replace.

Mr. McPherson: Perfect, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Is it good with the utility? Okay. Page 3-118. This is new. We hadn't gotten till now the, have some general development criteria for development adjacent to high voltage electric transmission

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

lines. And we applied it to developments inside the Urban Services Area, and some criteria for residential and some for commercial development.

Mr. Apicella: I like it, it's good.

Ms. Barnes: You put trees in there, thank you.

Mr. McPherson: What if the existing trees are too close to where the high power lines would be? Because that could cause power outages during storms.

Mr. Zuraf: If it's, well, I think the easement holder, Dominion, or if it's Dominion or another utility company, they will go ahead and remove them if they need to. And if it's outside of the easement area, that's I guess what that really is referring to.

Mr. McPherson: Yeah, outside.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. McPherson: If the easement's very narrow, those could still take out a power line. So that was my concern.

Mr. Zuraf: That could occur.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Commissioner McPherson, this section is dealing with high voltage lines, which typically have a wide easement rather than a narrow easement for local power distribution.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Barnes: And they make a great spot for trails. I'm just saying.

Mr. Zuraf: And page 3-122 again, this section is really updating the data. Again, data tables for the full kind of build-out. And Table 3.4 – the section needs to be updated.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, why are the... this is maybe a Microsoft issue or I don't know, why are these numbers KB 52, AB 53, showing up?

Mr. Zuraf: That was where comments during the review and...

Mr. Randall: It's Al Bain and Kristen Barnes.

Mr. Apicella: Ahhhh.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. So those will be removed.

Ms. Barnes: Oh, they'll be removed? I don't mind them staying.

Mr. Randall: There's no BR on there. I fell asleep during this part of the review.

Mr. Zuraf: And that was it for Chapter 3. Chapter 4, we have a guest speaker.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Finally, we have Joe.

Mr. Valotta: Hello, again, Planning Commissioners, Joe Valotta, Planning and Zoning. I do apologize for not having the pages numbered on this revised document. But I only have two or three items of interest to talk to you about. The first being in Section 4.41, which is the fourth page in. Initially, that paragraph used 2020 data for rideshare information. We've changed it to 2019 data. And then the next one is in regards to table 4.1, which is about 10 pages later. That is still an issue of updating the data for that table. Staff is still working on that.

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. Harvey, can I ask you a question? Will this need to be to and back from VDOT before we can have our public hearing? Or would it be access... would it be, would it be okay to have the public hearing with this still be out waiting for a comment from VDOT?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Randall, State Code requires that the County present the proposed change to VDOT for their review for adoption of the plan document. It says VDOT can take up to 90 days, or a shorter time period, if agreed upon between the locality and VDOT. I've reached out the Steven Haynes who's the Fredericksburg District Planner and made him aware of this coming. And he said he can't guarantee they'll have the written comments finalized by the public hearing, but we'll try to try to make it happen. And I've asked him if he would consider letting us know if there's any big ticket items before we get to the public hearing.

Mr. Randall: Okay, would those constitute substitute changes?

Mr. Harvey: It depends on what the comments might be.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: But if, for some reason there's a substantive change, we can come back and amend the Comp Plan again to address that issue if we need to. Or if there's an opportunity for deferral and some other action.

Mr. Randall: Would it make sense to take Chapter 4 out of the advertisement and then, and then, I don't know, look at it at another time? I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: So what I heard Mr. Harvey say, and that's true for anything in this document, the Comp Plan can always be amended. If we got something wrong or something needs to change, this body, along with a Board of Supervisors or the next Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission can make the fixes should VDOT come in with some showstopper changes.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. And the code also contemplates if VDOT provides written comments to the County and the County does not make changes to the plan, then they can go to the Commonwealth Transportation Board and the CTB could withhold funding. So if they give us comments back and they are substantive, again we can work on a separate amendment to address those specific issues. And there would be time to do that before VDOT would find the county non-responsive.

Mr. Apicella: I think we... I would suggest we keep it in. I think it'd be more problematic to take it out. I mean, transportation is it; that's the key issue here.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Well, no, I don't disagree. I just, you know, I'm trying to, I'm trying to get by the we can't get it approved unless VDOT agrees. A if VDOT doesn't agree, then, you know, how can we approve it? Or we approve it knowing that we have problems to it, and then we just fix it in January, you know, either way. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Joe, I just want you to make me a promise, that number one, you're going to put page numbers. And number two, this list is going to be 100%, you know, or as close to 100% as it can be when this thing goes to a public hearing.

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, we have, as Mike mentioned, we have about a week to data crunch. And that will be a number one priority.

Mr. Apicella: Right. But again, and Ms. Lucian can correct me if I'm wrong, this is still data. It falls in the rubric of data. And even past the advertisement date you can be working on this to tweak it and make sure it's where it needs to be on or before the 19<sup>th</sup>, right.

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, correct. Yes. And there will be page numbers. [*Laughter*] And the third and final item to bring to the Commission's attention is on the final page of the chapter, we've added a new section, section 4.16, Proposed North-South Corridors. We've added this section, along with a new map, figure 4.5, Proposed North-South Corridors. And we've given a general overview that some potential alignments for North-South Corridors have been identified, an inner connector and an outer connector, and they are represented on the map. And we've summarized that and also the fact that the County will be working in the next few years to further explore those potential alignments.

Mr. McPherson: On that map, the 95 needs to be moved over; 95 is sitting on a tiny road.

Mr. Valotta: Yes, that's right. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: It might be better there.

Mr. McPherson: The new 95.

Mr. Apicella: Anything else, Joe?

Mr. Valotta: No, that's all for Chapter 4, and I think that either Mike or Amy is coming back.

Mr. Apicella: Great, thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: I guess one thing to point out, I mentioned the trails. That would probably... somebody asked about reminding you about trails. Okay. That would likely be Section 4.4.7. That's where there's reference to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and reference to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan that we have. That's a separate element.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, just a minute. I'm looking for 4.4.7.

Mr. Apicella: It's on an unnumbered page.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, yeah, really. Are the pages not known? Is there a page number that I'm looking for? Anybody? I'm still looking.

***Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021***

Mr. McPherson: I think it looks good.

Mr. Randall: So now that I'm there, talk to me. What is it we're looking... what is it we've added?

Mr. Zuraf: There's no change here. You asked to be reminded when we get to that point. There were no new changes in this. So I don't know if there was anything new that the Commission wanted to see added?

Ms. Barnes: Well, we did get quite a few emails about, I think it was the Belmont trail and I think we forwarded to... I think everybody got them.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think we do need to talk about that. I know Mr. Brito is sitting out in the audience probably waiting for us to talk about that. I'm not sure this is the right place under transportation, but let's circle back before we're done, to see how we want to address those comments. Does that work for everybody?

Mr. Randall: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: And I'm also going to suggest that we, we probably do 6 last because there's so much there, if that works for everybody. So we go through 5 and we go through 7, then the appendix and then come back to 6.

Mr. Randall: Yes. Can I make a suggestion that we maybe we finish, now that we finished 4, that we find the areas where the trails are, let's talk about it. Let's get Mr. Brito out of here.

Mr. Apicella: Right before is transportation. Right. So I don't think it falls there. I think... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Randall: I don't think it falls there either. Where would we talk about... are the trails only in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan?

Mr. Zuraf: That's where we, well, I mean, this is the, you know, transportation is and a lot of the discussion is multimodal, you know. Transportation is not only cars, it's pedestrian, it's... so that's why the reference to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan is in this chapter. And so we do have a more detailed document or element of the Comp Plan that goes through different trail alignments... *inaudible.*

Mr. Randall: Does it include the Belmont Trail?

Mr. Zuraf: The Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail, yes.

Mr. Randall: It does talk about it.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so do we need to talk then, do we need to put it in here specifically?

Mr. Zuraf: No, it's already referenced in that document.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. English, can you tell us what you're seeing?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. English: I see it at 4.4.7.

Mr. Apicella: So yeah, it's kind of close to the last third of the page. It says most of the trails in Stafford County are privately owned and constructed as part of an individual... as part of individual neighborhoods, providing a series of connecting trails and sidewalks as a priority for the County. Trail projects include the planned Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail. I don't normally do this is. Is that what you're talking about, Mr. Brito?

Mr. Brito: The Cannon Ridge-Belmont Trail.

Mr. Randall: Not the Belmont-Ferry Farm.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, we're going from the golf course to existing trails, and tying those together.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, and that is not currently in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: I'd want to check; it might. There are some trails and maybe when we when we get to Chapter 6 I can go grab that plan and check, and we talk about it.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I think we need to do that. Make sure that it's covered. I think there's at least interest to put it in here.

Ms. Barnes: Is it a matter of just drawing a green line on a map and showing exactly where that should be? Is it easy enough to do that?

Mr. Zuraf: There would be a matter of amending the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan, which is a whole separate element and is not part of this. It could be referenced in here.

Mr. Randall: That's what I think we should do. I don't think we should try to modify that at the time. But I think there should be something that says something to add it in here that said, in addition to those things listed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, we also want to consider and look at the option of a Cannon Ridge to Belmont Trail that will allow us to have a trail system from here to here, or something to those words. Right? So let's go get the... when we get to 6, we'll get the plan, we'll look at it, we'll verify that it either is or it isn't. And then we'll re-address it in 4.4.7

Mr. Zuraf: Sounds good.

Mr. Randall: Okay?

Mr. Apicella: And the Cannon Ridge issue, where would that fall in this document?

Mr. Zuraf: If, well, if it's in the other plan, then there's nothing more that needs to be done. Unless...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I don't think that's a trail. I think, to me, that's more of a map change, right. I think it's a designation change on the map. Mr. Harvey...

Mr. Zuraf: For the entire area, designated as a park.

Mr. Randall: For the Cannon Ridge area.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: That would be a land use map change, Chapter 3, to designate the area...

Mr. Apicella: Chapter 3. So, let's just go back real quick. What... do you have an sense of what page that might be on?

Mr. Randall: Let's find that.

Mr. Zuraf: That would be page 3-23 in the second part of Chapter 3, Section 3.6. And if we can have the computer please, I have the land use map.

Ms. Barnes: Section 3.6; got it.

Mr. Zuraf: The future land use map.

Mr. Apicella: I'm lost; where am I at here?

Mr. Randall: The first, right there.

Mr. Apicella: This one.

Mr. Randall: Yep, right there.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So, yeah, here's the future land use map. And it is roughly... so it's going to be over here.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, but that one's gone, right? We want the next one.

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, this is the, yeah, this is the...

Mr. Randall: This is the one we've taken out.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. This is the old map.

Mr. Randall: That's the old map. Sorry.

Mr. Zuraf: I don't know if we have the...

Mr. Harvey: That's the only one I knew where to get, access it.

Mr. Zuraf: So, this area... so I am focused on this area has not changed. So if we can...

Mr. Randall: Nope, that's true.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so the area of Cannon Ridge is generally around here.

Mr. Apicella: So before we take any action, again I asked Mr. Harvey and presumably he asked you, Mike, to discuss with Parks and Rec; what kind of feedback did you get?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I did speak to Mr. Morris, who's the Director of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities. And he noted that in their various studies, that there is a lack of active recreation facilities in the Route 17 corridor, and he would support any proposal to have additional recreational amenities in that corridor.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so, again, we all got the emails, does anybody have an objection to adding the Cannon Ridge... what would the right, what would we call it, Cannon Ridge? No, that's... this is the change of the land use map to show the Cannon Ridge area under...

Ms. Barnes: Is it Cannon Ridge to England Run Falls?

Mr. Apicella: That's the trail. This is a separate issue.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: This is the changing the color coding on the map to designate the Cannon Ridge golf course area as a park.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Whatever color code that would be. Does anybody have any objection to doing that?

Mr. Randall: No. Let's do it.

Mr. Apicella: Alright. So you got your direction, Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. And it'd be that same... right outside of that red line along the river, it's that green, same green line, so it just gets extended in.

Mr. Randall: Then it would cover that whole section.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. And we'll have to just check to see the limits of that... inaudible.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. That's fine. That's fine. Alright. And that's part A. And then Part B is the trail part.

Mr. Apicella: And we'll circle back to that.

Mr. Randall: And we'll circle back to that.

Mr. Harvey: And Mr. Chairman, I do, I have pulled up the Bike Ped Plan while the discussion was going on. The proposal for a Cannon Ridge to Belmont Trail is not in the plan. So if the Commission was desiring to have that in the future Bike Ped Plan, would be something that the Commission could direct staff to add that language in that section to say that we should develop a new Bike Ped option for the Cannon Ridge to Belmont corridor.

Mr. Apicella: And that goes here, or that goes in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Harvey: Well, since we're amending the total Comp Plan, that will go in 4.4.7 as direction to amend the Bike Ped Plan.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Does anybody have any objection to doing that? Is that enough for you, Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: That's enough.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So let it be written. So what have you done? I'm doing it this.

Mr. Randall: To that point...

Ms. Lucian: Commissioners? I'm sorry, I've got to interrupt just for a second. It's almost 10. So you'll need to vote to continue the meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a motion to extend the meeting past the 10 o'clock hour?

Mr. Randall: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: I'll take a quick voice vote. Everybody in favor?

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody opposed? No. Alright, great. We're going past 10.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And Mike, I would very much recommend that you have plenty of emails or a source to get some writing and to fix... to make sure we know what we want to put that in there.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. McPherson: Are we doing 5 now?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. Okay, Chapter 5, if you go to page 5-9. Oh, okay, sorry, first 5-8. We added a fifth policy under Fire and Rescue, it is shaded in blue. But I did discuss this with Joe Granger, and he was good with this language, this proposed language, so if you would like to read that.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, help us out here. Where you at?

Mr. Zuraf: 5-8, very top of the page.

Mr. Apicella: You have the part we can't read?

Mr. Randall: They should have been in yellow, correct, because it was updated?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it was... we were working on it and I had a blue and then it was after we started copying. So it should be yellow now.

Mr. Randall: If you remember the conversation we have with the Assistant Fire Chief, we talked about refurbishing and updating and according to the growth, and that's what...

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I like it.

Mr. Randall: ... yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah, that's fine.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright, and then the next page was an update, amendment to that second policy. This was new language proposed by Mike Neuhard, who is here to talk to you about that issue.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, much better. I like that whole thing. We had a lengthy discussion about that, so I think it's good. We came up with the language.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright.

Mr. Randall: Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, hold on. Everybody see 5.9? Everybody look at it? That was a good discussion we had last, at our last meeting with the Sheriff's Department. So I want to make sure we're all good with that language. Alright. Moving on. Thank you.

Mr. McPherson: I like the link on 510.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, I added the link on 5-10, which...

Mr. Randall: Did you click it to make sure it worked? Please make sure you click every link in here to make sure that it actually takes you to the right place before we go live, please.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Alright.

Mr. McPherson: I'm clicking, it's not working. It's not taking me.

Mr. Zuraf: And the page 5-11; Utilities added some language to refer to the capacity of the two wastewater treatment plants to explain how, you know, I'll let you read that. And then for sewer, the sewer section or wastewater section, they added additional language to mirror some of the language in the water section with the amount of facilities they have. Then in 5-14, Section 5.3, this was... I still needed to incorporate some of the earlier... Well, okay, first, another table out of the Appendix, table 5.1, those numbers have to be updated. Then under the proffer section, there was an earlier comment from the subcommittee about referencing the latest proffer parameters and codes that were, that we operate under. So that just references the 2016 proffer legislation.

Mr. Randall: That looks good, that looks good.

And that, okay, then 5-18, we then also need to update the facility needs based on the Appendix updates.

Mr. Randall: So let me ask you a question, Mr. Harvey. This is a Comp Plan from 2016 to 2036, a 20 year process. Do we want to continue to list 4 high schools? We're not going to get 4 high schools built. We may barely get 2 high schools built in the next 14 years before 2036. Do we want to continue to still use what I would consider to be unreasonable expectations to this? Or do we want to try to be more reasonable as per, are we going to get 6 elementary schools or maybe we're only going to get 4? Are we

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

going to get 3 middle? Maybe we're only going to get... I mean, I don't know. I'm waiting, I'm wondering what you're thinking, what your thoughts are.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Randall, the charts in the document show the demand and a need for the facilities. It's one thing to say you need it; it's nothing to say you can afford it and can build it. So maybe there could be some narrative in the introduction to explain that this is based on per capita demand, and it does not reflect actual ability to afford or ability to construct. But I understand your concerns because oftentimes the CIP has a debt limit which we can't, these projects would exceed our debt limit.

Mr. Randall: Oh, for sure.

Mr. Apicella: I like what Mr. Harvey just said. Can we add that? Anybody got a problem with it?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I think we need to have some caveat to it. Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. And that's it for Chapter 5.

Mr. Apicella: So for now, let's just skip over 6, because there's a lot there.

Mr. Zuraf: Chapter 7, you know, while we updated the policy number references in the, under the action items, under the several pages, because the policy numbers changed in Chapter 2. So I just went through and updated those and corrected some of the complete by dates that were identified as being incorrect at the last meeting.

Mr. Randall: And Mr. Zuraf, we cross-referenced all of these, all of these 2.2.2, 2.2.6.2, all of the end numbers we cross-referenced with the applicable chapters to verify those numbers are all correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: That's it for Chapter 7.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, I'm going to jump in right on right away, because I noticed that maybe these changes that we got, the couple of pages that we got at that last meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup>, they didn't seem to be incorporated.

Mr. Zuraf: Which changes?

Mr. Apicella: So we got Appendix A4, B1, and E4. So there were separate sheets. Unless I was looking at the wrong version.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right, because those were from Fire and Rescue and, yeah, yeah. A4, B1...

Mr. Apicella: A4, B1, and E4... I mean, I can give you my copy if you want it.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, we have it; that's okay. Get those sheets in. And this, the first Appendix A and B, these tables need to be updated. Appendix C, the last meeting there were some desire to add some additional clarifying language. So that still needs to be done. I think that is it for the Appendix.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So, A and B are the only ones that you have to redo or are we doing Alpha, Bravo, Delta, Echo, and Foxtrot as well?

Mr. Zuraf: D...

Mr. Randall: We still have TGA by the way.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. D still has to be updated.

Mr. Randall: The rest of them have to be updated. So the only ones that are up-to-date right now is Charlie. Is that correct? Or are there other Appendix that have already been updated?

Mr. Zuraf: E was updated, that's the affordable housing.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so E is done. Charlie's done. What about Golf?

Mr. Zuraf: No change.

Mr. Randall: No change?

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, Golf -- that is all being deleted because it's moving over to Chapter 4.

Mr. Randall: Okay, sounds good.

Mr. Zuraf: And then that basically... so the new Appendix G, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Study, there were no, there was no change there.

Mr. Randall: No changes to that.

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: F. What is F?

Mr. Zuraf: That was from the development of the 2016 Plan.

Mr. Apicella: Right, that's what I thought. Do we still want this because this is, this is OBE.

Mr. Randall: It's OBE.

Mr. Apicella: Take it out and re-order the appendices.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, so it's Alpha, Bravo, Delta, and... those are the three, right? Those are the three that we still have to do work on.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, yes.

Mr. Randall: And you're going to take out Foxtrot.

***Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021***

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Now the fun part.

Mr. Randall: Alright.

Mr. English: Amy's up.

Mr. Zuraf: Amy.

Mr. Randall: All this time.

Mr. McPherson: This is just all factual data, correct? Chapter 6?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, but we've not, we haven't looked at it for a long time. So we're looking at it for the first time, just as we did for the work session.

Mr. McPherson: Understood, but it's not changes anything, it's just past factual data that we're reviewing.

Mr. Apicella: So Amy, I took the chance to look at this while you all were talking about that one item that I didn't participate in. And one, a couple things I noticed. Just kind of globally, some of the map dates, if we could just change them from 2016 to 2021. Several maps in here still have 2016 on them.

Ms. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I didn't notice that when I was making my updates to the section.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, that's fine. I'm just giving you some high level stuff.

Ms. Taylor: You're saying that there are still maps with 2016... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: There are still maps in here, for example, on page 652, Community Facilities, the map's dated April 27, 2016. I noticed that in several places.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we just go through it quickly, page by page.

Mr. Apicella: Right. I'm just, so they can make a note.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: And the other thing is, I found in some cases, we're still referring to data from say, 2010 to 2012, or 2014. So pre-, pre-2016 changes to the Comp Plan. So maybe the data is not available, and we keep it... I'm just saying, wherever, wherever we can, we should probably try to find the most up-to-date data.

Ms. Taylor: Yes sir. Can you give me a specific reference on that? Where you're seeing something referencing older data.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Alright, so again, we can go through it. I'm just going to give you an example; on page 634 it says table 616, Industries of Employment, 2010, Stafford County, Virginia and comparison areas. And then you read beyond the table, it starts talking about 2004 and 2010 in the narrative. So, I'm just saying, in case I missed it because I was flipping through it quickly in the back room...

Ms. Taylor: That entire section still needs to be updated.

Mr. Apicella: Absolutely. I'm just saying I might have missed something as we go through it. We might miss it because it's just, we're going through it as quickly as we can. If you could just take a look at those two bigger issues about the dates on the maps, which probably is not a big change, easily done, the data might be much more difficult to try to update.

Ms. Taylor: Yes sir.

Mr. McPherson: I'm seeing two 634s.

Mr. Randall: Okay, we need to go through this page by page so we can catch all those things.

Mr. McPherson: We have duplicate numbers, duplicate pages.

Mr. Bain: *Inaudible...* 634 to 641... *inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. McPherson: Yeah, the Historic and Cultural Resources is 634.

Ms. Taylor: Yeah, I do see those. I think it was a section break and it repeated numbering for some reason. I will make sure we get that corrected. Would you like me to go through and summarize the changes that were made and were not made in each section? Or would you simply like to go through page by page?

Mr. Randall: This is the first time we're looking at it. So we need to go through page by page as we've done with everything else, to verify we catch everything, verify that we've identified what it is that you're still working on, what it is that we're okay with, and make any changes that we identify. We knew we were going to get to Chapter 6, we knew we were going to have to go through it. So let's do it.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Bain: First, let me ask – everything that's in dark blue are numbers that have not been updated yet. Is that right?

Ms. Taylor: Correct. Everything that you see highlighted blue, as with other sections, is information that has yet to be updated and still requires data potentially coming from other departments.

Mr. Bain: Okay, great. Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, starting off with section... well, the entire Chapter 6, the first subsection 6.1. There are pending updates to data, all of the data, in this section and the maps. And that information should be coming from GIS. They've obviously been inundated with other components of the Comp Plan, so we are still waiting on their ability to get to that. Minor revisions, otherwise the rest of that section has minor revisions to the text.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Can I... figure 6.1? Page 6-3?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Randall: That map, I'm assuming because it's not lined out, we're using this map, correct?

Ms. Taylor: Correct. So the one on page 6-2 is X'd out; that one's being removed, and the new one has yet to be updated. So what we're seeing on 6-3 is what was previously shown, but we have not gotten an updated map from GIS yet.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So my point is, is that, obviously, you will get a map that'll change the date?

Ms. Taylor: Correct.

Mr. Randall: And then Mike, to your point, when we, when we put Cannon Ridge in, it needs to be shown on here as well, alright. They probably don't know that, but we need to show that on here as well. And so that little section down there will need to be in Parks and Rec.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Randall, this map is actually showing existing land use versus proposed, like we, the map we were talking about previously is proposed. park use.

Mr. Randall: Ah, okay, alright. No worries.

Ms. Taylor: So no Cannon Ridge on that one.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, you're fine.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, moving on to pages 6-4 and primarily 6-4, that entire table there for table 6.1, Existing Land Uses, still references 2015. But again, all of that data still needs to be updated. And I have highlighted throughout the rest of this section specific pieces of data that need to be updated regarding percentages and acreages for various land uses in the county.

Mr. Randall: At the top of 6-5, you need to make sure it's find and replace for Jefferson Davis. The top of 6-5.

Ms. Taylor: Yep, I did do a search and replace, and I think I missed that one for some reason. Otherwise, as you go through the section, moving on to page 6.9... 6-9, I'm sorry, table 6.2, Existing Zoning Districts also needs to be updated. And again, the text following that is also looking for updated percentages for the various districts.

Mr. Randall: And this is coming from GIS as well?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And just to be clear, these are not considered substantive changes, correct? We can change these all the way up to the public hearing?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Ms. Lucian: Yes, that's correct. And keep in mind that the public hearing advertisements aren't going to go out till next week. So the advertisement will be done at that time. So staff incorporate your changes before then.

Mr. Randall: Right. And I'm hoping GIS gets back to you quickly so that we have the chance to do all that before... *inaudible*... the alternative is. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Pages 6-14 and 6-15. Again, both of those tables for Zoning Build-Outs Inside and Outside of the Urban Services Area.

Mr. Randall: Can I go back to 6-13, please?

Ms. Taylor: I'm sorry, 6...?

Mr. Randall: 6-13.

Ms. Taylor: 6-13.

Mr. Randall: You added something at the bottom, Integrated Corporate and Technology Park?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Randall: That's a new, it's a new add, correct?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. That is another zoning overlay.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, that's Quantico Corporate Center, right?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay, good. I just want to make sure everybody noticed that as an add to the plan. Alright, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm. As we skim through other pages, you'll see that there are small minor updates to the text that's there. These were based on comments and information received during some of our subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Apicella: Amy, on 6-15, the second bullet, land use categories that account for the largest land areas in Stafford County. So I see that the numbers are still in flux. But when we settle on what those numbers, can we do a total? So at the end of that, before that period, I would add, for a total of, and I added these numbers up; it was 68.9%. Obviously that's not going to be the final number, but just so it's the context of these three areas make up the bulk.

Ms. Taylor: Okay. I will add that information.

Mr. McPherson: Were you saying it has to add to 100%?

Mr. Apicella: Oh, no. What I'm saying...

***Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021***

Mr. McPherson: Wouldn't it be good to have... *inaudible, two talking at the same time.*

Mr. Apicella: ... is when you count these three categories up, it adds up to 68.9%. That's about 70% of the County is Agricultural and forestall, military and rural residential. That's my point.

Mr. McPherson: Yeah. I think it'd be good at some point to have numbers that would add up to 100. Just a thought.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it's going to do that elsewhere.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: This is just kind of a summary of kind of... *inaudible.*

Mr. Randall: Of the three largest.

Mr. Bain: We can't read what it says in the blue.

Mr. Randall: It's in the blue somewhere. Alright, now, 6-17, those are updated numbers, correct?

Ms. Taylor: I'm sorry, page 6-17?

Mr. Randall: 6-17, I'm sorry. Those are updated because they're not in dark blue?

Ms. Taylor: Correct. Those numbers have been updated. I did not specifically put that on my list of summary information here. But yes, the population estimates in the projections have been updated based on the most recent Weldon Cooper data.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Bain: Just out of curiosity, is the Weldon Cooper data available on the County's website?

Ms. Taylor: I would have to defer to Mike on that. I don't believe that it is, but I'm not certain.

Mr. Zuraf: No, it's not necessarily something that's on the website. It's, that's a separate group through UVA. And so that's where we go to get different information.

Mr. Bain: Okay, it isn't like they...

Mr. Zuraf: It kind of covers all the localities.

Mr. Bain: ... gave you an electronic report file or anything.

Mr. Zuraf: There you can get Excel files with data or PDF tables of different demographic information. They have annual population estimates and then also population projections.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So we pull the information from them and incorporate that and... *inaudible.*

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: And put it in. Okay.

Ms. Taylor: My apologies. I'm gonna backtrack just a bit. Just as a summary for the updates that were made to Section 6.2 for population, they are appending updates to all of the maps for this entire section as well. Some of that data has been updated for population and housing based on 2020 census data that is currently available to us. We've also updated the population estimates and the projections from Weldon Cooper as previously noted, and we've also got pending updated data for population characteristics. And staff is still working through that data, which is available from the 2020 census and the 2019 American Community Survey, so. There are still a lot of updates here. But moving on to page 6-18 and 6-19. Table 6.7 shows the population, the county's population estimates and projections. The current table is being removed and a new updated table is being provided, which provides Weldon Cooper population projections through the year 2040. Page 6-20 shows we need to update the graph that is there regarding County residential occupancy permit projection. We have not yet had an opportunity to update that graph with the current numbers. Moving on to...

Mr. Randall: Okay, so what I'm looking at here then is 6-20. I'm looking at this map and the bottom. Everything... where does it become, where does it become a guess? Is it this year? Is it everything up to 2020 is actuals? Everything from here forward? Can you can you put them in a different color?

Ms. Taylor: Yes, the plan was to provide a revised graph as well. I do believe we're gonna turn the graph on end so that is a more of a portrait style graph. And I do believe we had notes to change the color of that graph.

Mr. Randall: Actuals versus projected?

Ms. Taylor: I did not have that specific information, but we can certainly do that.

Yes, if you would please. I think it's an easier, it's a more easy understood graph if you do that. Alright, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Again, as mentioned previously, on page 6-23, the composition regarding the County's population is still pending going through the data that is currently available so that we can update all the charts in this section, including table 6.9.

Mr. Randall: Now, will that include the description at the bottom of 6-23 as well?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. So any new data that we get from the 2020 census, we will be able to update the information in the percentages that are shown in that narrative below.

Mr. Randall: Right, I just wanted to make sure that it wasn't just the graphs we were updating, but it would be the narrative that describes the graphs as well.

Ms. Taylor: Correct. Every place that there is data shown in the text referencing a specific number or percentage, that will be updated in addition.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Moving on to Section 6.3 for housing, summary of the changes in this particular section, some of the data has been updated based on the data available from the Fredericksburg Area Association

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

of Realtors, specifically for home values and for rent in the County. The table and the graph associated with the housing unit trends does still need to be updated. And staff is still working through some of the data for the surrounding localities, including the available census data. So that would be in reference to table 610 for the annual housing trends that are there, that information needs to be updated and confirmed.

Mr. Randall: Alright. 6-... table 6.11, however, with the bottom of 6-26, and that table all in blue is all good. That's all new data, correct?

Ms. Taylor: I'm sorry, what page are you referring to?

Mr. Randall: 6-26.

Ms. Taylor: 6-26. No, the graph that's there also needs to be updated as well once we...

Mr. Randall: Let me rephrase my question. The comment at the bottom, the statement at the bottom and then the top of page 6-27, that graph in blue is all updated, correct?

Ms. Taylor: Correct, yes. All of that is current data.

Mr. Randall: Alright.

Ms. Taylor: So that table 611 was a new table and the previous one is being removed entirely. Moving on to page 628. That area highlighted in blue also needs to be updated. The information regarding permit activity on table 612 has been updated, so it's just the narrative immediately preceding that table that still needs to be updated.

Mr. Randall: So everybody take a note at 6.3.2, that value and rent, that's all been updated. So take a gander at that. As you can see, most of it's been changed.

Mr. Bain: On that first sentence, in 2019 the median value of a home Stafford was 366,000 as compared to 299,300 when? In 2010? Or in 2015? What did, where did the number 299,300 come? Is it in the table?

Ms. Taylor: It may have inadvertently been removed as we were making updates. I would need to go back to the previous...

Mr. Apicella: It says 2018.

Mr. Harvey: It's 2010 is the 299,300.

Mr. Bain: Okay. In 2010.

Mr. Apicella: Now it's up to about 450.

Mr. Randall: Exactly. And the rental is not going down anymore, by the way. Rentals have skyrocketed in the last year. Alright, thank you, moving on.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Ms. Taylor: There was additional information updated on 629 as well regarding gross incomes in comparison to rental costs in the County. Moving on to Section 6.4 for the economy. Summary of changes in this section. We are pending updates to data for the entire section and that is we are waiting on information coming in from Economic Development on that. Otherwise there have been minor revisions to the text throughout this section and those were again based on comments received during various subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Randall: 6-35, that's green; is that somebody else's comments or...?

Ms. Taylor: No. The green information is existing text that was previously shown in the Comp Plan, which has simply been cut from one area and pasted into another. So that was existing text that was previously shown in another portion of this section.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And then added here for context?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, it was on, it was immediately on the next page.

Mr. Randall: 6-35.

Ms. Taylor: And you can see on page 636 where it was removed.

Mr. Randall: Oh, right, there it is. Thank you.

Mr. McPherson: On page 637, is that change correct? Getting rid of agency and adding administration?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Okay. Just checking.

Mr. Randall: Not to be confused with no such agency.

Ms. Taylor: Okay. Moving on to Section 6.5, for historic and cultural resources, unless there are any further questions regarding 6.4.

Mr. Randall: So, 639 and 640. Were those rewritten? Or were they just put in a new format, a new font...?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. It is the exact same information. We had to retype it up because those were images, I was unable to modify that text as it currently appears.

Mr. Randall: Ah, don't you love old documents? Well, now, well, at least you've done it now so that it never has to be done again. Alright?

Ms. Taylor: The portion highlighted in blue is an acronym, which I need to go locate...

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: You have no idea where it came from or what it means?

Ms. Taylor: Exactly. So I need to go find where the information has come from.

Mr. Randall: Because in 1930, when it was first written up, yeah, I gotcha. I gotcha.

Mr. Apicella: You know those pictures, that if you look at it long enough, you know...

Mr. Randall: That's exactly... I'm sure that's what Amy was doing. What the heck! How am I gonna...!

Mr. McPherson: And Amy, this is where the page numbers kind of go back down; very minor. Just letting you know.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, I will make sure that they are corrected. I did run into that on another section.

Mr. Randall: Again...

Mr. McPherson: Minor.

Mr. Randall: ... not to talk about page numbers... [laughter]... but we do need to make sure that, again, I don't want to see this on public hearing and have...

Ms. Taylor: I'm beating myself up. I was very diligent...

Mr. Randall: ... and miss page numbers, not have proper formatting, spellcheck, we don't want... All of the things that, you know, you follow the 10 steps of proper documentation, document...

Mr. Apicella: Hey, it was fine. She passed it along to Joe and then it got completely messed up.

Mr. Randall: Amy – page numbers, alright? Yeah, we know where we got with page numbers over there. Alright, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: 6.5, for historic and cultural resources. Again, a summary of changes in this particular section. We are pending update to maps for this entire section.

Mr. Randall: Same pictures? You took the picture out, put a new one in; it looks like it's the same picture? Is that again a formatting thing?

Ms. Taylor: I believe so. They were... when I came into this process, those were already shown as being removed and replaced. So I simply made sure it was very clear that that, the one on the top was being removed.

Mr. Randall: No worries. Thank you.

Mr. Bain: When you get to page 642, I haven't really been paying attention on the other maps. But on this one, here again, we've got a legend that you need a magnifying glass to read. Is it possible to put the legend on an adjoining page and not have it on the map? Yeah, the cultural resources map? Yeah, I mean, there's a lot of resources, the legend is very big. So I would support putting the legend itself on a

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

separate page and maybe making the bullet numbers on the map itself a little bit larger. Just to make it more readable.

Mr. Apicella: Al, you didn't realize that everybody that gets a copy is going to get a magnifying glass to go with it.

Mr. Bain: Ohhhhhhhhhhh, good.

Mr. Randall: Exactly, exactly. This is not full page, correct?

Ms. Taylor: No, these maps have not yet been updated by GIS.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so I need full page maps just like we've done with the other sections.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, that the maps that are at the end of this section are full size that GIS was able to get to so as they move on to these other ones...

Mr. Randall: And if we can, then when we get the full map, if you can maybe expand that out a little bit. I don't care if we cover the City of Fredericksburg a little bit with a table with a key, right. But to his point, Mr. Bain's point, we need to make sure that it is readable without Mr. Apicella's magnifying glass.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, so we want to remove the legend and put it on a separate page.

Mr. Randall: No, I wouldn't go that far. You can make it...

Ms. Taylor: Just potentially larger.

Mr. Randall: Make the map a full size map. Expand the size of the legend. And see if it's readable. If it still has, if it's still an eye chart based on this, then yes, let's look at other options.

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Randall, just for your information, When this is posted on the web, it'll be in a PDF format. So the viewer can increase the font or increase the view and see it... yes.

Mr. Randall: Perfect. That will be the case on all the maps, correct?

Mr. Harvey: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay, perfect. That's a great update to that. I know it's for us old people that like the... don't laugh; that's not funny. That like having it in our hands.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, so pending updates to all the maps for this section. We are also pending updates to the data specifically for the listings on the National Register of Historic Places, and for the Virginia Landmarks Register in the associated table 6.20, which is on page 6-38. This also includes the number of resources, the total number of resources in the cultural resource inventory. Otherwise, there are minor revisions to the text throughout this section. Moving on to Section 6.6, for community facilities, updates made to this section, we are pending updates to again all the maps for this entire section. However, we have received updated data and information from schools, the Sheriff's Office and Fire and Rescue, and all of that information has been incorporated here. Otherwise, there were also additional minor revisions

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

to the text for all the other sections. So under public schools, we did reference the switch from using the ADM, the average...

Mr. Randall: Daily Membership.

Ms. Taylor: ... yep. I was trying to remember what the M was for, Average Daily Membership to the 30, the September 30<sup>th</sup> enrollment date that Stafford County Public Schools currently uses. And they indicated that that change occurred approximately in 2018.

Mr. Randall: And that narrative is on page 6-43.

Ms. Taylor: Table 6.21, for all of the Stafford County Public Schools have also been updated with the official count. That's September 1<sup>st</sup> official count. Page 647 goes over the renovations, the increase, the limited increase in school capacities and then goes over the renovations.

Mr. Randall: Sorry. This is a question for everyone. 6-46. You have a table in the legend that talks about proposed schools. And one of... two of those are in Embrey Mill and one of those it looks like is the high school at Clift Farm. Yes. Is there a benefit, Mr. Harvey, to leave in proposed schools as a potential location on here? We talk about proposed schools other places; do we want to put on here an actual location? We know that it changes, it seems to change pretty regularly as to where they're going to go. There is land proffered, but not necessarily anything done to it. I'm concerned that if we leave it on there that people will look at it and go, oh, yeah, they're going to build a high school there or they're going to build an elementary school here. How do we want to, how do we want to, how do we want to message this so that we show the need for proposed schools but we don't actually show a location per se?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Commissioner Randall, based on the State Code for the County to spend any money towards a capital facility, it has to be identified in the Comprehensive Plan. So that's why staff was proposing these, listing these as proposed sites so it would check the boxes being identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Otherwise, as we currently have in the public facilities charts, we just indicate we have a need but we don't have any location, information, or anything that can meet that requirement; so we'd have to either come back for a subsequent Comp Plan amendment or a 2232 review to locate any future schools or fire stations or anything else that are not already in existence.

Mr. Randall: Alright, I... Okay. Are we okay to leave in...?

Mr. Apicella: I'd rather leave it in and not cause us a problem if that's what I'm hearing it might create.

Mr. Randall: Well, can I, can we put a caveat at the bottom that says proposed schools unofficial? Proposed schools not yet determined? Location yet to be determined?

Mr. Apicella: How about proposed schools pending funding?

Mr. Randall: Pending funding? I mean, we've just been told to Clift Farm probably has no intention of having a school built on it, yet it's in here as a proposed location.

*Inaudible, microphones not on.*

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So let's... so if anything, I would change that location to a Route 17 location. That's probably a better...

Mr. Apicella: That's not a done deal yet, so I wouldn't, I wouldn't, I wouldn't do that.

Mr. Randall: Well, again...

Mr. Apicella: As of today it's not a done deal so

Mr. Randall: No? But that's a closer proposed than Clift Farm. I just think we need to put something, some disclaimer at the bottom of that that says these aren't, that this isn't ...

Mr. Apicella: Well, how about proposed schools and then parentheses actual location to be determined?

Mr. Randall: I'm good with that. That's fine.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that's probably not going to meet the intended purpose of the Comp Plan identifying the location extent of a public facility.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, I think we've beat this one; let's just leave it as it.

Mr. Randall: Alright, that's fine. We'll leave it alone and then we'll have to amend the Comp Plan when we find an actual location.

Mr. Harvey: Just for clarification, do we want to identify the school site on Route 17?

Mr. Apicella: Is that official?

Mr. Randall: It's a potential, it's a proposed.

Mr. Apicella: I mean, Westlake... if it's anything, it's Westlake, right?

Mr. Harvey: That's a different school site.

Mr. Apicella: But that's, I mean, that's officially been identified as a school site.

Mr. Harvey: It's proffered for a public use site. It could be a school, it could be a park, it could be multiple things.

Mr. Apicella: I think it would be problematic to put that potential school site on this map at this point in time. I think that could be very problematic. I wouldn't do it. Yeah. No, it's not even close to being official.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Randall: Well, once it becomes official, are we required to change this map?

Mr. Harvey: We'd be required to amend the Comprehensive Plan before we could spend money towards designing and constructing the school.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Which would probably happen when it has to be designated as a school site, right, as part of a rezoning. So, you do the Comp Plan amendment at that point in time; that would be the appropriate moment. Can we move on? Under adult education – I thought that we identified a site for Germanna. They proffered the site next to the Abberly Apartments.

Mr. Randall: It's already there. They've already got a campus there.

Mr. Apicella: Right. That's my point.

Mr. Randall: Oh.

Mr. Apicella: It says we're looking for a site. We've secured the land. Am I wrong? I'm on page 647 under adult education, about mid page.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was a site that was proffered approximately 20 acres adjacent to the Abberly Apartments. That was conveyed to the County and I believe it's been conveyed on to Germanna. I'm just saying this sentence probably needs to be tweaked. The County has identified a site.

Ms. Taylor: We will make sure that language gets updated.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Taylor: We expanded and provided some information regarding adult education regarding the University of Mary Washington campus on Warrenton Road. The Sheriff's Office also provided information for 6.6.2 under law enforcement regarding the Sheriff's Office cooperation with State Police and other agencies that have jurisdiction within the County as well. On page 648, they also provided information regarding the new animal shelter.

Mr. Randall: 6.6.3, another notice of the Jefferson Davis Highway.

Mr. English: That's the address; you can't change that. That's their address.

Mr. Randall: It's all going to change.

Mr. English: Right now it's their physical address. I mean, I don't know how you change it if that's their physical address.

Mr. Randall: Well, they're going to have to go through a change. That's what the problem is; all these businesses are going to have to go through and officially change all of their... yeah, because it's going to be changed. Anyway I don't know if you want to use their address how that works.

Mr. Zuraf: There'll have to be an update at the next five year update.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

*Inaudible, microphones not on.*

Ms. Taylor: Moving on to page 6-49 for Fire and Rescue, Section 6.6.4, information, updated information was provided by Fire and Rescue regarding all of the existing Fire and Rescue stations.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Amy, two things on 6.6.4. I think Mr. English asked to add Ford T. Humphrey, and is headquartered at the Ford T. Humphrey Public Safety Center, first sentence.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, and I inadvertently omitted it.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, no worries. And then I think Mr. Randall asked in the last sentence calls for emergency service. And then I think you would take out the calls at the end of that.

Mr. Randall: You see that?

Ms. Taylor: The very last sentence in the first paragraph?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Taylor: Responded to 12,693 calls for emergency service.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. And then take out the second calls.

Ms. Taylor: Okay. For the rest of this section, moving on to page 6-53, there have been minor updates to various sections for libraries and solid waste. And then the findings on 6-54.

Mr. Apicella: So I think Mr. Bain would probably say on these, same thing on these maps, if you can blow them up a little bit so that legends can be read.

Mr. Bain: You don't know how bad my eyes are.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, moving on to page 6-55, which is the beginning of Section 6.7 for infrastructure. Updates for this section, we are pending updates to all the maps again for this entire section. We have also received updated data and information from Utilities, including the status of the Abel Lake Reservoir, and all such information has been incorporated. We're currently pending receipt of some updated data from Public Works regarding stormwater management facilities. And we are pending some updated information from our own department actually, regarding telecommunications. We still need to pull some data for approved but unbuilt towers in the County.

Mr. Bain: On the water supply section, is there any mention at all of use of the quarries at the Vulcan Quarry for water storage?

Ms. Taylor: No, sir, no information was...

Mr. Bain: Because that was an issue when we were talking about it, and it just seems to me if it's intended it ought to be mentioned in the plan somewhere, maybe. I know, I know. But it was, it became an issue for the application.

Mr. Randall: Well, because the decision at that point in time was that Abel Lake would be the third reservoir, that it's a much easier process because there was, it was part of the source. They took it out when Mooney was there and it's readily available to be the third source and that it would be too cost prohibitive for Vulcan to take or to use water from that source.

Mr. McPherson: Can't Abel be counted as source?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Utilities Department confirmed that they were still looking to use those quarries.

Mr. Randall: No, Utilities came back and said that Abel Lake is the only one that they're looking for.

Mr. Bain: No they didn't.

Mr. McPherson: So that can't be kept as a source, Abel Lake?

Mr. Bain: I don't think they did.

Mr. Randall: Well, look at the Utilities input. It doesn't list Vulcan at all.

Mr. Bain: I know, that's why I was raised the question.

Mr. Randall: Well, it was their input.

Ms. Taylor: No information was provided from Utilities regarding the use of the quarries. But they did, they did confirm that Abel Lake could be reinstated at a later date if it was needed.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Moving on to page 6-58, Section 6.7.2 for stormwater management. The areas highlighted in blue are the information that needs to be updated from Public Works regarding the BMPs and stormwater facilities in the County, specifically, those that were identified previously is their condition was unknown because they were unable to be located or did not have access. Page 659 for the telecommunications.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, can I go back? 655, sorry. I was, must have been daydreaming. We've been told that the referendum in 2009 for parks included the Cannon Ridge to Belmont or Cannon Ridge to Belmont Trail. At least that's the emails that we received. Is this an all inclusive list or was there more of a list for the referendum? I just want to make sure that it was... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: I'm lost. Where are you at?

Mr. Randall: 6-55.

Mr. Apicella: I'm not seeing that; I'm on 655.

Mr. Randall: Parks and Rec, Parks and Rec, go to the next one.

Ms. Taylor: Oh, it's further in. The numbering is...

Mr. Randall: Oh, whoa, alright, I'm sorry. Now I know why I'm not following you. Alright, we'll get to the second 655 in just a second.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Sorry.



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Who needs just one 655.

Mr. Randall: I was gonna say, sorry, that's my bad, I should have waited.

Ms. Taylor: Going back to page six 6-59 regarding telecommunications 6.7.5, that again is the section that we need to update regarding the number of approved but unbuilt towers in the County. Okay. Now moving on to Section 6.8 for Parks and Rec on page, duplicate page 6-55. In this section...

Mr. Randall: I was just trying to make sure that we list the 2009 bond referendum for parks and... for parks. And I just wanted to make sure that we have had, you know, Joe mentioned that it was included in that referendum. But it's not shown here. So I just want to make sure that this list is indeed an all inclusive list.

Ms. Taylor: It is an all inclusive list of both the 2002 bond referendum and the 2009 bond referendum. Staff actually went to the County's own web page and found the, specifically the 2009 bond referendum and it did not specifically mention the Cannon Ridge Trail.

Ms. Barnes: Did it mention the Dominion Trail?

Ms. Taylor: I do not believe it mentioned that trail either. It did... I would almost have to go back and double check the information. I know that there was a mention of trail. I got... information was specifically provided from Parks and Rec that mentioned the Ferry Farm Trail. I do not recall whether specific trail names were identified on the bond referendum document.

Mr. Randall: Could you do a quick check on that and make sure?

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Randall: Thank you. Alright.

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Barnes, could you repeat the other trail that you were inquiring about?

Ms. Barnes: I believe it was called the Dominion Trail. It was for the underground where they put the underground line in.

Mr. Randall: The easement.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I think it goes over Hampton... no, H.H. Poole.

Mr. Randall: *Inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, I will confirm both of those. Under the general section, 6.8 for Parks and Rec. The general updates that were done here, we did receive updated information from Parks and Recreation; all of that information has been included. Staff also added some additional subsections regarding state and other parks in the County. But we do still need to draft some language regarding those parks and they specifically are Widewater State Park, Belmont, and Ferry Farm. We're also still pending some updated information regarding the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail. It is our understanding that it was discussed at

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

yesterday's Board meeting. So we need to confirm the status of yesterday's discussion. I do believe it's on the next coming phase for that trail. Otherwise, the rest of this section has only had some minor revisions to text, again, based on previous discussions at subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Apicella: Kind of a dumb question – where does the Rouse Center fit into the equation?

Mr. McPherson: That's private.

Mr. Apicella: No, it's county-owned.

Ms. Taylor: The Rouse Center, I believe is the, that is the aquatics facility at Embrey Mill Park, is that correct?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Oh, I didn't know that was county-owned.

Ms. Taylor: They are specifically listed. They were included under the bond referendum for the Embrey Mill Park. That additional bulleted list was added there, and it specifically indicates that the Embrey Mill Park was including the indoor Recreation Center and the aquatics facility.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, I see Jeff Rouse. Alright, thanks.

Mr. Randall: It's all County. It's county-owned.

Ms. Taylor: Moving on to page 656. That is a new updated list of facilities, parks and recreation facilities and what amenities each has. Moving on to page 6-57, excuse me, 59; this is our first updated map in section, in Chapter 6. So these are the larger size maps.

Mr. Randall: Right, can you, would it be possible to expand that legend? Could you make it bigger?

Ms. Taylor: Specifically for figure 6.9?

Mr. Randall: Yes. I mean, you'd only get in, you know, half inch on either side. But we understand where the City of Fredericksburg is, we don't need to, you know, make it as large as you can. I mean, it's good. I think it's still readable. But the bigger the better.

Ms. Taylor: Okay. I'll relay that... we will relay that to GIS and see what can be done.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, absolutely. Because I like the map. It looks good. Now that it's the full size. It's, it's you can read the numbers. There's just a little bit of I can't necessarily read the numbers in the legend, and how to correspond that and so I don't know what the best way is, but those numbers in the legend are fairly unrecognizable.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Also, if they could just change the font or the shading of the font. These are hard to read. There was another map somewhere else where I thought they did a really good job on the legend, it wasn't much bigger than what's here but you can see all the letters.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So I would, you know, see where Stafford, at the top, Stafford County Parks and Rec, right? Maybe you make that a 12 font, maybe you make this a 10 font, maybe you bold it, you know, do something. You know, there's 1000s of fonts you can use to make it so that it's more readable and then do something with the numbers because at this point in time, it's tough to see the number that corresponds. I mean, you see them on the map, but then it's like, what, I don't know. You know, the National Park screening, NPS. I don't, I can't read what those numbers are. So, anyway, stuff like that.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, moving on to page 6-60, Table 6.24, for School Board owned recreational facilities, just some very minor updates have been made to that table. Page 6-61. Unfortunately, the blue shading has kind of obscured some of the text that is there, since it was also blue new information being added. But these are the additional subsections that have been added to specifically reference state parks and other parks within the county. And again, those parks that need to have some text or narrative provided are Widewater State Park, Belmont, and Ferry Farm. Moving on to page 6-62 for the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, section 6.8.6, those numbers have changed now that we've added the subsections for state parks and other parks. The Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail has been highlighted in blue indicating that we just need to provide some additional information there based on the discussion with the Board yesterday. Page 6- 64 just a minor update. In the last paragraph under Natural Resources, 6.9, obviously, as all these revisions are being made and text is being removed and things are shifting, that page number may change. So that page number will need to be updated. And we've started in on Section 6.9 for Natural Resources. Summary of revisions under this section, we are pending some minor updates to subsection 6.9.1 for land resources, specifically for the alternative septic systems. Staff is currently in the process of acquiring that information. Questions were raised regarding costs of such systems and some other information that we are reaching out to get that information.

Mr. Randall: Is that going to be a separate section? Its own section? I don't see where that would... where would that go in 6.9.1?

Ms. Taylor: That information is specifically referenced on 6-69, top of the page.

Mr. Randall: Ah. After the map.

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Bain: On figure 610, which is 6-67 I guess. I'm trying to read there's supposed to be a RPA buffer designation, a shading with a, I guess, an outline line? I can't see any place that that is discernible. Am I missing something? Or is it just in very, very small areas?

Mr. Randall: It's not really outlined, it's just those areas that have a dot on them. Because if you look at those... if you look at that outline, that outline is the same for all of the... they just use, in the legend, they just use that.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, but I'm saying I can't... the shading, the little dotted shading, I don't see anywhere on the map.

Mr. Apicella: You don't see dots? There's dots all over the place.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Randall: There's dots all over the entire map. So here's what I would do... here's what I would do. I would...

Mr. Bain: Oh, now I see some, okay.

Mr. Randall: ... I would make those circles. I would take that out. It looks like, it looks like to Mr. Bain's point, it looks like that there should be someplace that's, that's outlined like that, if you just if you just make it a circle?

Mr. English: There is. Right there and right there.

Mr. Apicella: No, I think what you're saying is different. So if you, if you take out the, so if you look at the legend, and you take out the boundary in the legend, see how forest doesn't have a boundary around it. You see what I'm saying? You got three of, three of the four have a boundary line around it. So you're kind of looking for that boundary line?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: If you just take out the boundary line and make it like forest; I don't know if I'm making sense.

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Then you won't be looking for the boundary line.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, same difference, just take that boundary line out or make them unique.

Ms. Taylor: So we want to keep the boundary line for the RPA buffer or remove it for the other two.

Mr. Apicella: It's some kind of weird boundary. Just take it out. It's just going to look like a bunch of dots.

Ms. Taylor: But so we're removing the boundary line for the buffer.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. McPherson: I'm having a hard time finding...

Mr. English: A cluster of dots. You just want a cluster of dots.

Mr. Randall: Yes, I just want a cluster of dots.

Mr. Apicella: You got it. But do the same on streams and national wetlands so...

Mr. McPherson: I'm having a hard time finding national wetlands on the map.

Mr. English: RPAs you mean?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: No, national wetlands.

Mr. Harvey: There's some identified in Potomac Creek and Accokeek Creek and Aquia Creek. It's one of those maps where you're going to have to zoom in to see the detail.

Ms. Taylor: I was going to say this one would be definitely...

*Inaudible, several people talking at once.*

Mr. Harvey: The countywide map, your line width is like a quarter mile wide.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, that's, yeah, I understand. Okay.

Ms. Taylor: So removing boundary lines on all of the symbols.

Mr. Randall: Yeah.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: It could make sense. If it doesn't make sense... *inaudible*.

Mr. Randall: That's the 35 by 35 GIS map that helps you recall that.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, moving on to... oh, I missed it.

Mr. Randall: I thought we are at the top of 6-69?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. So we have the additional information that we are waiting on regarding the alternative septic systems. We are also pending receipt of updated inform... updated data and information from Public Works regarding table 6.28 which is located on sheet, page 6-73, and that information for the Stafford watershed system. Otherwise, it has been minor revisions to the rest of this section. We are also pending receipt of updated data and information from Public Works regarding subsection 6.9.7 which is on page...

Mr. McPherson: 680.

Ms. Taylor: ... 680 regarding the forest and wildlife resources, specifically for more recent studies or reports related to the current acreage of forest land. And then some of that information will carry over into the finding section at the end of the section. Okay, and then moving on to our last section, section 6.10 for transportation which begins on page 6-88. Updates for this section – staff has updated data regarding current traffic volumes and that is based on VDOT's annual traffic data for 2019. We did do a data comparison and numbers in 2020 were lower. We are still pending updated information regarding traffic safety and roadway management and improvement. That information is on page 6-91. Staff needs to reach out to Transportation and the Sheriff's Office for information regarding this. On, at the bottom of page 691, staff has updated information regarding rail service and has specifically updated and included information regarding the Manassas line, the VRE Manassas line. And then on page 694, additional information has been updated and expanded regarding the commuter lots, all the available commuter lots and the total number of spaces available in those lots, and has also updated information regarding private airports in the County.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

Mr. Bain: Just an editorial thing, sorry to be picky. Under 6.10.7 commuter lots, the third paragraph, the very last line starts with the word lot maintained should be by VDOT. Don't know why I caught that. Did you find that?

Ms. Taylor: No. Could you repeat that again? I'm sorry.

Mr. Bain: Okay. You're on page 694?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Bain: And under 6.10.7 commuter lots. The third paragraph, last line, not the last... well, it is the last sentence, starts with the word lot, maintained and should add the word "by" VDOT.

Ms. Taylor: Oh, yes.

Mr. McPherson: And one other thing; in 6.10.8, Air Service. I disagree with the saying that our airport is within a short drive from two major airports. Maybe a reasonable drive. We're not short from BWI, Dulles, Reagan National, Richmond. Just my opinion. I wouldn't call that short. I don't know what anybody else thinks.

Mr. Apicella: It's fine with me.

Mr. Bain: Is within a five hour drive...

Mr. Apicella: We have... *inaudible*... on a good day.

Mr. McPherson: Well, we're still an hour from Richmond.

Ms. Taylor: Okay. Unless there are any other questions, that concludes all the updated information we have for Chapter 6.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, my kudos and well done. I know it was a lot of work just to get to this point. So we all appreciate it. Anything else you needed to talk about, Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: We will be working on all these final changes over the next week, so.

Mr. Apicella: Well, over the next week and then some to the extent it still needs to be done after next week. Again, we talked about the parameters of additional changes you can make after the advertisement, so.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, right, right, up to the point of the advertisement, right.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you very much Mike...

Mr. Zuraf: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: ... Amy and Joe. Alright, Mr. Harvey, it looks like we don't have any New Business, thank goodness. Planning Director's Report.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*September 22, 2021*

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- \* Family Subdivision Ordinance
- \* Industrial Lighting Standards
- \* Project Clover Comprehensive Sign Plan

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, just to report on activity at the Board yesterday, the Family Subdivision Exemption Ordinance was passed. They also passed Industrial Lighting Standards and approved the CUP for Project Clover and their Comprehensive Sign Waiver. That concludes my report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

Ms. Lucian: Just a reminder that you should make a motion to move that forward to a public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: I actually did not understand a word you said.

Ms. Lucian: You need to make a motion to move forward the Comp Plan changes to public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, we do need to do that; absolutely.

Ms. Lucian: I know you've been working on it so hard.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Lucian: Just that one final detail.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, so taking us back – my fault – is there a motion to put the Comp Plan update forward to a public hearing...

Ms. Barnes: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: ... to be held on October 19<sup>th</sup> as part of a joint public hearing with the Board of Supervisors with the changes that we talked about and any additional changes that are within the purview for the staff to make?

Mr. Randall: Yes, I move to make that motion.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Is there a second?

Ms. Barnes/Mr. McPherson: Second.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments Mr. Randall?

Mr. Randall: No, no; are you kidding?

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: No, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Alright, motion to put it forward. Please cast your vote. Motion carries 7-0. Thank you very much, Ms. Lucian, for making sure we were doing what we needed to do. I don't believe we have any Committee Reports. I don't have a Chairman's Report. Looks like you got a little bit activity for TRC in the George Washington District. Last item on the agenda are the approval of the minutes. Anyone want to make a motion for the June 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

10. New TRC Submissions
  - 21154102 Colebrook Rd – George Washington Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

11. June 23, 2021

Mr. English: Can we make them all in one motion?

Mr. Apicella: I think we have to do them separately.

Mr. English: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Just gonna do a quick voice vote. Motion to approve the June 23, 2021 minutes say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Nay. I abstain because I wasn't here. That motion carries. Motion to approve the July 28, 2021 minutes?

12. July 28, 2021



*Planning Commission Minutes  
September 22, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Mr. Bain: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Do a voice vote. All those in favor of the July 28, 2021 minutes say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Nay? Motion carries. Motion to approve the August 23, 2021 minutes.

13. August 25, 2021

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Second, somebody?

Mr. McPherson: August 25<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Bain: Oh, 25<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, my fault. August 25, 2021 minutes.

Mr. Bain: So moved.

Mr. Apicella: Second? All those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Nay? Motion carries. No further business before the Commission, we are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 PM.