

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 28, 2024

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, February 28, 2024, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella, Willie Shelton, Jr., Kristen Barnes, Carlos Bratton, Martin Martinez (arrived late; left early), Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kelsey Caudill

STAFF PRESENT: Kathy Baker, Lauren Lucian, Vicki Sowers, Mike Zuraf, Evelyn Keith, Natalie Doolittle

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualification? Alright, seeing none. Are there any changes to the agenda? None. Okay. So, 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 on the three public hearing items on today's agenda. So if you're here for the Clift Farm item or the Starbucks, you'll have an opportunity to address the Planning Commission when those hearings come up. This is not an interactive conversation. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. And red means your time is up. So if anyone would like to speak on any item except the public hearing items, please feel free to come forward now. Alright, seeing no one, I'm going to close the public presentations for... oh, sorry, sir.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Member of Audience: Were you asking for public views?

Mr. Apicella: On any matter except the public hearing items. So again, if...

Member of Audience: Oh, okay, pardon. Sorry.

Mr. Apicella: No worries. Alright, so we're gonna move on to...

Ms. Maxson: Wait a second.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, alright, sorry.

Ms. Maxson: Kristin Maxson. I was making sure that everybody had a chance, so that was my hesitation. I apologize. I want to let you know that February 20, 2024, which was just this past Tuesday a week ago, it says referred to the Planning Commission February 20, 2024. But it says potential code amendment on December 15, '20. And it's strange because normally they pass information immediately for the year '24 and this seems like it's four years old at least, and so that was questionable. Also, that just makes the public confused. So we, you know, we normally see things being passed immediately from the Board to the Commissioners, which shows good communication. And, um, oh, I still have three minutes; it's not even ticking. Thank you. Not that funny, am I. I can take another three. The Board committee, it basically says – let me read it right off my phone so it's accurate – it says February 20, 2024, and it says the standing committees are currently on hold while the committee structure is

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

assessed. So this is another concern. What is being passed is old and there isn't committees currently. There is, however, three Board members that did come together on a committee or two but a majority of the committee's are not standing. So this means that the Board is not representing the people and passing handshaking baton, whatever you call it, to the committee, and we're concerned about that. We have been told that our courthouse will be moved on private property. We are sort of confused. We were told where this private property is and we're still confused. We have been told that they'll be using specific private equipment, which will be rented, I believe. Nothing's written in stone. But we as a public want public equipment, so we can trust that what we're seeing right here today is on public, a public platform. And we are the public. So please take that in consideration. So right now, we stand somewhat confused. And we'd like you take the last minute for, for some silence for order, order for transparency. Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. Again, is there anyone else who would like to speak? Seeing no one, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting and move on to the first agenda item. Mr. Zuraf.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC20153640; Zoning Reclassification – Clift Farm – A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 46-79, 46-79H, and 46-80, together consisting of 56.91 acres (collectively, “the Property”), to allow for the development of an age-restricted residential community. The proposed proffers would restrict the permitted use of the Property to no more than 141 age-restricted single-family detached dwelling units; install transportation improvements; provide cash contributions to mitigate impacts; install necessary utility infrastructure to serve the site; provide community amenities; install specific landscaping and screening; commit to specific senior housing and neighborhood design standards; and require additional analysis and recognition of archeological resources located on the Property. The Property is located along both sides of Clift Farm Road, north of the intersection with Leeland Road, within the Falmouth Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent request for a CUP for retirement housing in the R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density Zoning District. **(Time Limit: April 19, 2024) (History: Deferred at the January 10, 2024 meeting to the February 28, 2024 meeting)**
2. CUP22154813; Conditional Use Permit – Clift Farm – A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow retirement housing in the R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 46-79, 46-79H, and 46-80, together consisting of 56.91 acres (collectively, “the Property”). The retirement housing would consist of up to 141 single-family dwellings. The Property is located along both sides of Clift Farm Road, north of the intersection with Leeland Road, within the Falmouth Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent request for a reclassification to the R-2, Urban Residential – Medium Density Zoning District. **(Time Limit: April 19, 2024) (History: Deferred at the January 10, 2024 meeting to the February 28, 2024 meeting)**

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. I'm going to go over, if it's okay, a summary of items 1 and 2 together. This is a...

Mr. Apicella: Mike, is there a presentation?

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, yes.

Mr. Apicella: A presentation please. Thanks.

Mr. Zuraf: So if I could go over items 1 and 2 together in my presentation. So this is a project known as Clift Farm. It's a zoning reclassification and a conditional use permit for, for this project. For some background, the first application, item 1, is a zoning reclassification to reclassify the property from A-1, Agricultural to the R-2, Urban Residential-Medium Density Zoning District. The site is 56.91 acres. The second item is a conditional use permit request to allow retirement housing in the R-2 Zoning District on the same property. And there's three parcels involved in this project. The site is in the Falmouth Election District and Jarrell Properties is the applicant. For an update, your initial public hearing for this item, of these two items was held on January 10th earlier this year, and deferred to this meeting. The Planning Commission had several questions of the applicant and staff. The applicant did provide a memo responding to questions and included amended proffers, amended general development plan, and other documents in support of their response. And this staff presentation will focus mainly on summarizing the issues raised at the original public hearing and changes that were made to the application. I'll go through just some, some basic background and context first. Here's a location map of the site. The site is located on both sides of Clift Farm Road, on the north side of the intersection with Leeland Road. Here's the existing zoning map for this site and surrounding area. The A-1 zoning of the site is shaded in light green and you'll see that same A-1 zoning is surrounding a majority of the site to the north, south, and east. Also you have the light yellow shading is R-1, Suburban Residential; that is located to the west where the Hickory Ridge subdivision is located. There are no proffers on any of the three properties involved in this application. Here's an aerial view of the site. You see the site is mostly undeveloped. There's one single-family dwelling on the west side of the site. The site includes open farm fields and some tree cover in the northwest corner of the site where there's a perennial stream and wetlands and resource protection area buffers. Topography of the site is generally level across the, from one side to the other. This is the development plan for the 141-lot subdivision, which would be age-restricted, an age-restricted community. It would be single-family detached homes in this 141-lot development. The access to the site would be off of Clift Farm Road, which bisects the project. There was one change to the development plan since the, since the last meeting. In this northern, northeast end of the of the site, there's an enhancement to the buffer along this, along this property boundary. So the applicant, in this area, added a 20-foot wide open space strip along the boundary, and in there will be planting evergreen trees to add some additional screening. Previously, the applicant proffered a fence across that property boundary and the property and the lots ran right up to the edge of the property. Here you have an open space, 20-foot open space strip between the lots and the adjacent property. So going over some of the issues and questions that were raised at the last meeting, there were questions about the potential for school-aged children in the community despite the age restrictions that would be placed on the development. Staff looked into the situations in two of the other larger, larger and actually largest age-restricted communities in the County to see how many students are there. Student data from the school divisions found that the Celebrate Virginia Del Webb community has two students out of the 1,091 dwelling units, and the Falls Run by Del Webb community has zero students out of the 583 dwelling units. Separate info was provided to the Commission that included the specific age restriction language from recorded covenants of these two communities, but also the age-restricted sections within Leeland Station and Embrey Mill. The standards of age-restricted covenants are designed generally to be in compliance with state and federal laws. And they were all generally similar between the four

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

developments. And staff would note that the enforcement of these covenants and these standards would lie with the homeowners association and would not be a County function. The applicant did strengthen some of the proffer language that related to archaeological resources. They did include some language that would prohibit any development activity that would be in conflict with any of the Phase 2 Archaeological Study recommendation areas. Originally, the proffers said they would work up a plan, but now they're saying in the proffers that they would not do anything in conflict with what might be recommended in the Phases 2 study. In addition, after the last meeting, the Historic Commission reconsidered the project and proposal, and amended their comments to recommend a full Phase 1 study across the entire site. The applicant did add a proffer to complete the full Phase 1 study prior to site plan approval. There are questions about the 2017 Parks and Rec Utilization Plan and what the status is of that since it dates back to 2017. In talking to the Parks and Recreation, that document is still the latest kind of countywide planning document. There is also, in 2014, a Phase 1 Utilization Plan was developed. So they still utilize those two plans. They are, they do have some near term plans to develop a new countywide master plan for parks but they've not gotten to that point yet. And they did point out in the, in these utilization plans they make reference to recreation needs and providing recreation needs to older citizens. However, the analysis is mainly focused on youth recreation needs, you know, rectangular ball fields and baseball fields. There's a question about the traffic and the safety of Leeland Road, so staff did look into accident data that's been recorded along Leeland Road, specifically a five year period from 2018 to 2022; basically on Leeland Road, 500 feet from each, in each direction from the Clift Farm Road intersection. And during that time period there was one accident in 2022, which basically was a single vehicle collision with a deer with no injuries reported.

Mr. Apicella: Except to the deer.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, yeah. The report did not talk about the fate of the deer. Also, there were questions about the impacts to the Falmouth Fire and Rescue station. We did not get specific kind of response times from the station to this site. We, we did, in looking at the Capital Improvements Plan, there are several different improvements planned to different fire stations in the surrounding area. The closest being the White Oak; White Oak has a separate rescue station and a separate fire station and it's basically the plan is to basically build a new combined fire and rescue station to improve operational efficiencies to that station. And then in talking to fire and rescue staff, you know, they all kind of overlap and so in Falmouth, that's the next station over from Falmouth and if Falmouth is busy on calls, they may rely on the White Oak station to service this area. So that plan improvement could have a benefit to this, to this site. There was a request for more details on the flight patterns associated with the Dogwood Airpark. The Dogwood Airpark is a small private airfield located to the northwest of the site. And since it is a small airfield, there are no specific traffic pattern charts that we could rely on. Staff did receive info from, from a resident and president of the Dogwood HOA, and it was cited several site factors were cited to explain why the majority of air traffic from the airport will actually cross over this Clift Farm site. Some of the general traffic pattern will go in this direction, and if it circles around, they will, they'll swing through this way to land and sometimes take off. And they said, generally, the flight traffic is to the south of the airport because of the proximity to the Stafford Regional Airport, which is up in this direction. And so to avoid potential conflicts with air traffic around Stafford Regional, they generally will fly their maneuvers and maneuver to the south. And also they will generally fly to the east when patterns permit because of the proximity to Stafford High School. They made mention that the high school long ago has asked them to as much as possible to fly in the other direction so they're not going over top of the school.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Sellers: How many aircraft come in and out of that airport annually?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not certain.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. And it looks like – I'm very interested in this neighborhood that has an airport in it by the way, which I had no idea existed; very, very unique -- and so you don't know how many, like the size of the aircraft or compared to the Stafford airport runway, do you know how big this runway is?

Mr. Zuraf: That was mentioned. I believe 4,000 feet and I'm sure if one of those residents are here, they can correct me; 4,000 feet.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I see somebody who might, so hopefully he'll get up and speak.

Mr. Zuraf: There are people who probably will have, and there are smaller planes, there's single engine planes that, that would fly in and out because it is a much smaller airport.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: So just summarizing the proffer modifications since the last meeting, the applicant did amend proffer 3.a. to add reference and include a new Exhibit E which is basically draft and representative covenants that would outline the age-restricted, age restriction parameters for the community. Proffer 4.c., that was amended to commit to constructing the shared use path along the entire site frontage of Leeland Road all the way over to Morton Road. Originally, they were committing to construct that path from Cliff Farm Road over to Morton. So, they extended the pathway across the full length of the, of the property. Proffers 6 amended some of the pump station design; This was regarding the sanitary sewer pump station and some of the details. They amended the pump station design capacity section to remove specific capacity amounts in favor of requiring the sizing to be determined later at time of site plan. And based on the proposed demands, that might be match what's recommended in the Comp Plan. And I talked to the Utilities Department; they were, they were satisfied with the way these, this proffer was amended. And proffer 7.a./b., this adds related to the outdoor recreation, there's concern about the pickleball courts that were proposed and what kind of noise impacts those would be. They did add clarification that the outdoor recreation locations shown on the GDP might be adjusted later, that they were in the GDP, they're more representative of what might happen. And then also they added in language that any pickleball or tennis courts would require a noise abatement plan, and with various noise abatement methods utilized, if it's shown that that's needed. And then proffer 7.e. As I've mentioned, adding that Phase 1 study would be conducted across the entire site in response to comments from the Historic Commission. And then also modifying the Phase 2 proffer language to not conduct any work in the Phase 2 areas that would be inconsistent with any of the recommendations out of a Phase 2 study. Overall, in summary, our staff recommendations with the zoning reclassification, we kind of went through the positives and negatives at the last public hearing. And although there are several positive aspects, staff would support the reclassification application with a lower development density that's more in line with the R-1, Suburban Residential zoning district standards which comply with the 1.5 units per acre. And then for the conditional use permit, staff would recommend approval of the use permit with the conditions recommended, but of course subject to approval first of the concurrent zoning reclassification request. And I can answer any questions at this time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Questions for staff? Ms. Barnes.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Barnes: So you said that, that staff would support you said an R-1, which is less density? With an R-1, you can't do an age-restricted housing in an R-1, is that correct? Or is that something that you could do with that less density?

Mr. Zuraf: That is something I have to check.

Ms. Baker: I think the comparison to R-1 was the densities themselves.

Ms. Barnes: So they could still do an age-restricted community if, if they did instead a reclassification to an R-1?

Mr. Zuraf: We'd have to check on that.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Baker: What we were saying though was the...

Mr. Zuraf: That lower density, yes.

Ms. Baker: ... the lower density, not necessarily going to the lower district, zoning district. But sticking with the current request, however, lowering the number to the same intensity, that's intended in the R-1.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I see what you're saying. And just to clarify, with as far as the age restriction goes, the 80/20 law still applies; 80% have to be 50... at least one person has to be 55, 20% can be I'm guessing below 55. Nevertheless, with that proffer in it, there can be no long term kids, kids under 21.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Ms. Barnes: And this might be a question for the applicant. Why 21?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that's gonna be a question for the applicant.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Most of the others we saw, we see are 18 or 19.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, 18 or 19, so when I saw that 21 I thought that was unusual. And I don't know if it's, I would find that unfortunate. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: I have a question on the entrances. Would you go back over that? The entrance is a little confusing to me. The entrance is off of Clift Farm Road and not off of Leeland, if interpreted correctly?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. The entrance is into the subdivision streets basically have, you know, in... so here's Clift Farm Road, and then your access is in these locations. So then access to the any of the dwelling units are within internal neighborhood streets, not off of Clift Farm Road.

Mr. Shelton: And those streets are VDOT approved?

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, they're proposing public VDOT roads, streets in this.

Mr. Shelton: And are there any improvements to Leeland or Morton included in the proposal?

Mr. Zuraf: Not Morton, but for Leeland they are proposing a slight intersection improvement to adjust the kind of the way... traffic currently kind of comes at an angle to the intersection and it would, it would more so provide more of a 90 degree kind of access point at the intersection.

Mr. Shelton: And the revised proffer on the archeological study was the entire site would be reviewed under a Phase 1, am I correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Shelton: And then the three sites would be re-examined under a Phase 2?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, well, those... that was always the the proffer, but they expanded the, they modified their language to clarify that they wouldn't do anything in those areas if that would, that would be in conflict with what's recommended in that Phase 2.

Ms. Baker: And the proffer is actually worded that it's within the area of disturbance, not, not the entire site. So there is that entire area that's being retained; that's excluding that, is that correct?

Mr. Shelton: That's awesome.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. More Ms. Barnes? Go ahead.

Ms. Barnes: If you go back to that last, you just pulled it down... that last slide. So that Leeland Road improvement you were just talking about, is that... that's not shown on here, is it? Because that's still at a pretty like, what? That's not a 90 degree angle turn there into it.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. It's a wide area, and it's been more so striping. And within the general development plan, they do... there's more detail that kind of shows how that...

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Because that's one of the things that concerns me. It looked like almost, I mean, that looks like almost like you'd have to scoot way up and then almost do a U-turn kind of thing.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. It's, it's changed. It's basically adding some striping to direct cars a better way into.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Is the proffer for age... is it a proffer for age restriction or is it attached to like a condition statement?

Mr. Zuraf: It's a proffer.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Sellers: So... okay. And we're not doing a separate, because they're doing a conditional use permit for the retirement housing. And so we're not going to do... we're just going to do it as a proffer instead of have something separate?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, the proffer would cover it. And then the purpose of the conditional use permit is, is more so connecting the, tying the project back to the overall design standards of the community. That will require them to develop the the community appropriate for, you know, residents of that age.

Ms. Sellers: Oh, okay, so it's not, it's not keeping it the age restriction.

Mr. Zuraf: The, well the proffer will ensure that it stays as an age-restricted developed.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. Sorry. Just based on the how it's worded, the CUP to allow retirement housing. I figured there was a separate... I didn't realize that was a CUP that you did that with but.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. Alright.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Okay, I've got a few. Do we know if Morton is gonna get any upgrades as a result of the new Leeland bridge? Modifications?

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not aware.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I have some other questions.

Ms. Sellers: I don't think we have a... *inaudible, microphone not on*. I don't know if there's a drawing out for the new Leeland bridge.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. When did the density cap for R-1 subdivisions change?

Mr. Zuraf: That was in 2000.

Mr. Apicella: And do we know what it, what it was previously?

Mr. Zuraf: It previously was 3 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Could someone pursue an A-2 subdivision on this property without connecting to public water and sewer?

Mr. Zuraf: They would have to connect to public water and sewer because it's inside the Urban Services Area.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so, so any development associated with this parcel, residential development would require to hook up to public water and sewer.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. They could do an A-2 or subdivision but it would still have to connect to public water and sewer.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Apicella: So, so if the Flippo farm was developed either as an A-2 or R-1, they would need to provide a sewer pump station.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And from what I recall, the developer said it was about a million bucks. So that's \$12,000 per unit, if it's 82 units under R-1, and \$20,000 per unit is A-2, roughly speaking, if they pass it on to the property owners. Are there any alternatives for a developer to avoid connecting to public water and sewer?

Mr. Zuraf: The, really I think the only, the only option would be to actually amend the Comprehensive Plan and remove the property from the Urban Services Area.

Ms. Barnes: Is that a possibility?

Mr. Apicella: So, they could do a, they could do a rezoning with a Comp Plan Amendment.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. But there's no waiver, there's no, under the Utilities Ordinance there's no waiver that the applicant could pursue.

Mr. Zuraf: I'm not aware of any waiver on the connection requirement.

Mr. Apicella: Is this, is this property the only option or bridging point to connect the school site to public sewer?

Mr. Zuraf: I think it might be, because you do have Hickory Ridge is right immediately to the west. But that generally, I think has gravity lines. And that might not... Yeah, I'm not, I can't say it for certain, but they're probably more appropriate. Those lines are probably sized for the community within it, and may not be able to accommodate additional, you know, capacity plus a force main that would be required. So I'm guessing it would have to run through this, this area to get connected back to the, the network.

Mr. Apicella: So again, kind of tying these thoughts together, could a developer proffer an easement so the County could connect the school site to public utilities?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. That's it for me. Any other questions? No? Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Would the applicant like to come forward? Welcome.

Mr. Hicks: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Jay Hicks representing Jarrell Properties here this evening, who was making the proposal for the Clift Farm project that we are discussing.

Ms. Baker: Computer, please. Sorry.

Mr. Hicks: Thank you. How do we turn the page? Is there a way I can do it? Oh, the clicker is working tonight? Okay, good. Alright. Well, as we all discussed, well, let me, Chairman Aicella, I want to

address the alternate path real quick that you just asked the question about for the school property. There is another path to the, to the, for the school property to acquire access to the sewer lines. However, I think there's gonna be an independent separate cost than the things that we're offering to benefit the school property with our pump station. So you're talking about acquisition of land from private property owners. And due to our efforts to try to explore options for paths for sewer, we know that the Hickory Ridge pump station is over 40 years old. There's a number of questions about its current capacity, much less its ability to handle any additional capacity, like we're talking about with the potential the school property. So we're talking about Clift Farm and it's a project that we're proffering as a 55 and over project, 141 lots, and first thing is that we're observing the Stafford Senior Housing Design Standards. And we're making it equitable, safe and affordable, just as, as we've been asked to do. An age exclusive residential community, we've covered some of this ground at the last meeting. It's going to be a professionally managed homeowners association. There'll be... through that they'll be able to manage their common area, they will take care of the budgeting and the management of the homeowners association for the residents. There'll be professional landscaping provided as well. The 55 and over restrictive covenants have been beefed up. We've included that in our proffers. And in our package, we provided an example of the covenant that we'd be using. Temporarily, we'll be quickly addressing that. There's been a lot of questions about the potential for school-aged children to be in this community. And I think there was some information provided to this Commission that I acquired as well from the School Board Division, which indicates that Celebrate Virginia, which is in, off Route 17 near the GEICO area, has approximately 1,071 homes. The Falls Run Senior Living Community in England Run, north of 17, has about 582 residential units. And out of that over 1,500 residential units, the school division tells us that there are two school-aged children. So I hope that's an example that how these restrictive covenants are effective. Lot sizes are important for 55 and over communities. Most people going into that phase of life are not looking for large yards to have to maintain. And of course, the declarations will be enforced by the homeowners association to eliminate some of the bothersome issues that may occur in the neighborhood. Community engagement – again, this is some of the ground that we've covered before, but there have been additions to this. We've been out there. We've been talking to people early on, well attended community meetings, individual meetings with the neighbors, group meetings with the neighbors. The product of that is the landscaping buffering. I realized, I heard comments at the last Commission meeting that not everybody's necessarily satisfied with what would the outcome was, but we've certainly engaged every one of them to have their, have them express their opinion as to what their interests were for that buffering, and have employed it as fully as we could. And since the last Commission meeting, we've met with the Dogwood Airpark representatives twice. Highlights of the project are the fact that it's a 55 and over community, something that's becoming more and more necessary in our region as we increase in population and our population ages. Within that community, we're going to try and make it a pleasant place to be; a place where if somebody wants to be active, they can be active, and with sidewalks and nature trails. There'll be a clubhouse with bocce ball and pickleball courts, as we've talked about. We've included within our proffers the, an answer to the concern related to noise potential from the pickleball court. We're going to employ audible, audio experts to assist us in the proper materials to minimize that impact as much as possible. An AED device will be made available. And then there'll be other outdoor opportunities as well, not to mention the 10-foot shared use path that'll go along Leeland Road. When we, I talked about this last time, when we come in looking at a project we we go in and try and figure out what the County wants. The County issues a Comp Plan, a Comprehensive Plan that illustrates guidelines for us to follow as to where development should go, what type of development should go there. This project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. There's a... we're in an area with a Suburban Future Land Use designation. We are within the Urban Services Area. The Comprehensive Plans suggest to the County that development should be directed into the Urban Services Area. The Urban Services Area was recently reviewed in 2022 by you all and the Board of Supervisors. And so the current line has not been stale, it is a new consideration. We are employing

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

benefit to the community by providing senior housing needs. And we've all heard about how there's going to be one in five of us that will be 65 years, 65 years or older by 2040. We believe we're fulfilling future public facility needs based on the population growth. And we are encouraging, well we're ensuring, we're putting things in place to make sure that it's well fiscally managed in a responsible project. And fiscally, we think we're being excessively responsible frankly. We've done a few of these and the numbers that are the outcome of this analysis are rarely this beneficial to the local jurisdiction. This is extraordinary. We're talking about a low impact group of residents of Stafford County on the services, but a high impact on the coffers and the bank account for Stafford County. Projected revenues from taxes and associated fees from the residents of Clift Farm exceed \$25 million. The same group of residents are assigned expenses in the amount of \$7.6 million. That leads to a net income for Stafford County of over \$17 million for all operating costs; \$17.3 million. And this number is not, is not current, frankly; it's based off of 2021 analysis so it doesn't take into account the most recent tax year increase for property taxes, which I believe is 93/94 cents for every 100. In addition, we've talked extensively about the pump station and the benefits that that would provide. I think the number that we... we took a little closer look at the number and we're looking at probably \$2 million, and with all the infrastructure for this pump station, in excess of \$2 million. So we're providing the capacity to be able to accommodate the school property in its 202 acres. And then the ability to hook up to the main line, which will utilize that pump station. The pump station will be designed with the Public Utilities Department for Stafford County. It satisfies the Master Plan. It's in line with the Comprehensive Plan. And it will be designed to accommodate all the area you see on the example in the exhibit. We've had many conversations with the Public Utilities Department. They actually asked us and I apologize to Chris Edwards, but they actually asked us to not be so detailed in the information we provided to you previously. So we stepped back from that a little bit and just suggested that whatever the Master Plan dictates, whatever the needs of the facility are based on what the Public Utilities Department tells us is what we will do. In addition, this area of the County with its water network is a dead end in places. And so one of the benefits that we're providing is we're going to provide a looping system so that there's no stationary water in any location, which, if anybody has ever lived on the end of the line understands what I'm talking about. Density and zoning – a lot of conversation about that. The Clift Farm Project is an infill development within the Urban Services Area. In comparison with other local developments, nearby developments, we're pretty in line with those neighborhoods. The example that you see on the exhibit is a portrayal of the Hickory Ridge subdivision. And what you see there is a lighter shading and a darker shading. The darker shading represents over 60% of the neighborhood, which exceeds the density that we're proposing for Clift Farm. So everything in excess of 2.4 units per acre is shaded in the darker shade. With our project, we're actually providing a suggestion of 30% less that's otherwise provided through the, through the ordinances for R-2 designation. And we're providing 10% more open space than is required. Traffic considerations – this is pretty detailed, but the summary of it is that we've been engaged with Virginia Department of Transportation from the very beginning. And all of our proposed transportation improvements have been approved by VDOT. It does involve some striping at the intersection, which will make it more clear how to enter onto Leeland Road or how to better enter onto Clift Farm Road. We're going to have the multi-use path that I mentioned earlier, 10-foot wide that runs along Leeland Road. There's going to be site clearing to assist with the line of sight as you come off of Clift Farm Road and look to the east. And that ultimate... lots of analysis has been provided. And we've even since the last Commission meeting confirmed that auto turn analysis for school buses in the event of whatever use for the school property ends up being used for can accommodate the school buses. Historical considerations – of course, this was another new item since our last Commission meeting. We received notice from the Historic Commission that they would suggest that we perform a Phase 1 initial study on the property and beyond the Phase 2 studies that we have previously proffered. So we have proffered to perform that Phase 1 study. With that, we've agreed that we wouldn't do any construction until we have completed the Phase 1 study, followed its recommendations, and if it leads to a Phase 2 determination,

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

then we go ahead and follow through with that. And as we've mentioned before, we've agreed to work with the Historical Commission on the naming of streets and the installation of historical placards that would be relevant to the property and surrounding area. Not in the presentation is our conversations with the Dogwood Airpark. Again, two meetings with those folks, and we believe we, because it's not formally discussed, we, we've had negotiations this week and received a latest draft that we're okay with from the Dogwood representatives. So I'd like to suggest that we have an agreement on a notice that will be provided to the residents of the Airpark, and their flight paths and things of that nature. It's a pretty general notice that's used in other locations of the state. And we're happy to say that we've come a short way because I don't think we were that far away, because maybe they're too nice and they just come across that way. But it's a unique property. Really cool, cool situation. We appreciate what they're doing there. A couple of the smartest people we've dealt with, with any development, really came to the table with us. And we had great conversations about what their needs were, what our needs were, and believe we've come to a reasonable outcome for both of us, which I'm happy to share that notice. I have multiple copies, but it's very late notice. And it's just really a demonstrative deal.

Mr. Apicella: So is that different than what's been proffered?

Mr. Hicks: It's a little beefed up. Again, after the conversations this week, we've included reference to the FAA regulation that may have been previously referred to that lays out the rules for their flying. And we put on information regarding Stafford Regional Airport, as well as the Dogwood Airpark and where they can find additional information.

Mr. Apicella: So, Mike, would that... that would be a proffer update that we'd have to consider tonight?

Mr. Hicks: I wouldn't want... well, yeah, I guess it would be.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, if you want to, if you have copies.

Mr. Hicks: I do. It's hot off the press. Otherwise we would have gotten it to you earlier. Thank you. Maybe lastly, I'd want to leave you with this, that the, the benefits to the County, we might suggest counter the questions over density. The proposal of the pump station expansion. The fiscal impact that this project has is one that not only pays its way, but because of the large amount of financial benefit we see coming for the County, it subsidize the needs of other existing residential units in the County and generates a positive outcome for the County that we ask you to take in consideration with our submission. And that's my presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Questions for the applicant? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: I just have the one brief one about the under 21. What was the reasoning behind under 21 as opposed to most are under 18 or 19?

Mr. Hicks: We certainly felt with the concern that we were feeling from the Commission that an expansion of that prohibition would be of benefit. To be clear that we're not looking for people that are younger people to be residents of the community.

Ms. Barnes: It almost feels like you can't win, but I, just my opinion, under 21, 55 and up, that's going to include occasional college age kids that come home over the summer. So it, you know, I don't want that to capture that because people that age are still going to have college age kids.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Hicks: It sounds like you're presuming that they were living there in high school.

Ms. Barnes: Excuse me?

Mr. Hicks: It sounds like you may be presumed...

Ms. Barnes: No, I presume that if somebody like me moved there, and my son came home for the summer, I would want to make sure that my son could stay home for the summer.

Mr. Hicks: Right. Well, under our conditions he would not be allowed to.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hicks: You're welcome.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Would you clarify again the entrances? Because I still am a little miffed on why you limit your entrances to Clift Farm and not make improvements on Leeland.

Mr. Hicks: This is all based on recommendations from the Virginia Department of Transportation. If any additional work were to be required, it would have to rise to a level where VDOT sees that it is, the word is warranted, and VDOT does not see anything additional necessary that is warranted.

Mr. Shelton: Okay, thank you. One other question. You alluded to the fact that in the recreational areas you would provide one AED?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, sir.

Mr. Shelton: Don't you think that's a little restrictive for 141 seniors?

Mr. Hicks: I love your progressive thinking. But this is a new thing that is just becoming familiar with this industry and people and society in general. And we're trying to do our best by providing one. It makes sense to us to have one in a central location, which would be the clubhouse. If we went ahead and had a second one, I guess there's a question as to what an appropriate location for that second one would be.

Mr. Shelton: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Okay, I have a question. I'll start first with a comment. So I appreciate the work that JPI has done on this project and adopting the senior housing guidelines. Most of those, the proffer changes that you all have made based on the comments we had at the last meeting, and the detailed comment matrix that you provided. And I'm going to repeat a question that I asked at the last meeting. So I beg your indulgence. As you heard, staff, neighbors, and some Commissioners have raised concerns about the project's density, that it's greater than what was proposed in the Comp Plan. And, and it's more significant or different from most of the nearby parcels, those to the northeast and to the south. So I think I asked you at the last meeting, if you would, and have you considered developing a project at a lower intensity.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Hicks: I can tell you that we have been considering it. However, the County has come back and asked for more. The Phase 1 request is not a small request. It is a request that would create a delay in time. And as soon as we file an application, we're on the money clock. So we've been on the money clock for some time on this project. Um, the... I apologize. When we talk about the benefits to the County, we think that counters off to the... well, going back to the 500, we're talking about with the Phase 1, delay in construction plans being approved, delay for the project, and then we're talking about our initial conversations with, with companies that would do this type of work, we're looking at starting at \$200,000 and getting anywhere up to \$500,000 just for the Phase 1. So you're talking about six figures of more things that the County is requesting of us. We are contributing a considerable amount financially by providing an exceedingly accommodating sump pump station and a main line that the school properties can benefit from. And then we're talking about \$17.3 million of straight up money for the County over 30 years to help support the operating expenses of the departments for the County. With those factors, and considering the senior housing guidelines and the type of product people in this phase of life are looking for, the lot size is very important. And we at this time would not be proposing any reduction in density.

Mr. Apicella: So you heard me ask, and again, it's a hypothetical question about an alternative path, which is a rezoning and a Comp Plan amendment that could potentially avoid the need for potentially by taking the property outside of the Urban Services Area and the... *inaudible*... need for the pump station. So that's, you said that's about \$2 million of cost. With that in mind, again, it may not end up with the project that you had envisioned for this area. Is that something you could or would consider as an alternative approach?

Mr. Hicks: No.

Mr. Apicella: No. Okay. Alright, that's it for me. Again, any other questions? Thank you, sir.

Mr. Hicks: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, at the last meeting we left the public hearing open. So again, I'm going to provide anyone who wishes to speak an opportunity to comment on these two items, both the rezoning and the CUP. You have up to 3 minutes. 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. I do have some speaker cards so I'm going to start with those. And I'm going to read names three in a row. I apologize in advance if I don't get your name exactly as it should be read. So I'm going to start with, and if you'd please line up, Marty Lemus, Lisa Nguyen, and Christine Robbins-Campbell.

Mr. Lemus: Marty Lemus, Potomac Run, a concerned neighbor. I believe this proposal is forcing a deal to either satisfy political pressure, developers coercing or rubbing elbows with County officials, checking a box senior low cost housing, or perceived revenue stream increases. It's odd how little the developer is contributing while Stafford County is giving up the gamut for this proposal. The proposal consists of building a small city development of low cost micro houses in the middle of rural area to satisfy one need. And then the County just reacting to issues as if they were overlooked in the initial planning. Any improvements outside of the property, no problem. According to the developer agreement, the County can sue any property owner to force improvements on their property. Isolated from roads, emergency systems... emergency services, police, hospitals, if they build it, they will come. I'm referring to problems. Let's look at a few. I lived in Riverside, California, in the late 90s. And there were a bunch of startup senior homes like this, it's eerily similar. Low cost housing, perhaps subsidized housing. And that's a low pride of ownership. Trash started coming, drug peddling, and the crime found their way

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

with shootings not far behind. Later, the Eastside Rivas, a local gang, started to frequent these areas and the crime at these areas went crazy and these prices went bust. History does have a tendency of repeating itself. Developer to use covenants instead of HOA to control who stays in the houses – come on man. Potomac Run development has covenants, us, our development, and they're useless. They control nothing. Palestine, Ohio, train derailment, a major fire, a flood, one road in and out, 140 cars. ,Let's compound this with the VRE bridge closed to renovation in 2025 and 300 houses up the street. Remove this parcel of Urban Service Area, USA, and change the land designation to A-2. I don't think the school is happening. This will allow the Flippo owners to sell the property at a hefty profit. Perhaps in another conversation the County has 180 acres; why not create another Crow's Nest like preserve? Have you are their planners seen the property, surrounding area? A picture's worth 1,000 words. I hope all of you have the courage to go against the grain, think out of the box, and stand up to the pressure and make the correct decision. Please decline this development and perhaps let's build this in an area that already has the roads and infrastructure to support this. I stand with smart growth but this is not it. And thank you for hearing me out.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Nguyen: My name is Lisa Nguyen, I live at Potomac Run Estates. I'm very concerned about having a 141 plus home R-2 development and an excessive traffic that it will cause to an already heavily traveled roads, especially when the 95 corridor and Route 1 is backed up. Eskimo Hill Road, Potomac Run Road, Leeland Road, and Morton Road are narrow 2-lane undivided roads with no shoulders and deep ditches, used by cars and trash haulers to trips to the dump, the landfill. These are the roads which divert back to Route 1, alternate bypass, to get through traffic shown from Waze, Google Maps, etc. I have been stuck in traffic many times trying to get to an appointment and would be late because of this. Have any one of you driven on these roads before? I have seen many accidents with cars, trucks, etc., going to deep, these deep ditches, especially during severe weather conditions like fog, storm, ice, and snow, and sometimes just a drivers miscalculations. Leeland Road, Potomac Run Road, and Eskimo Hill Road frequently shuts down by storm debris, ice storms, and falling trees. During the ice storm of January 2022, many cars went off the road and into these ditches, even a snow plow truck, as you can see here on the photos. I experienced this myself and was stuck in the ditch trying to turn into my development, and was rescued by my neighbors. Please note during this time, we lost power for seven days. With all the new development popping up in the areas like Granville, this has caused even more traffic. I can't imagine allowing R-2 development without the consideration of the traffic infrastructures and patterns and electrical grid considerations. What about the Leeland Road bridge closure over the train tracks starting next year that will detour all the traffic to Morton Road, with the developer not even offering a cash for transportation for this development. This shows lack of commitment to the success of the area and shows that JPI is just in it to make a profit and will force taxpayers to pay for it. This is like going to a fancy restaurant and leaving zero tip and having the waiter or waitress eating their tip. Disgusting. dLet's concentrate on improving our existing infrastructure first, as I have seen on the Virginia passenger railroad authority.org, there is much to do. How about removing the parcel of land from the Urban Service Area, USA, and changing this to A-2 development which will be more cohesive to the area and make the improvements that are needed to be done. This will also give the Flippos the opportunity to sell their property. Say no to R-1 and R-2 developments please. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Robbins-Campbell: Hello, my name is Christine Robins Campbell. I am Ms. Flippo's neighbor on Leeland Road. When I attended the first meeting in May of 2021 at Conway Elementary School, it was quite the surprise the Flippos had sold to a developer for a retirement community of 55 and over with

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

140 plus homes. I am 55 years old and retirement is not in sight till I'm 62 or 65. This development will not be monitored; it will have a huge impact to the already crowded school systems and a very busy Leeland Road. This developer has only offered \$62,000 in proffers when they stand to make millions off this deal. Once again, the taxpayers of this County will end up paying for all the hardships it will cause. When I bought my home 19 years ago, I was happy to buy near a family farm that I thought would never be sold. This decision by the Flippo sons to sell to a developer greatly affects my property. The developer has no, has had no discussion with me regarding the impacts to my property. They are proposing a 10-foot wide multi-use path in front of my house on my property in the proffer summary we just saw. This path is supposed to go to the corner of Morton Road. They can end their path on the Flippo property that they own now. They do not own my property. This path is nonsense and goes nowhere anyway. This multi-use path will affect me and my family how we enter and exit our home to a very busy Leeland Road. I asked the board to vote no to this developer and development. Leeland and Clift Farm Road is a historic site that should be preserved for future generations. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. The next speakers I have are Robert Betts, Leslie Pugh, and Jackie Erickson. Is Mr. Betts here? How about Leslie Pugh? Okay, thank you.

Ms. Pugh: Hello, my name is Leslie Pugh and I live in the Woodlawn subdivision about a mile from Clift Farm. And I have a few points that I just want to bring out. Right now we're looking at two separate options, I mean two separate subjects: (a) the rezoning and (b) allowing that particular subdivision to go in. My first concern is changing it from an A-1 property to an R-2 property just to let a developer line his pockets. I don't see any pluses in this. And just to point out that the reason for A-1 is, the purpose of the A-1 district is to reserve areas for traditional agricultural activities and to provide for their continuation and as well as preservation of areas and character, rural character. So why are we even considering changing it from, to an R-2 is sort of curious. And let's see, what's my next one? I might not get through all this. Okay, read one and two. Okay. Okay. And there are a couple of things that Stafford has, in their plan, revisions to the plan, I hope I've got a current copy of it. The plan should be evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure it meets current and changing expectations. This introduces flexibility through time to evaluate changes that are unanticipated by the plan. When the Planning Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors identify a need to amend the Comprehensive Plan, such amendments should be based on a general county need, not specific development proposals. And that, that's from the plan printout. And then another similar quote, amendments, this is Policy 1.1.5; amendments to the Comprehensive Plan should be made to serve the general public interest. Amendments should be based on a general need in response to the current context of development patterns and community vision, and not based solely on a specific development proposal. Which I see is what we have here. Let's see. Okay. The County, and this is policy 1.2.2., the county will establish measures to encourage new development within the Urban Services Area in order to reduce the growth pressure in the rural parts of the county. Which is what we're, I think that applies here. And let's see. Let's see, okay. Okay, number two, if 55 plus, I think we all kind of agree, it's not really strongly enforceable. We've had some examples of that already in here.

Mr. Apicella: Ma'am, thank you. Your time's up. Appreciate it.

Ms. Pugh: Okay. I didn't think I'd make it.

Ms. Erickson: Hello, my name is Jackie Erickson, and I live in the Garrisonville District. I came to this meeting tonight to support the adjacent landowners of the area of Clift Farm project. My land is zoned A-1 and is adjacent to Liberty Knowles which Jarrell JPI was a developer of. When they purchased the property next to me, the County had approved this subdivision many years before. It was my

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

understanding that they kept the approved plan so that they did not have to go through approval process again. We watched as a white tape of death was put up and they destroyed all the trees and flattened out all the knowles that Liberty Knowles had. Funny how they named these subdivisions knowles or woods and when they're done, there aren't any left. The plans that I had gotten a copy of said that they were required to put in a 10-foot buffer on our prop... on our, next to our property in the subdivision. As they started building and many houses were finished, I never saw any type of plants being put in place. Finally I contacted the County. What I found out was that Mr. Jarrell had written a letter asking that the buffer be omitted and it was approved. I was never notified and certainly would have never agreed. So they were able to save money by keeping the plans but omitting the buffer at my expense. I think that anyone was property adjacent to anything that a developer is trying to rezone should definitely be proactive, because they certainly aren't concerned about the adjacent property rights. I listened to the last meeting on Clift Farm online and heard JPI say that one landowner was very nice and only wanted a fence. But when the landowner spoke, that wasn't what he said. I do feel for the family that is trying to sell their land so that their mother can live out her life on her own land. It's a shame that developers like to take advantage of people's circumstances. I'm not really understanding why the County would approve a project without the developer being able to get their own right-of-ways. I read that, that, um, they wanted the County to condemn landowners' property and the County already tells landowners what they can and can't do with their property, they should not be able to come take it so a developer can get approval. Sounds to me like this company is offering Stafford County access to a pump station for the land they own further down the road and, in return, they will receive approval of this project and condemnation of property needed to provide this. As landowners in this County, we must all stick together and make sure that our rights are not taken away by these developers. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. So the next group of speakers that I have are Robert Dreistadt, I'm sorry, I can't... Sam Wang, Tim Hawley, and Cathy Hansen.

Mr. Dreistadt: Good evening, Robert Dreistadt. To start, no one asked me about nothing. My property borders part of this stuff, just to be clear. I didn't bring anything. I wanted to hear what was going on in here before I would even think about preparing anything. I cannot believe people are going to destroy so much property. The wildlife that's in that backwoods, all the deer, herds of deer. And then I hear you're gonna put a retirement community with these packs of coyotes out there? Are you nuts? Really, you have eagle's nests all over the place back there. It's a beautiful property. But it's property for wildlife. Not some sprawl development. That's all I have.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Wang: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Sam Wang. As I mentioned last time, I'm a marathon runner. I want to thank the staff for good job, I understand property as a very difficult job. As I mentioned last time, I came from a government or was born and raised in the country where the decisions are made top down, there's no inputs from the citizens. And I was pleasantly surprised after I talked last time, I got a thank you letter from one of the attendees. I like to read briefly that letter to you, if I may. And basically, the party says thank you for making the comments. And your comments resonate with me. And this is a democracy. We'll want to see if the public inputs actually can be heard. So I was happy to relate that the people over here, not only me, trying to watch to see if this actually, the public input actually make a difference. I attended the the, the committee meeting back in May 2021 as well. If I recall correctly, just like the public comments over here, majority, vast majority of them opposed the project. So that's, that will be also my, my, my suggestion to decline this rezoning request. Thank you.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Hawley: Hello, Tim Hawley, how you doing? I don't have a lot to say, except for I just wondered if a few questions can be asked. And that is what's the value of the properties that are, that are proposed to be built per property. And compare that with the value of the homes that would be built at the residential one or the A-1 or the one that's currently at now. The homes that were just built across from our subdivision Potomac Run recently, they're very expensive. I don't know if you've been out there, but I think those are one and a half acre lots or one acre lots. And they're like well over 500 even into the 600,000 range right now for each one of those. So I'm not sure what the net profit is for the developer with regards to 141 homes, or if Plan B, 80 homes or whatever that is, I'm not sure. But that would be questions I'd like to hear an answer to is, what is their net profit margin for each zoning. Now, he's already said that they're not willing to do I think residential one, I think it was what he was referring to. But I'd like to see that asked of the developer, what is the profit margin or the value of the properties that are going to be built? And what would they be at a bigger lot size? Just to hear that and to see if there's a bigger profit margin or if there's a, you know, what is the profit margin? Why are they insisting on developing those small lots, small homes, and what's the value of those homes compared to the other homes in the area. And if you look at that, and you go, okay, you're trying to get a higher profit through the smaller homes. If that's the case, that should be taken into consideration when you decide what you want to do. Other than that, I was going to tell you about a dream I had last night. I was wandering through parking lots, walking, and I was walking, walking, walking, and I could not find my car. I don't know if you ever had a dream like that where you're walking through a parking lot, you cannot find your car and you don't know where you put it. And when this subdivision if it gets built, that's how I'm going to feel. This is not something in the area that I moved into. And the area I love, the wildlife that I've seen. I do want to mention, some gentleman came up, I think it was this gentleman to my left here mentioned that there was only one accident. I'm not sure, I came in right after, right before that. On the road out there, I'm not sure what where you got your information from or what type of accident it was. And that's the reason why there was only one. Well, I've seen 20 or 30 since I've been here; trees falling on people's cars, all sorts of stuff. So I just want to say good luck with your decision. But please support us. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you sir.

Ms. Hansen: My name is Cathy Hansen. I don't like this development. I would like to know what is the proof that the developer keeps referencing to and using to show the need for an over 55 retirement community? I'd like to know how is this reducing growth pressure? I'd like to know how is this preserving areas of rural character? And what is the general need, the general, the, the count, the general county need? What is the need that we're fulfilling by rezoning? I don't want to see the white tape of death. And yes, it is everywhere all around us. Just driving up Route 1, the barrenness where the houses are going in, so close together even and those I think are much further apart. So I would like if you would consider voting no to this development. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. My next group of speaker cards are Rebecca Adamson, Julia Lewis, and Abby Carter.

Ms. Adamson: Good evening. My name is Rebecca Adamson and I live in Falmouth. I want to thank the previous speakers, just thank you. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for their expertise and commitment to our County. I said last time that I was here that Stafford County is the fifth fastest growing County in Virginia. You nor we need to accommodate a developer's profit margins. We really can just replace them instantly by doing nothing if we just agree on a vision of the kind of community

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

we heard here tonight. Last month, I was with the group that spoke at the Historical Commission about the importance of Stoneman's Switch, and the need for a study of the entire property. The Commission was grateful to receive accurate information on the site, and it voted unanimously to write a letter to JPI recommending the entire area be studied. It's very unfortunate it took JPI three years to finally acknowledge the historical importance of this property. Frankly, they should have done it at the, in the beginning part of their application. You're now being asked to decide on a rezoning without knowing what it may be found in Phase 1 of the study, or if additional studies will be needed, or how the proffer would address Phase 2 study, in particular with their construction plans. I'm also concerned that JPI states they will perform Phase 1 analysis of the Clift Farm project area and they will provide a proposed course of action. They are conflicted, clearly conflicted. They state they shall not perform construction work until Phase 1 study is complete. Does this allow them to proceed at once when Phase 1 is done? It does not say they will agree to a Phase 2, if that is the recommendation. Has the Historical Commission reviewed the proffer and agreed to the proffer language? The proffer should clearly indicate the study area will include the area along Leeland Road, which is the RF&P rail bed, and the Leeland school site. Not to mention, the bridge down at the end of Leeland. JP should not be the ones performing the Phase 1 study; that should be performed by an independent, qualified company following the methods and standards established by the Virginia Department of Historical Resources. The proffer should be clear that any reports will be provided to the Historical Commission for their review and advice on regarding additional studies. Regardless of what the studies find, the sad reality for Stafford County...

Mr. Apicella: Ma'am, thank you.

Ms. Adamson: Oh.

Ms. Lewis: Hello, my name is Julia Lewis and I live at Dogwood Airpark. And JPI says there's a gray tidal wave hitting Stafford County. But the census data does not support that. They say one in 20... one in five, which is would be 20% and it's not, it's like 14%. In fact, there was only one reference in the Comprehensive Plan from the Weldon Study about the aging population. I ask you to please use your common sense. Stafford County is a bedroom community. It's full of commuters. As long as we have federal, military, and other workers who move down here and commute to Northern Virginia, we will have younger families with children who can't afford to live in Northern Virginia and will commute to work from here. Even the Canadians figured out because they extended the Express lanes and they're pretty busy. With people living longer and needing to work longer, the goalposts for retirement keeps getting pushed further and further out. Some work well into their 70s either because they love what they do, or they absolutely have to so that they can pay their bills. This proposed 55% community is not going to be filled with retirees. At best it will be filled with people who are still working, which means more cars and more trips on the road. This developer is using this retirement classification to mislead VDOT about the traffic that these working residents will be causing. What about these people's safety? And where, what about being able to turn safely onto Leeland Road? You're gonna put stripes on there? You gotta be joking me; you guys have got to go look at this. And JPI is telling VDOT nothing to see here. This proposed 55 project is not anything like a thousand unit Del Webb community. Without a strong HOA to protect the homeowners' investment, you will have children living in his community before long. Mr. Zuraf clearly noted in the first page of the application... *inaudible*... that, issue one, that age restricted covenants are not enforceable by the County even if they're reported. Neighbors would have to snitch on neighbors and let's face it, when grandparents have to step in and help their grandchildren, they will not let some HOA rule get in the way. The first time there's a lawsuit and the homeowners are hit with a special assessment, they'll quickly lose their appetite to evict kids out of the neighborhood. This sardine village of houses packed together on 1/10 acre lots just six feet apart, won't get their recreation area started until the 100th home, which is around on five years. This development

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

is just smoke and mirrors. The easiest to build. Very few requirements makes it look like something they're doing great for the community when in fact, they are causing more problems and destroying the rural beauty by not being consistent with the homes that already exist here. Please, I ask you to vote against this. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Carter: Good evening. My name is Abby Carter I live in the Falmouth District. My home is adjacent to this prop, this proposed development which has a future street connection pointed directly facing our house. At the last public hearing, several questions were asked about Fire and Rescue support and how long it would take for a response to reach this proposed community. Following the hearing, we contacted Joe Grainger, Assistant Fire and EMS Chief. According to him we are in the southern suburban demand zone for Fire and Rescue Services, which is primarily supported by Falmouth Company 1 and White Oak 7, with backup from Berea Company 12. Falmouth Company 1 is located on Butler Road three and a half miles from Clift Farm Road. White Oak Rescue 7 is located on White Oak Road 6.8 miles from Clift Farm Road. Both stations provide 24/7 ambulance medic support and are career staffed. Chief Grainger provided the 2021 standard cover report prepared for Stafford County. This report is filled with a ton of information about actual fire and rescue performance evaluated against national standards. The report established a, quote, level of service, unquote, objectives for fire and rescue. Chief Grainger spent considerable time answering our questions about Fire and Rescue performance, resources needed, and Fire and Rescue CIP. Unfortunately, the report shows that Fire and Rescue failed to achieve level of service performance goals for our area of the County. It showed travel time alone for Falmouth response was more than 10 minutes for Fire and Rescue to reach Leeland Road/Clift Farm Road area. When you add in call processing, dispatch, and the time it takes for the unit to leave the station, the response time grows to 14 to 16 minutes. JPI's November 2020 proffer analysis is very outdated. It does not consider changes to the Comprehensive Plan, significant changes to Capital Provement Plans such as the planned upgrades for White Oak Fire Station, and the impacts of inflation. Has anyone asked Chief Grainger what \$62,519 spread across five to seven years well buy? Approving this, an age-restricted community without adequate responsive fire and rescue services will put risks, lives at risk. Keep communities such as this in or near the Targeted Development Areas where they can get the responsive services they need. I have this copy of the report if you're interested in having it. I also have some data about speeding along Leeland Road that was provided to us from the Sheriff's Department. Would you like these?

Mr. Apicella: Thank you ma'am. You can hand it to the clerk. So my next group are Mike Shields, Tim Diehr, and Kevin Walz.

Mr. Shields: Hi, my name is Mike Shields and my wife and I we live in the Potomac Run Estates in the Falmouth District. We've been living in our current residence for the past 19 years, which is about a mile away from where this proposed development is to be built. We have seen over the years how traffic has grown in this area, especially when I-95 or Route 1 is congested, and cars detour along Potomac Run and Leeland Road. Our main concerns are the traffic, safety, and emergency response for our area which are directly related to Leeland Road. The problem is that Leeland Road is already in poor condition to support traffic right now, today, let alone the addition of hundreds of vehicles that will come from approval of this subdivision. Leeland Road is narrow, and much of the shoulders consist of deep ditches that are upwards of two to three feet wide and deep. These ditches are always clogged with tree stumps, large branches, rocks, dirt, leaves, and trash. During heavy rain, we have seen flooding on several occasions due to the debris buildup in these ditches. The water simply has nowhere to drain properly and carries debris onto the road. We have also witnessed several vehicles that have gotten stuck in these

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

ditches and had to be rescued by tow trucks. Now, as you just heard from Abby who spoke, there is currently a 14 to 16 minute average response time for emergency services in the Clift Farm area; 14 to 16 minutes. That's not good. And this emergency response time will only get much worse when the Leeland bridge is closed for replacement and all traffic has to travel via a detour on Morton Road. If an emergency were to occur in something like heavy traffic, snow, ice, or a flooding situation, it would be almost impossible for a rescue or medical emergency vehicle to make its way to its destination in a timely manner. We are worried about the real possibility of an emergency vehicle not being able to respond promptly in a fire or rescue situation which could cost lives. The Clift Farm Road infrastructure is simply not ready to properly and safely support hundreds of additional vehicles. The bottom line is that now is not the time for this development. My wife and I, we strongly encourage you to do the right thing and vote no.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Diehr: Good evening. My name is Tim Diehr. The proposed development borders 1,350 feet on two sides of our property, which includes 650 feet in the front along Clift Farm Road. The impact to our property is immeasurable. There are numerous issues with the GDP that remain unresolved, some of which cannot be resolved with what JPI proposes, such as a tightly clustered urban community adjacent to our rural properties with completely different zoning rules that will forever destroy the rural character, lifestyle, and enjoyment of our existing tight knit community. Inadequate buffering, screening, and open space between our communities, yet 400 feet of existing open space with Hickory Ridge. Two road connections to nowhere, one pointed directly at my neighbor's house, another at a creek behind my property, yet none towards the established Hickory Ridge Community. Risks to surrounding property drainfields and wells, will JPI proffer a 10 year warranty bond to cover repair costs if there's a failure? No true road or intersection improvements which will decrease safety and level of service for our road. Finally, uncertainty on the future use of the 3-acre residue Flippo homestead. Will the property be owned and managed by the HOA or retained by JPI for some other future use? If JPI retains it, then why is it being rezoned to R-2 and not remain as A-1 with the required six acre minimum? We question the use of residue which does not conform to Section 22.5 of the County Code of Ordinances. Stafford County states that the Comprehensive Plan is arguably the single most important document in a locality besides county ordinances. The plan and code of ordinances directs decision-makers to ensure development proposals are evaluated for conformance with the desires of the community. The Comprehensive Plan states the zoning change must not adversely affect the character, the area in which it is located. For three years, we have diligently asked questions, provided feedback, engaged county staff, boards, Commissions and committees, and the developers as well. We expect transparency, responsiveness, and adherence to the established ordinances, plans, policies, and processes. Unfortunately, this has not been our experience. We are not against planned development for our growing vibrant County. We are against development that does not adhere to the Comprehensive Plan and smart growth principles. Too many questions remain unanswered with unacceptable risks for the County and the public to accept. We ask the Commission to listen to what the public has said. We also ask for your support and courage tonight and deny these applications. It's time to send them to the Board of Supervisors for a vote. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Walz: Good evening. My name is Kevin Walz. The Planning Department's background summary and recommendations proposes to further delay a Planning Commission's vote to allow for additional considerations prior to the approval of the zoning reclassification. After three years, and two extensions, we ask you to bring this application to a vote. More time won't fix inherent problems with this

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

application. And as I presented in the 10 January public hearing, this highly compact urban style development with 1/10 of an acre size lots does not, I say again, does not conform to the Comprehensive Plan for lot sizes, requiring half to one quarter acres or half to one acre against the Urban Services Area. Mr. Zuraf clearly stated in previous meetings, gone on record, to state that the density of nearby Hickory Ridge is less than the density proposed for this development. After the last hearing, we presented that this area lacks necessary public and commercial services to support this type of community. Public Facilities are not planned and commercial services promised to us when the Leeland Station development went in never materialized. A Field of Dreams development won't bring them now. This is not infill development as JPI claims. In fact, your Comprehensive Plan defines it as land within built up areas of existing communities where infrastructure is already in place, and should be of the appropriate building scale and compatible to the character with the surrounding areas. We do agree with Mr. Zuraf's assessment of the need for the lower density development, larger lot sizes, and more screening for buffering. Now three years ago, we stood in front of several boards, requested that this Clift Farm Road be removed from this Urban Service Area until such time that the Comprehensive Plan was revised to support future growth. This is a rural area that lacks roads, public facilities, services, sewer infrastructure, and commercial services to support this type of growth. The 2021 Comp Plan shifted, it literally shifted all of the county resources away from this area for growth. Don't allow JPI to force growth in an area where it's not supported. You're gonna put people's lives at risk. We ask you to bring this application to a decision and forward tonight to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation to deny firmly supported by criteria contained in Section 28-206 of the Code of Ordinances. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. My next group of speakers are Paula Steven, Jim Boyles, and Peter Rhyne.

Ms. Steven: My name is Paula Steven and I oppose the rezoning and development plan. The Comprehensive Plan states that for any zoning change, the zoning change must not adversely affect the character of the area in which it's located. But this requested rezoning is completely incompatible with the current rural character of the surrounding A-1 properties. Let me explain, and I'll begin with pigs. At our last meeting here, there was a suggestion that we who lived on Clift Farm Road should be happy with the project because we might end up with a pig farm on the property instead. Actually, we all would be delighted to have a pig farm in lieu of pickle courts. In fact, pigs have been on our road time out of mind. My husband and I now raise pigs on our property. We dispatch, gut, and butcher those pigs on our property. We raise meat birds and again slaughter and process those chickens on our property. We raise 70 laying hens and keep a couple of roosters. The crowing of these roosters commences at 4 AM and it goes on all day long. Do you think retirees, deserving of all the peace and quiet the R-2 HOA can offer are going to be pleased with these daily A-1 wake up call that never end? No doubt petitions will be signed, and we will have to fight for our A-1 rights to keep and care for and process farm animals. Let's move from pigs and chickens to dogs. Our neighbor keeps a kennel and those dogs can make a real ruckus to which all neighboring dogs respond in kind. Now, what would happen if someone bought the property immediately adjacent to the project and set up such a kennel? You would have 141 R-2 two dogs all howling back and not... and if it's not dogs on the A-1 property, how about sheep or cows or horror of horrors, pigs? I don't think that's what our R-2 neighbors would be expecting. Another point of inevitable conflict, Clift Farm Road is made up of three to 10 acre wooded lots. On any given weekend, one can hear multiple chainsaws roaring for hours to cut our pastures or yards. We are not operating quiet electric push mowers. But diesel tractors hauling bush hogs. Is that what our potential R-2 neighbors expect starting at 8 AM Saturday morning? Complaints will be registered within County. And finally, there are bothersome A-1 recreational activities that will cause conflict, such as hunting, firearms practice, dirt race, a dirt bike racing, outdoor rock concerts, and many more robustly, rural pastimes that will lead to a discordant community at best. To conclude, the existing character of the community...

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Apicella: Ma'am, I'm sorry, time's up. Thank you.

Mr. Boyles: Good evening. My name is Jim Boyles and I live in the Falmouth District. Our family moved to Clift Farm Road in 2005 to enjoy the rural living this area provides for us. We didn't purchase a house or land, we actually purchased a way of life. In 2006, the board, School Board purchased 181-acre working farm on Clift Farm Road, and our road was added to the Urban Service Area in 2010, to support that school that was never built. For 17 years the property remains vacant and somewhat neglected. And we have continually engaged our School Board representative, the School Board, the Board of Supervisors as to plans for the use of the property, yet were given no information. The current 10-year Capital Improvement Plan submitted by Stafford County Public Schools still has no identified use for the property. In the recent proffer statement, Jarrell Properties has removed any specificity for pump station design, and infrastructure requirements proposing to wait until the site plan after the development has already been approved by the County to define requirements and to enter into a pro rata agreement. The public fails to understand how after three years since the application was submitted, there hasn't been any discussion and the requirements defined. How can any requirements be addressed outside of this 55 and over development? It doesn't make sense just for that purpose. Why should the County or taxpayers accept that risk of uncertainty? It's clear the School Board and the Board of Supervisors may not be talking to one another. How has JPI independently defined the potential service area without any input or validation from the County? What methodology and tools were used to determine the developable area, and who in the County validated this analysis? The 30 acres defined as sub area A are my neighbor's properties that were removed from the USA in the 2021 Comprehensive update. The lack of improvements on Clift Farm Road presents a considerable risk to the County, and the intersection improvements will lead to future litigation and acquire necessary easements. The right-of-way is to expand it and a higher cost to move the telecom and utilities required to straighten and widen the intersection. Now how will that cost and/or risk be absorbed? In December 2023, JPI community meeting Mr. Hicks stated that as far as he knew the school property was still planned as a school site. Based on that and until the different decisions made, it made no sense and makes no sense to approve this Clift Farm Road development and have three disparate and highly incompatible land uses of an R-2 age-restricted community, A-1 zoned rural properties, and a school on the same three quarter mile dead end road. Again, are the County, you entities communicating with one another on these concerns? The 55 and over development and its impacts are in no way good for Clift Farm Road, surrounding area residents, and the County. I urge the Commission to do this; don't displace our way of life.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you sir.

Mr. Boyles: Thank you so much.

Mr. Rhyne: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. Thank you for your careful evaluation of this. Some of the questions that you asked last time really made me respect you even more at how detailed you are. Last week was a double whammy for Stafford citizens, including my family. Tax assessments reflected residential property values going up by 13%, which is a big hit for my family. We've got, my wife and I have five kids. And then I read Stafford County's proposed budget is more than a billion dollars, including more money for schools, public safety, transportation, and government. At the last hearing, Ms. Barnes discussed the public cost of growth. And I'd like to ask you to consider some of the real world costs of development that we believe will be helpful in your evaluation process. We used the methodology provided in the Comprehensive Plan to look at the public's cost of this development. So we tried to basically use the, your own metric that you guys have put together, and after subtracting by-right development and no cost for schools, the impact to the public is more than \$8 million; \$8.25 million. Add another \$45,000 for each child when they do try to start showing up for

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

schools. JPI continues to use an outdated three year old proffer analysis that does not consider information from the 2021 Comp Plan update, which identified deficiencies by 2024. Right now we need almost 12,000 square feet of space for fire and rescue. We need 564 additional acres for parkland, we need three new libraries, and we need nearly 64,000 square feet for additional space for government and judicial. The taxpayers are also funding the nearby 2019 transportation bond projects, including 6.2 million in bond funds for Leeland Road widening, which is a \$21 million project overall, 2 million in bond funds for Route 1 and Layhill Road intersection improvements, part of a \$15.6 million project. Yet JPI offers no transportation cash proffers to offset the impacts of the 280 vehicles this development will add to area roads. It's difficult to know potential County financial impacts if the School Board finally decides to build a school on the road. I'll add that having a school after a 55 and older development goes in, I think they're going to be really upset about that. And then you add in condemning the land near the road's intersection because there's houses right at the end of the road where if you widen it, those people would have to have their properties removed to widen that intersection. Mr. Shelton, your question. The public has shared its widespread opposition to this development. We urge the Planning Commission to make a recommendation against the proposed Clift Farm development. The County needs to fix the problem created when this property was added to the USA to build a school. This will allow by-right development or perhaps A-1... A-2 zoning as land use consistent with adjoining rural properties. Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. So my next three speaker cards, Bob Rowlette, Paul Armstrong, and Robert Betts.

Mr. Rowlette: Good evening Chairman Apicella, Commission members. My name is Bob Rowlette and I live in the Falmouth District. Our property is separated by a 20-foot wide rural road from this development. At the last hearing, the Flippo brothers described the growing up on Clift Farm Road and their fond memories. And 20 years ago, we were blessed to buy a four-acre property and build our forever home. Everyone who visits us remarks about the beauty and the historic nature of our area. Some of my neighbors have lived here for more than 50 years. It's a unique community where neighbors help neighbors, work on projects, mow fields, plow snow, plant and harvest our gardens, and share our bounty. We look after each other when we're sick. We celebrate events and mourn the loss of loved ones. We're more family than we are neighbors. Much of this opposition could have been avoided had the Flippos and JPI engaged residents early on to discuss a more compatible solution, not this compact urban development. In fact, the Planning Department agreed with us noting in their first staff review on February 24 of 2021. Consider a lower density development with fewer homes. The majority of abutting properties is zoned agriculture, and Hickory Ridge, the subdivision to the west, is zoned R-1, Suburban Residential. Unfortunately, JPI didn't listen and continued down this path. In fairness to the Flippos, the County created this problem 17 years ago when the School Board bought the farm on Clift Farm for a school site. In fairness to the Flippo... excuse me, adding to the Urban Services Area requiring water and sewer took away the Flippos by-right ability to divide and sell smaller lots. In contrast, a development just across the street and outside the USA, is now beginning to sell 10 three-acre plus lots with water and septic. During the 2021 Comprehensive Plan update, you listened intently, and you removed our property from the USA. And for that we're grateful. But now as we feared, the developer seeks to destroy our rural agricultural lifestyle solely for their financial gain. Conditional zoning requires proffers mitigate impacts to surrounding communities and levels of service. Instead, this proposed draft proffer creates impacts with financial risks and threats of litigation and condemnation. It lacks specifics creating unacceptable risk for the County and for taxpayers. You've heard the public speak passionately. We've provided petitions against this development. Tonight, we ask the Commission support to not delay the vote any longer. Please, deny this applications. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Armstrong: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Paul Armstrong. Initially, I planned on coming here and not speaking, just listening, because I really haven't been involved with this too much. But listening to the initial two presentations, you know, by the builder and by the gentleman to my left, my first concern is safety. You know, I have, I have two parents that are 86 and 88. And they're getting ready to move into one of these similar communities. There's no way I would allow my parents to move into a community that the nearest fire rescue couldn't get to them in 15 minutes. Every minute, when somebody has a medical emergency, is a higher percentage chance of death. You know, I did my initial calculations. I was like, ah, you know, it's about, it's three half miles away, it's, you know, and I looked it up on my phone, it's a 7 minute drive from Falmouth. You include dispatching and all that, and I was thinking is probably 12 to 15 minutes response time. And I was like that, that's for putting a community that's going to have quite a few medical emergencies probably a year? I know, my, my dad has been in the hospital three times in this, in the past 12 months. And, you know, that's one of the things... I don't know if it's a really good idea to have, have a medical... an elderly community that far away from emergency services. Also, along the lines of safety I was also thinking which has been kind of brought up that road, Leeand Road, you know, they say that they're going to create a walkway to Morton, but I don't know about the rest of you. But the last six months, there's been a lot of people walking on that road. One time, I swear, I was probably only about two to three inches away from hitting somebody; I was scared because I didn't see them. They were wearing all black walking at night. And there's no place to walk. I don't think that this bridge that's being planned to be built has even a walking lane, you know, and so if, if we're going to have potentially some more commuters that are old walking early in the morning, because they don't want to drive to the VRE. It's just potentially more safety concerns. But safety is the first thing that came to my mind. Listening to the initial two presentations, I was glad it was addressed by some of the previous speakers. Like I said, I wasn't planning on speaking but I personally wouldn't want my my parents moving to a community like this where the emergency response is going to be delayed. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. So that's the last of the speaker cards that I have. So I'm going to ask if there's anyone to my left, if they would like to come forward and speak on this item; if you'd please line up. Alright, seeing no one to my left, if anybody to my right would like to speak on this item.

Ms. Burdette: My name is Linda Burdette. I'm the HOA President for Dogwood Airpark and I wanted to answer some of the questions that Ms. Sellers had earlier. Dogwood Airpark is a fly-in community. It's kind of unusual. It's just a really a nice neighborhood except instead of paying our HOA dues for a pool, or a golf course, we pay them for a runway. And the folks have their hangers at their homes, they can taxi their planes out and take off. It's for people who love flying. To give you some background on both Stafford and Dogwood – Stafford Airport, the runway is 6,000 feet. It's designed for business aircraft. It can handle the larger turboprops and jets. It has 94 based aircraft. Dogwood on the other hand, the runway is 4,100 feet, of which 2,900 is usable; we have a displaced threshold. It is designed strictly for small general aviation aircraft. We have about 31 aircraft based there, and they are all small single engine aircraft. Our runway could handle small twins, but there are none there and there haven't been any since we've lived there. All of the flight out of Dogwood is personal flight, no commercial flight out of there. It's just people with their small planes who enjoy flying. There are days that we have no takeoffs and landings at all. On a pretty day you might have two or three takeoffs and landings. Our biggest day of the of the week is Sunday, when the guys get together and they all fly out for breakfast. Then you'll have about six to eight aircraft taking off from the runway. So we're not making a lot of noise out there. We're just out there having a good time and enjoying our neighbors and enjoying flying. Our concern is that across the country, there are more and more noise complaints about airports. We

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

have been working with Jarrell Properties on this. We found out that Loudoun County requires a notification to be given whenever a house is being sold within the operational area, Dallas and Leesburg Executive. The folks from Jarrell were able to get a copy of this notification form. And we amended it to apply to Stafford and Dogwood. Jarrell has offered to put that notification in their community declarations in the portion that can't be changed; it can only be changed by the declarant. We're still working on all of this. It's still in, we're still polishing the language and working out our agreements. But at this point, it looks like it is going to be an excellent compromise for us. And we anticipate that we will be finalizing that notification in the near future. We just want to say to all of you that we very much appreciate your support in this.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you ma'am.

Ms. Burdette: Does anyone have any questions? I mean, I'd be glad to answer...

Mr. Apicella: It's not an interactive conversation. I appreciate it.

Mr. Hansgen: Good evening. My name is Robert Hansgen. My property is at the corner, the crossroads of Leeland and Morton. And I am at the crossroads of any development that's going to happen in the Leeland area, whether it be the lengthening of the train bridge, the widening of Leeland or Morton, the walking or biking paths, the commercial development that they're thinking about in that area, or the Clift Farm area. Over the last year I've kind of watched the, the Clift Farm development with kind of an empathetic eye because the potential development is going to be, have a devastating effect on the people who have built their forever homes out there. I thought my impact would be somewhat moderate; increased traffic, more trash in my ditches, and the occasional senior citizen who has followed the path to nowhere and now in my woods. That was until about three months ago when JPI announced that they were going to increase the size of the, the pump station for any unplanned development in the Clift Farm area. They would run a sewer line up the north side of Leeland Road directly impacting my property. This was the first time I'd ever heard of that. Approximately two or three weeks later, my concerned neighbors sent me a copy of the proffer and on page five, section six, JPI would request the County to come condemn my property if I failed to reach a land agreement with them for the sewer line. In simple terms, they will make a lowball offer, I will refuse, and they can immediately ask the County to condemn my property without any negotiation needed. This act of coercion intimidation eliminates my ability for fair negotiations and sets up unchecked and unabated eminent domain. A proffer statement is intended to mitigate the impact of development on the community and County services. Condemnation or eminent domain is a government function. It has no place in a proffer, particularly for development primarily for the private gain of the developer, a single owner, and to increase the County tax base with absolutely no public benefit. Instead, the proffer should address fair and reasonable negotiation, just compensation, fair market value, but JPI has no intention of doing that. They have had sufficient time to contact me and talk to me about it and they have failed to do so. I'm requesting the Commission, the Flippo family to refrain the proffer and require JPI to strike the condemnation paragraph, and then add language how JPI will work in good faith for everyone affected. If all options are exhausted, JPI can petition the County for eminent domain, and I can exercise my due rights to due process and challenge the taking of it for public use. I believe the Flippo family are honorable, honest Americans. And they have been wonderful neighbors for the last 18 years. And I hope they just didn't know that the representative was making these threats. Either way, I do not do well with coercion or intimidation, and no one will take my land for the private benefit without a fight. Thank you for hearing my concerns this evening. And I look forward to your decision.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Maxson: Kristin Maxson. I have a request that no clapping, please. Eminent domain, that's a very, very special subject. And everybody here is a home owner or rents. And we, we love Stafford. I, I'm proud to be here with the people speaking. We go back to the economic development just back to March where we were thrown, the beautiful picture, which now is untitled. There, there was so much thrown on this this community and the signatures with Cliff Farms go back to 2017. But the last signature, which I believe is February 13th of this year, does not hold to the 30 day notice. So we have changes happening all the time to what people here are trying to witness and trying to behold. Now, as far as the fire department, if you look at your maps, and everybody has a different map routine, but if I'm not mistaken, there's a fire department right at the intersection of Richmond Highway and Courthouse Road. No, there's no fire station there. But the symbol is there. Would this affect the Comp Plans and how things are laid out? I don't know. We had the economic development, which is very difficult to follow, because now we have the Economic Development Authority, and the minutes and agendas don't stay publicized too long. There's many pages that are blank within the the proffer statement. And it should say that this page is intentionally blank. I would ask people to not use the word USA, but Urban Areas Served. And now there's CPI-U, which is placed to measure the change in price for goods and services purchased by the urban areas. I'm also concerned about the sewer and water. They say the water it will be taken from the north. I'm 1.1 miles and if you take a circumference I'm less than a mile away. And I can tell you that there's a big demand of water and sewer. No matter whether it is sewer or water, it is water and the pump station, where's the pump station going to be? And where are they going to take that land? I'm out of time. And I really appreciate all your time and efforts. Thank you so much Stafford.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. So last call; if anybody would like to comment on this matter, please come forward now if you haven't already spoken.

Mr. Flipppo: Hi, I'm Dale Flipppo. I stand before you guys very conflicted because I understand our neighbors' concerns. And we've been neighbors forever, most of them. But, as we mentioned before, we've had, we've had the family for over 100 years. And we grew up working the property and so we have a vested interest in how this is all going to play out, of course. And and we all know there's nothing constant, but change. But I want to remind you guys that four years ago, we started working with the Board of Supervisors and with the Commission, the County planning committee to come up with something that we could do for this farm that would be the least impact we could possibly do for the community. But yet, we have a very serious need of what of our mother, as we've talked about before, but she has 24/7 around the clock care for the last 12 years. So there is a concern that we can't just walk away with something of nothing. That being said, we, we, we did want to work with the County and, and of that, out of that, in JPI's defense, the County came up and said this would be the best solution that we could come up, come up with, was a senior over 55 community. And so that's how that got started. And that's where we went down that road. And there was concessions on around to make that happen. So that's kind of the history of that, the background part of that. And then as time has developed, and again, I get it with where we are; there's... none of us like changes. But this reminder, that it is good thing for the County. We got the VRE there with what's going on, the road, the smart, Virginia SmartScale System that's happening has already funded the road repairs from Morton to Layhill, I mean not Morton, from Leeland to Layhill. The VRE is talking about, you know, putting on more lines for they're... starting in August, I think they're adding another line for the weekend. And so I know we got a lot of work to get to with that, how we can make that convenient for people and safe for people. And I'm hoping that we'll do, would happen quickly. Anyway, I just wanted to kind the put the background back where we were and how this got started and and where we were going with it. And we hope that you guys can see that this, I mean, we do have a change to go through the community. We also need to meet the needs that are happening and kind of reshape the concerns and, and all, considering all of it. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? Alright, seeing no one else I'm going to close the public hearing on this matter and bring it back to the Commission. Would the applicant like to address any of the comments that they heard?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate Mr. Flippo coming up and speaking, I was going to point out that the representatives of the Flippo family are present here tonight. And we've heard a lot of folks talking about property rights, but the Flippo's, through their own sweat and tears and through the efforts of their ancestors, have earned over 100 years their property rights. And that earning comes from planting, fertilizing, bailing, maintaining equipment, maintaining buildings. It's been no small task. And I don't know who in this audience has plans to continue that work. But they, the Flippo's are here and probably be willing to entertain an offer if any of them wanted to purchase the property and take on those things to protect their rural vista. Negative aspects of things that were pointed out by the staff report; one, number one was the development intensity exceeds what is contemplated by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Zuraf would acknowledge that this comment is a black and white review of the Comprehensive Plan that does not take into account the fiscal impacts that I mentioned to you early which are significant in total, in excess of \$20 million. Concerns with proffer details regarding proposed sewer pump station capacities, we believe in conversation with the Public Utilities Department we've addressed those in accordance with both their wishes and what we hoped as was substantive, was sufficient to convey. Potential archaeological impacts unknown without Phase 1 survey. An organization called Virginia Digs has been on that property over six times doing extensive relic searching, digging holes as much as 10 or 12 feet in the ground looking for relics. So that, that property has been thoroughly examined. And there were comments about our doing the Phase 1 study, and I assure you that we have no knowledge of how to do a Phase 1 study. And the 200,000 to \$500,000 in costs that I've referenced to would be for a third party to come in and conduct that analysis and make their report, and certainly the report would be something that would be made public. Now for the positive sides of things, which there are a few of. The pros with residential use is generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, excluding the intensity of the density. Our conversation is presented as it's just us coming with ideas where I'll remind you again, we come into a situation looking at the property, and we go to the county documents. So it's actually the County that's telling us what we should be looking to do on these properties. And then once we initiate the process, we go from department to department to department for them to evaluate what we're saying, for them to look at the documents from the county indicating what needs to be done, and then we marry them together, and we come to you guys and show you the finished product. So it's not just us, it's the County; we're speaking with the County about what we believe is the best use of this property. The development is in conformance with the transportation policies and provides safety improvements at the intersection with Leeland Road. All of us have issues with traffic in the Fredericksburg area right now. But I can tell you that I came out here this afternoon about quarter after five, and what we considered a peak time for evaluation by traffic analysis and I passed 12 cars between the VRE station and Eskimo Hill. I don't represent that that's what happens every day. But I can tell you that there are a lot of people that live in the Fredericksburg area that would like to have that traffic problem. Proffers ensure the development would be consistent with what is envisioned in this application. The proffer is tied to GDP, the General Development Plan, together with our application, and certainly, all of those items represent what we intend to provide and deliver. The proposal would reduce potential school impacts. The Stafford County School Division provided the information that out of 1,500 or more homes there are two school students, out of senior living communities. All the other information that's being put out there is speculation. Monetary contributions would mitigate public safety impacts. Proffers are considered in four categories; parks, schools, traffic, and public safety. We examine from there we have to examine what's out there, as far as needs for improvements to physical facilities in those four areas. From there, each of the departments of the County are responsible for putting out capital improvement plans indicating what physical space needs

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

they have. The information provided in the proffers are a product of the information provided by the County and our analysis by again a third party Municap, which we hired, but other private developers hire, but the actual company started because they worked for municipalities. So we rely on them to provide us with the analysis based again on the information that's provided by the County through their Comprehensive Plan and other documents like the capital improvement plans. The building design standards are consistent with... *inaudible*... plans architectural design guideline recommendations. In addition to that we have almost maxed out to 100% the senior housing guidelines. Screen is provided from the closest adjacent properties to the north of the site. We tried our best to talk with all the neighbors and we realized that each one of them told us that they were still opposed to the project, but we were trying to find the way we could propose what would be most acceptable to them. And that's all I can tell you that we tried to do. Conversations with multiple persons from the school division, including the facilities manager and the School Board Chairman – there's no plan for a school on that site today. There's not a plan to get rid of this property either. This is a property that the Board of Supervisors required, the School Board to purchased for \$5 million. That was not cheap at the time. There is very little inventory of available properties in Stafford County for the potential school uses and school uses aren't just a school. I was told that other uses for this property could be an athletics facility. I understand for years it was used as a cross country track. And in addition to that a bus depot may be possible. So it's not exclusively a school. But the school division still needs property. And they have this within their inventory today. And they have no plans whatsoever to disturb that. In addition to that, we are providing, again, financial benefits to the County in the form of the pump station we're delivering that would be able to serve the school property. I would suggest to you again that if the school were to use an alternative path to sewer, condemnation as the gentleman mentioned before would be involved. And there would be a significant improvement required of the Hickory Ridge pump station. So we're delivering savings and costs for that. In addition, we have over \$17 million in net fiscal income to the County that is allowed to go towards, which is different from proffers, this money that we're analyzing for fiscal analysis would go to operating costs to get a pay for teachers, for buses, firefighters, and things of that nature. Further, we're now going to conduct a Phase 1 study to the benefit of the County, because we've heard from everyone that there is a considerable concern over the historical context of this property. So it is a service for the county, it's gonna be a service to the county in the tune of 200 to \$500,000. And so, we have made our best effort to use the information available. That was, at some point a consensus of the members of the county that put it out there for the public to consume. We had believed we have proposed the best use for this property in a fiscally responsible way, which again, the Comprehensive Plan requires. And we do ask you to vote on this item tonight, and we ask for approval. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Before you go, are there any final questions for the applicant? Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chair, thank you. Just a few questions. Has the Commissioner of the Revenue validated the numbers that you displayed in the presentation?

Mr. Hicks: Which numbers are you talking about?

Mr. Martinez: The tax revenues and the 20 million? Or 17 million.

Mr. Hicks: That's not... In a direct answer your question, no, but that's not a normal part of the process. It is a process where again, we hire this third party, and then it is submitted to the Planning Department for their review.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Martinez: Okay. And some residents during the speaking time indicated that they live near the property weren't notified. I'm not saying that they weren't, but how did you go about notifying nearby residents?

Mr. Hicks: For our community meetings, we had... actually the County issued invitations for our community meetings. And then as far as the neighbor meetings and the group neighbor meetings, we relied on those groups to assemble themselves. The adjacent neighbors that we did focus on are the people that primarily live on Clift Farm Road, with the exception of Miss Carter, who is off another driveway. But again, after our conversation with her, we agreed to maintain a 25-foot hedgerow that is decades old. And we're going to continue to maintain that for her benefit.

Mr. Martinez: I appreciate that. Thank you. And one final question. You mentioned property rights for the Flippos, and I acknowledge that, yet there's a risk that a resident had raised a concern that they may have their property rights taken. So how was one individual's property rights greater than the needs of another individual's? Help me you square that circle.

Mr. Hicks: Well, I think that was actually the presentation I was making to you. From the perspective I had is who are they to assert property rights over the Flippos. It depends on who that neighbor is, is according to their property rights. I think that those people that are immediately adjacent and live on Clift Farm Road, they have property rights at all, because the Flippos subdivided their farm in the first place. We had, we had four speakers that, that directly received their property because the Flippos subdivided pieces off of their farm. And but all property rights are correct. I think these individuals should be able to do whatever is legally possible on their own property as well. And this is certainly something that is not only legal, but again, we followed the path that the County laid out for us as closely as we could.

Mr. Martinez: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: Can I piggyback off that? You said that some of these residents have their properties now because that, those properties were subdivided off the original parcel?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Barnes: Can they still do that?

Mr. Hicks: Can who still do what?

Ms. Barnes: The Flippos? Legally?

Mr. Hicks: No... Well, they could do A-1 with six acres.

Ms. Barnes: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Hicks: You're welcome.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else have questions for the applicant? Any questions... Thank you, sir.

Mr. Hicks: You're welcome.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Apicella: Any questions for staff? Alright, seeing none, I'm going to pass the gavel over to Vice Chairman Shelton. Okay.

Ms. Sellers: Why don't we see transportation proffers in the proffer statement? And I'm trying to pull up the proffer guidelines, but they're a little confusing, a lot more confusing than I remember them being for transportation. So maybe can you explain that to me?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, with the current proffer guidance, which basically filters down from the state code, there's limitations to what the County can actually receive in the way of, of proffers for public facility impacts. For cash contributions, or really, for public facility impacts, it's limited for residential to transportation, schools, parks, and Fire and Rescue. So those are the four categories that the County can, can collect. And so when it comes, we can handle those differently. With transportation, it basically is done through a traffic impact analysis that is provided, and the applicant did provide a traffic impact analysis. And in that study, there were not, there was not findings of a level of service degradation as a result of their project. And they're actually, their project did not, doesn't even trigger a traffic study, but they did do a traffic study to see what those impacts would, would be. And it was, since there were no... and so if there were impacts, then the mitigation would be through providing improvements that might be recommended out of that traffic study. And in this case, there were no improvements needed, or recommended in the study.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, so, so my understanding and typically, well, when I was a Supervisor, I didn't know that the Planning Commission engaged in these conversations. But as a Supervisor, I would have taken here's our transportation plan, here's our CIP, looked at the project and said, okay, you know, you can see where your impact is. So, they, there, they kind of understood that. And with this particular project, there are transportation projects in the plan, with County contributions as stated through a bond. That while it is earmarked, or sort of earmarked, right, the bond is, is general enough that the money could be moved to another project should, should the County be able to collect something like a cash proffer to help offset the cost of that. So it's just a little, I don't know if that's for us to discuss, or maybe the Board of Supervisors if they're watching, but it is quite interesting that we don't see cash proffers with this when there are so many transportation projects going on in that area, maybe not at the Leeland Station particularly because that's being paid for through a different type of funding stream, but Layhill Road, Morton Road, Leeland Road, there's lots of little projects going on along there. So I, that would be interesting. Fire and Rescue is another one that we do see a gap. It did you know, peek through this, it does look like the call times are, are under that four minutes or less 90% of the time. But there is this gap, right. And so I don't know if this is something for the Planning Commission to discuss, but to recognize that that is a gap in that area that we don't have a fire and rescue station in this part of the County. And do we start discussing what that looks like? And maybe talk to the Board of Supervisors about putting something on the CIP because there isn't one. So we probably couldn't even ask for proffers because we don't have a fire station on there to get to, to that. But, yeah, those are just two areas that I would have expected to see some sort of cash proffers identified for those two areas. And we're just not.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so just to further explain the transportation issue. And so a lot of those other transportation improvements that are identified and happening and being funded around, those really are based on overall County needs. And again, getting back to the state code really, it limits and really ties the County's hands to, the impacts really have to be focused on what would be generated by the specific project. And that's why we, we have to link it to the traffic study. And we can't just... and we also will, if there's, if there's recommended road widenings, we'll at least get additional right-of-way to kind of help offset that potential impact in the future when a larger project comes along. At least the right-of-way will be there so.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Sellers: Right, the right-of-way is there; that, that is an important one because you can't ask for that in the future. But just something that I did notice is that those were not asked for. So thank you for that explanation.

Mr. Shelton: You ready. Since this is in Mr. Apicella's area, the Falmouth District, I'll turn it over to him for a potential motion.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the first issue we have to accommodate is the applicant came forward with a change to the original or the, the airport notification that was provided in our package. So whether or not we make a recommendation for approval or denial, we have to dispense with that?

Mr. Zuraf: I talked to the applicant, they did not add that into the proffers.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. While I greatly appreciate the applicant's vision and work on this project and the Flippo family's circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors deny the applicant's Clift...

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: ... Farm rezoning application.

Mr. Shelton: Do I have a second?

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Shelton: Comments? Questions?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I do think this is a well thought out project. And I agree that one of the County's goals is to promote a mix of housing types and communities. The fundamental question before us is whether this, this zoning category requested by the applicant with this density in this particular location is appropriate. Given the information we received from staff and the rural nature of most of the nearby parcels, I believe that a 141 unit R-2 subdivision, even if it's age-restricted, is inconsistent with the Comp Plan, and more importantly, the growth pattern and the character of the neighborhood in the immediate vicinity. I do recognize that there is a higher density subdivision to the west of this proposed project. However, the Board purposefully lowered the density allowed in R-1 subdivisions since Hickory Ridge was approved. So I believe that comparison is less pertinent here. I also think while there are no guarantees on what will happen in the future with the school site downstream, I remain concerned, although I admit that it's somewhat speculative, that approving an R-2 project here could influence the growth potential of the school site. So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am recommending denial.

Mr. Shelton: Additional comments or questions? Ms. Sellers, go ahead.

Ms. Sellers: So I'm actually not going to support the motion. I will support sending this to the Board and recommending approval. Because we're looking at the area, Leeland Station is what, 800 homes or something crazy like that, you have three railroad tracks that are about to run down that area, and there are a lot of transportation projects that are coming. That part of the County, much like North Stafford and right here around the courthouse, have seen in the last 10 to 15 years is going to start changing. And so part of the conversation needs to be what do you want that change to look like. And this

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

reclassification process is your way to navigate that and have a little bit of control in a much better way than a simple by-right, by-right developments. In addition, by-right developments, and I would say this as a Supervisor and I'll say this now, by-right developments are the reason we are struggling with our schools. It is a reason we were struggling with transportation and fire and rescue. It is because we can plan for reclassifications, we plan for these, we have these discussions. When a 500 unit by-right development pops up, we haven't planned for that school. And if you drive out in the county, and I'm happy to take you and show you some of these large by-right developments that have popped up, we haven't planned for them. So you go out Route 3 or out Kings Highway and you got a whole bunch of them. And they're popping up, they're overcrowding our schools, they're pushing things in. And it's, it's creating all of these situations out there. It's creating transportation issues, it's creating school issues. So I do think these reclassifications are a much better opportunity for the residents to have some say, to have some control. And this is an opportunity to work with the developers and with your neighbors to participate in that. So I will be supporting the applicant and not the motion.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you. First off, I appreciate the applicant really working on this and making a lot of changes. I know that there's, there's limited things that can be done out there. I think, however, that we should, hopefully encourage you to consider other kinds of developments that might be more appropriate out there. I don't want to go over all the things that Steven went over because he said them very well. Yes, I do agree with Ms. Sellers that the biggest problem that we've got in Stafford County is these by-right developments. We can't do anything about that. We can do something about this. This is in our tool belt. I don't think that it's, like Steven said, I think that this is inconsistent with the, with the surrounding area. Yes, I, we hear, we hear property rights all the time. Everybody has property rights. This owner has property rights. But one of those rights is not to get a reclassification. Property rights is something that's very different than that. So sometimes I bristle when I hear that, but I'm going to support the motion. And once again, thank you to the applicant and to the Flippo family for coming and making your case. If you end up getting this, more power to you, but I unfortunately can't support it.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: No comments, thank you.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: No comment.

Mr. Shelton: Alright as... excuse me... as the Chair, I appreciate staff's work, as well as the applicant's work. But I've also listened to the audience here this evening. And as a fire professional, I will tell you that the national sense, consensus is an eight minute response time. That's nationwide, and we have that same resolution here in Stafford County. I do also want to mention the fact that last Tuesday, we approved for a new ambulance in Stafford County. That's \$384,000 for one ambulance. We're also online to order a new tanker pumper, it's going to run \$1.1 million dollars. So again, I appreciate the applicant's offer on his proffer. But again, as a fire professional, I look at dollars and cents just as well as anyone else. And I will be supporting the motion. I ask that you vote. Looks like we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5... 4 for, 1 against (*Ms. Sellers opposed*), and 1 abstaining (*Mr. Bratton abstained*); (*Ms. Caudill absent*). So the motion passes. I'll turn it back over to the Chairman.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I have one more motion to make since we also have the CUP application. So with regard to that, I'm going to make a motion to deny the Clift Farm CUP.

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Shelton: Second, Ms. Barnes. Discussion?

Ms. Barnes: No comment.

Mr. Apicella: No further comment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: So if we, so if we deny this, does that mean they don't have to put the age restriction there? I still don't understand this CUP.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: So yeah, so if the rezoning, say if the rezoning is approved, but the conditional use permit is denied, they would not be able to build the age re... they wouldn't be able to build the project because they, the proffers say it's age-restricted but the use permit is part of it and required so. They really go hand in hand.

Ms. Sellers: Thank you.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: No comment.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: No comment.

Mr. Shelton: And no comment from me. Please cast your vote. I need to change my vote, I'm sorry. I hit the wrong button. Sorry about that. Motion has 4 yes, 1 no (*Ms. Sellers opposed*), 1 abstention (*Mr. Bratton abstained*); (*Ms. Caudill absent*). It passes.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. I appreciate everyone who came and participated tonight. We're going to take a five minute recess before we move on to the next agenda item.

Meeting recessed at 8:33 PM.

Meeting reconvened at 8:45 PM.

3. CUP23154899; Conditional Use Permit – Aquia Towne Center Starbucks – A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a drive-through facility in the B-2, Urban Commercial and HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 21-49I (Property). The Property consists of 1.6770 acres, and is located on the north side of Town Center Boulevard, approximately 200 feet east of Richmond Highway, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: June 7, 2024)**

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Ms. Keith: I will be presenting item 3 on the agenda.

Ms. Baker: Computer please?

Ms. Keith: Yes, very good. This request is a conditional use permit for a drive-through facility associated with a Starbucks restaurant located on a portion of Tax Map 21-49I within the Aquia Election District. Jessica Pfeiffer is the agent for this application and will be representing the applicant this evening. The property is outlined in blue on the zoning map and zoned B-2, Urban Commercial and within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. The site is located on the north side of Town Center Boulevard, approximately 200 feet east of Richmond Highway. Surrounding zoning districts are B-2 to the north, which is shaded in the pink, north, south and west, and P-TND to the east which is the gray shade. The portion of the property subject to the CUP consists of approximately 0.902 acres; the entire parcel consists of approximately 1.677 acres. The site was rezoned from R-1 to B-2 zoning on September 16, 1986, pursuant to Ordinance O86-68 as part of the original Aquia Towne Center development and subject to existing proffers. This is, this aerial view shows the existing conditions. The site is currently developed with a Carlos Kelly's restaurant to be demolished for the construction of the new restaurant. The property has frontage along both Aquia Towne Center Drive and Town Center Boulevard. The roads are internal to the Aquia Towne Center. A McDonald's restaurant is located to the west, a hotel to the north, Juicy Bucket restaurant to the south, and a vacant commercial lot to the east. There are no environmental sensitive features are present at this site. This is a view of the property from Town Center Boulevard, and this is a view from the shared access easement. This GDP depicts the proposed layout of the Starbucks restaurant which consists of a single story 2,365 square-foot building with a single drive-through and a bypass lane. Access to the site will be provided through a new full access entrance along the shared access easement to the west, and the existing southern entrance along the shared access easement will be reconfigured to an exit only access point. Vehicles will enter the drive-through on the, on the south side of the building and proceed counterclockwise around the east side of the building. Drive aisles and parking areas are located to the west and south sides of the building. A loading space and dumpster enclosure are proposed north of the building and will be approximately screened from view from Richmond Highway. The location of the dumpster and loading space in the vicinity of the main entrance and drive-through lane, I'm sorry, as it may cause brief interruptions to traffic circulation. There are no sidewalks along Town Center Boulevard or Aquia Towne Center Drive. The applicant will construct a sidewalk and install a crosswalk across Town Center Boulevard to provide a pedestrian connection from the restaurant to nearby apartments. As required by the Zoning Ordinance, parking lot perimeter landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the property. A detailed landscape review will occur at the time of site plan submittal. The applicant provided this delivery truck exhibit that identifies how a truck will be able to access and leave the loading space. It demonstrates the trucks will enter through the northern entrance, as shown in the red outline, and will access the loading space via a backing movement, as shown in the blue outline. Once deliveries are complete, trucks will exit through the northern entrance and travel south on the access drive, as shown here in the yellow outline. The applicant has indicated a single unit 30-foot truck or smaller is anticipated. And Starbucks hours of operation will be 5am to 9pm, Monday through Friday, and 6am to 9pm Saturdays and Sundays, with delivery truck hours from 9pm to 5am, which is outside typical business hours. This would limit truck conflicts with customer vehicles. The dumpster pickup times have not been provided. However the duration on the site should be short. Also, Starbucks likely cannot control pickup times of a third-party contractor. These are some architectural renderings that were included with the application. Staff notes that the proposed building design conforms with several of the architectural guidelines of the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan, and incorporates architectural treatment standards referenced in the proffers. Due to the property location within the H-COD Overlay, or the Highway Corridor Overlay District, the building must conform to the architectural standards in the Neighborhood Design Standard Plans. This

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

review will occur prior to building permit approval. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the property within the Suburban Land Use designation. Suburban areas of the County are areas where suburban scale of development is most appropriate. These are some conditions that will, proposed conditions that which, which will help offset any potential negative impacts and would require the property to be developed in general conformance with the GDP; require a drive-through bypass lane in the general location shown on the GDP; require sidewalk and crosswalk be constructed across Town Center Boulevard to provide a pedestrian connection from the restaurant to nearby apartments; and the proposed building design incorporates architectural treatments referenced in the proffers that apply to the property and shall comply with the Neighborhood Design Standard Plan. Staff finds the positive features or aspects of this application are that the proposed use is generally consistent with land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan; consistent with established development patterns within the vicinity; the proposed building design incorporates recommendations of the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan; this proposal is in compliance with the proffers established in Ordinance O86-68. And the one negative aspect pointed out is that the location of the dumpster and the loading space may cause brief interruptions to internal traffic circulation. Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions pursuant to Resolution R24-78. Staff is supportive of this project and recommends approval of the application with conditions pursuant... I'm sorry, I said that twice... pursuant to Resolution R24-78. that concludes the presentation. Does anyone have any question?

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Keith. Questions for staff? Ms. Barnes?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chairman, one quick question.

Mr. Apicella: Let me...

Ms. Barnes: Go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Let me do Mr. Martinez. Go ahead, Mr. Martinez.

Mr. Martinez: Oh, okay. Sorry. Thank you, Ms. Keith. One quick question. You mentioned that the road, the dumpster may create some sort of disruption in the traffic. What road exactly?

Ms. Keith: It's internal to the site because the, the entrance is off of that access drive. So you said the road... I'm sorry, repeat what you said?

Mr. Martinez: Yeah, which road you said that it's going to create traffic disruptions? Which road would be impacted?

Ms. Keith: It would be the entrance at, off of that access drive.

Mr. Martinez: Okay, okay.

Ms. Keith: Yes.

Mr. Martinez: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Can I piggyback off of that? So I think I heard you say the applicant indicated that the hours of operation might be such that it could mitigate that concern. Does that satisfy you? Or are you still thinking that that could be an issue?

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Keith: Yes, because it would avoid any vehicle conflicts if their hours are after business hours of Starbucks.

Mr. Apicella: Now how about when there's trash pickups? Because that might be at a different timeframe.

Ms. Keith: There's an exhibit that the applicant brought this evening. Yes, it would be a concern but trash pick-up, from my understanding and we don't have any specifics, would probably be two to three times a week, most likely early in the day and it would be very short stops. So it shouldn't disrupt for a long period of time.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Ms. Keith: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: As far as blocking the traffic there, I have a feeling that Starbucks is going to want to make sure that no traffic is blocked going into that restaurant, even if there's, you know, there's a problem with the trucks or whatever; I have a feeling they're gonna, they're gonna make that work.

Ms. Keith: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: Because you want people coming in there. That's just my guess. I did have a question from somebody who saw this application and said, oh, yay, they're doing something about Aquia Towne Center. They're finally starting to build. This is not a Mosaic property, is it?

Ms. Keith: It is not.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Just making that clear. This is, this is entirely separate. Yes, we'd all be doing the happy dance, if it was Mosaic, but it's not.

Ms. Keith: Right, it is not.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Barnes. Any other questions? Alright. Thank you.

Ms. Keith: Thank you.

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

Ms. Pfeiffer: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Apicella: They went to go get some coffee at Starbucks.

Ms. Barnes: It's late.

Ms. Pfeiffer: When that's open late. Good evening. My name is Jessica Pfeiffer. I'm a senior land use planner with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh. Here with me tonight is Jonelle Cameron, also with Walsh, Colucci. Tyler Grau, he is a Construction and Development Project Manager with MCB Real

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Estate, the applicant, and Christina Hughes with Bohler Engineering, she is our Civil Engineer. I'm gonna go through a few of these slides kind of fast because Evelyn did a great job and I know it's pretty late. This is the property location. was just going to point out two things that Evelyn didn't immediately point out, one of which is these apartments, the, I believe they're called the Aquia 15 Apartments right here. And then also, this is the Enterprise just to orient you. And this is the Pizza Hut that's now under construction. The existing conditions on this site – I learned how to erase, but it doesn't work. That's okay. There is an existing vacant Carlos Kelly's on the property. I believe the restaurant closed in summer of 2022, so it has been a few years. This is that restaurant. The proposal would demolish this building and construct a new Starbucks restaurant. As you can see here, there's pretty minimal landscaping on the site today. We would be improving, upgrading, and adding landscaping. This is an overall aerial showing the proposed Starbucks and how it will fit in with the corridor and can be compatible with adjacent uses. You see McDonald's, PNC Bank, you see the gas station across the street. Access to the Starbucks will be from this shared access easement right here that runs through there. This is Town Center Boulevard down here and this is Aquia Towne Center Drive right here. There is no access from Town Center Boulevard or Aquia Towne Center Drive, only this shared access easement. So when we talk about the various entrances, it is off of a private shared access easement. The applicant also owns the northern portion of this parcel. This is this area right here. They are looking for a tenant for that northern portion of the property to have more redevelopment within this area, within Aquia Towne Center not owned by Mosaic at anytime, but more redevelopment in an area that is very much looking for redevelopment. This is our illustrative plan. A few things to note here. This is the full access easement right here. This is an out only access right here. We are proposing an outdoor seating area right here. The drive-through lane located right here can stack up to 16 cars. This is the pickup window. This is the ordering point; a menu board and then there is a preview board in that location. One thing I did want to talk about is the pedestrian connections that the applicant is going to make to other areas within this corridor. But I have a separate slide on that. You can also see the bypass lane which is located right here, which is not a requirement but we do have a bypass lane for most of that drive-through lane. These are our building elevations. Again, this is that really tall, ugly Carlos Kelly's sign that we are going to take down and put up a 12-foot monument sign.

Inaudible speaker.

Ms. Pfeiffer: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. We could, we could reface it. This is our truck turn exhibit. And I did want to pause here. I know there have been some questions on this and we've done various different exhibits to just show how this works. So when we initially submitted in February 2023, we were showing the loading and the trash in the southern portion of the property. But because there's a requirement to fully screen the loading and the trash from Richmond Highway, our engineer ended up moving it to the northern portion of the site. And we do have a line of sight exhibit to show that you won't see it from Richmond Highway, and I'll share that. So we did a redesign of the layout at that time. And what this shows you is the truck will come on-site, it will come down here, it'll turn around, park in this location, unload, and this is a reserved spot striped spot, and then it will leave like this. And a few things to note here, one, this distance right here. I know you can't read it on my exhibit, but it is 11.8 feet, which is enough room for a car to, who is in the bypass lane – so your coffee is taking too long – you're in the bypass lane, there's loading going on, you have the ability to bail out and leave. Also someone in the drive-through lane can bail out and leave. So no one is stuck in that drive-through lane because a loading situation is happening. I did mention to Evelyn that the anticipated hours of operation are 5am to 9pm, Monday through Friday, and 6am to 9pm, Saturday and Sunday. Starbucks would prefer not to condition to that because that is the anticipated hours of operation right now. If something were to change, that would mean a conditional use permit amendment. So that is what they are anticipating, especially with some of the other stores they have opening such as Stafford Marketplace, Embrey Mill,

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

courthouse, those stores are likely going to be 24 hours and likely not this one. And then they did say that that loading would be during off peak times, so between 9pm and 5am. But once the truck is parked in this location, it is out of the way, unloading is happening. No one is blocked from where they are, and it's only the truck movement to leave. That would then be a minimal amount of time. I do have an exhibit for the trash truck that I will go through. But I did want you to let you know that this is a 30-foot truck, which is a pretty significant size truck to fit in this space right here. So this is that line of sight exhibit I mentioned. So Bohler Engineering prepared this to show that our dumpster and loading space would be fully screened from Richmond Highway. And there's two locations that they took this from; one is just south of Town Center Boulevard, and one is kind of dead on. And one thing you'll notice, which is kind of funny, is that McDonald's dumpster is right there. So we are screened, you wouldn't be able to see it. But that's why we moved it to that location. And that's why it's near that entrance. This is a pedestrian connectivity exhibit. So as we were going through this process with staff, one thing that they asked us to do was to pick up the pedestrian connectivity so that these apartment buildings could walk to Starbucks. So here's what we did; we added sidewalks on site, but then we pick up some off-site improvements including sidewalk here, a crosswalk here, and a ramp right here, that will then pick up the sidewalk connections on the other side of the road. So I will go a little past my presentation to the trash truck exhibit. So the way trash works at this location and for many pad sites and drive-through restaurants is that it's a third-party contractor. So Tyler informed me that they can put in a request for what days, what times, what types of trucks, what hours for the trash truck. And those requests are sometimes accommodated, they're sometimes not. But they can absolutely do that to reduce any conflicts. But what the trash truck would do, and remember, this is a quick movement, it's not like they're parking to unload. So they're just front loader picking up the trash. This is the truck right here, it's 35 feet, they would come on-site, they would come into the loading space, they would back up, they would get the trash and then they would leave. So that's how the trash would work. And again, it would be a pretty quick process not lingering on the site, especially with it being a front loader trash truck that would pick up the dumpster... oops, sorry... lift it over and then leave the site. So that is pretty much all I have. I am available for questions. I did want to let you know that Starbucks is very interested in getting going assuming the conditional use permit process goes well. They are really pushing Tyler and MCB to be open June 2025.

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

Mr. Shelton: I have one question. Are you maintaining the same number of parking spaces that Carlos O'Kelly's had? Are you adding additional spaces?

Ms. Pfeiffer: We are not because we don't require as many spaces. I assume that Carlos O'Kelly's was also using these spaces. So we are providing 22 spaces on the property; 21 parking spaces are required.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Thank you.

Ms. Pfeiffer: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, so I'm going to open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on this specific item. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. Would anyone like come forward, please do so now.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Ms. Maxson: Thanks for your consideration. Kristen Maxson. I feel like I owe it to the committee and to Starbucks to just ask one question. They mentioned February of last year, starting to design this. Well, past that date, just within the season, the past season, the Board of Supervisors passed a fire station to be in Aquia. And if I, as I remember it, it was south of where they were mentioning it and they're loading from the north. And so that's a good thing. However, if I buy coffee, I might decide not to go where there's a fire station, just because if there's a unannounced activity, you know, it might be a nerve-racking issue if they have emergency. And so I really apologize for mentioning this. But I was actually at the meeting where they basically passed for this fire station now. That fire station might have been decided no, but I probably didn't get that information. And I sort of understand this area, because we used to go to a movie theater in this area. And that was condemned, surprisingly. So I know it is a heartache for all of us. And I just want the best solution for everyone. Thank you for your consideration. And I do apologize for coming up, because we do love Starbucks, we love our coffee. But we also love our fire department, too. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? Seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing on this matter and bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Martinez, this is in your area. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion to approve CUP23154899.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Martinez and Ms. Sellers. Any further comments Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: No comment.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: I think this is excellent. We do not have a drive-through Starbucks in north Stafford, in case people don't know. You do have two there on Courthouse Road, as my son likes to say and remind me that we live in suburbia, because we have two Starbucks right outside of our neighborhood there. So this is a nice addition. And I think it's nice to see some change to Aquia Towne Center. Even though it's not in the P-TND, it is nice to see some changes there with the Enterprise and then just the different things that are coming. So this is a good thing for North Stafford and thank you guys for bringing it and thank you to Starbucks.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Sellers. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: So as far as the Carlos O'Kelly's goes, just in a note, this San Diego girl moved to Stafford in 1990. And the only reprieve or fix for anything close to Mexican food was Carlos O'Kelly's, so I'm sorry to see the building gone. It's been there for a long time. Yeah, it doesn't look great, but it has a lot of emotion. Oh, there was nothing. In 1990 there was nothing. Okay. But anyway.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you for that nostalgia, Ms. Barnes. Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No comment.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Anyone else? Please cast your vote on the motion to approve this CUP. Alright, that motion carries 6-0, 1 absent (*Ms. Caudill absent*). Thank you very much. Congratulations. Alright,

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

moving on to the next item, Unfinished Business, there's none. New Business, Melrod Preliminary Site Plan. Ms. Doolittle. Computer please?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

4. SPR23155250; Preliminary Site Plan – Melrod – A proposed preliminary site plan for four data centers totaling 948,200 square feet gross floor area, the site is located on the east side of Centreport Parkway, north of Mountain View Road, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 37-74S and 37-30, zoned M-1, Light Industrial, within the Hartwood Election District. The review of the preliminary site plan is required pursuant to proffer 7 of Ordinances O92-10 and O92-11. **(Time limit: April 28, 2024)**

Ms. Doolittle: Alright. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Item number 4 is a request for consideration and recommendation to the agent for a preliminary site plan for Melrod SPR23155250. A preliminary site plan for commercial projects is not something that would normally come before the Commission because the county ordinance no longer has a provision for the submission of preliminary site plans for commercial developments, and therefore, it's no longer a requirement. However, there are proffers associated with the property as approved on February 4, 1992, that require a preliminary site plan. Pursuant to Ordinance O92-10 and O92-11, proffer 7 requires the applicant to submit a preliminary site plan to the Planning Commission for consideration and recommendation prior to agent approval from the Department of Planning and Zoning. The preliminary site plan has been reviewed in accordance with Section 28-295 of the Zoning Ordinance of 1990 and meets requirements. Ordinance O10-48 removed the requirement for preliminary site plan submission. Proffer 5 requires the applicant to provide a streetscape plan for comment and non-binding review by County staff and the Planning Commission. Therefore the landscape plan has been included with this preliminary site plan for comment and review by the Commission. Melrod includes Assessor's Parcels 37-74S and 37-30, located on the east side of Centreport Parkway north of Mountain View Road. The total acreage is 82.06 acres, zoned M-1, Light Industrial, and the site will utilize public water and sewer. And here's a map showing the location of the site, again located east of Centreport Parkway, north of Mountain View Road. The site has frontage along Centreport Parkway and as well as Mountain View Road; however, access is only proposed from Centreport Parkway. The preliminary site plan proposes four 2-story data center buildings with a gross floor area of 948,200 square feet. Wetlands on site are to remain undisturbed. There is no Critical Resource Protection Area on the site. A portion of the site is located in the Dam Break Inundation Zone. And the site is located within within the Airport Impact Overlay District and the Flood Hazard Overlay District. Proffer 5 requires the applicant to provide a streetscape plan for comment and non-binding review by County staff and the Planning Commission. The landscape plan has been included with the preliminary plan and staff has reviewed the landscape plan with the review of the major site plan for the project. The landscape plan proposes street trees along Mountain View Road and landscape credits have been requested to utilize existing vegetation for a portion of the street tree requirement. And the plan also proposes a street buffer along Centreport Parkway with additional evergreen trees provided to screen the mechanical equipment from view. There are no buffers required adjacent to the M-1 zoned parcels to the east. And the plan also proposes interior and perimeter parking lot landscaping and vehicle access drive landscaping. The Planning Commission may consider to either recommend staff approve the preliminary site plan as presented, recommend denial due to failure to comply with specific code requirements, recommend applicant revises the plan in order to

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

comply with specific code requirements or best practices. And I didn't put it in the presentation but staff notes that a new Ordinance O23-24 was adopted on October 17, 2023, with regard to development of data centers. This application was submitted prior to adoption of the Ordinance and is therefore grandfathered from development under the new regulations established. And this concludes my presentation, and I can answer any questions. And the engineer and applicant are also here to answer any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Doolittle. Ms. Barnes, you had a question?

Ms. Barnes: For this there was included in the package notifications for the neighboring property owners. Did the, did you all send that out? I believe the applicant sent that out.

Ms. Doolittle: The applicant sent it out, and that was actually for the major site plan submission.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. On that application, the type of uses listed is industrial distribution. It doesn't say data center, and I'm concerned about that. I have a feeling and, you know, if Prince William County is any indication, this is going to come to a surprise to some people in that area, whether it's... I don't even know, did NVR even getting it because that, that, those four buildings are going to be directly north of that huge NVR. I mean, there's,

Ms. Doolittle: Yeah, Centreport Village.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, it's right there. And if industrial distribution went out, if I saw that, and I didn't know anything else, I'd say off, oh, you know, it's a warehouse like everything else. It's not; it's a data center, which I guess is a kind of distribution. Nevertheless, I'm, I don't know that this is going to stop anything. But you may have some surprises, and you'll get some pushback from the community if they don't know exactly what's going on in there.

Ms. Doolittle: Thank you for pointing that out.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton, I know you have some questions. But if you'll indulge me, can you pull up the site plan? And Ms. Barnes kind of references, where are the nearest existing or future proposed developments, residential developments in relationship to this project?

Ms. Doolittle: They would be... I don't know if this is gonna work for me. I don't know what I'm doing. Well, it's on the other side of Mountain View Road.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible*... to the left.

Ms. Doolittle: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: And then across Mountain View and... *inaudible*.

Ms. Doolittle: Yeah.

Mr. Shelton: Is that the 499 townhouses?

Ms. Doolittle: Yeah, the larger townhouse development, yes.

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Ms. Barnes: Well, and there's 107 single-family homes. It's actually on our agenda under the TRC, too. That's going in right next to that, too.

Ms. Doolittle: Is it?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah.

Ms. Doolittle: What's the name of that development?

Mr. Apicella: Centreport.

Ms. Barnes: Centreport, yeah. Centreport Village, Section 2B and 4A, Hartwood Election District. That's right there.

Ms. Doolittle: Oh, that's all included in that. That's just a construction plan for what you've already seen with the preliminary plan.

Ms. Barnes: But, I mean, they were asking about townhouses. I mean, it's single-family homes that are going to be right next to that, too.

Ms. Doolittle: I think, I think that's all townhouses.

Ms. Barnes: It all is? okay.

Ms. Doolittle: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: It says single-family lots. So that's not a single-family home, that's different?

Ms. Doolittle: Oh, does it say attached?

Ms. Barnes: It does not say.

Ms. Doolittle: Sorry, it should say attached.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. That makes more sense but I looked at it, it looked like attached and I thought man those are close. Well, yeah, they're attached.

Mr. Apicella: And I'm sorry since I can't see it, can you just tell me out what the distance is from the nearest building?

Ms. Doolittle: To Mountain View or?

Mr. Apicella: Well, to the housing development.

Ms. Doolittle: I don't know if I can answer that. Let me see if I can go back to at least the, uh, to here. I wish I could get this to work. I don't know what I'm doing wrong. Mike? Okay, cool. Okay, so Centreport Village, if you look to the south, there's that little parcel that's not part of Centreport Village but the parcel below it with a little notch out on the bottom, that is the east side of Centreport Village. And then the parcel to the west of Centreport Parkway is also included.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Apicella: So again, just a rough estimate, are we talking 200 feet, 500 feet?

Ms. Doolittle: I honestly don't know. Maybe the applicant can answer that.

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, not at microphone...* can look at it and tell you in feet exactly how much...

Ms. Doolittle: Thanks.

Ms. Baker: 900 feet, it looks to that, to those residences on Mountain View Road.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: I got 823 feet when I use the GIS but it's somewhere around there, yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Good enough for... *inaudible*... work, right.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Doolittle, some of these questions may have to be answered by the applicant. But again, are all four buildings 65 feet or less in height?

Ms. Doolittle: Correct.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. The electric load permit, has that been secured from Dominion?

Ms. Doolittle: I'll defer to the applicant.

Mr. Shelton: And is there a substation planned for the site?

Ms. Doolittle: There is a sub...

Mr. Shelton: Electric substation?

Ms. Doolittle: Yes, there is. That will be done separately by Dominion, I believe.

Mr. Shelton: So since we're within 900 feet, give or take a couple of inches, I'm going to ask the applicant about noise abatement and reduction, and ask that they consider what we voted on in December so that you remain in compliance with what we suggested that. I know you're grandfathered on this, but we're going to ask you to take those things in consideration. And last but not least, I think I understand you're going to use potable water and sewer. Is that correct? Are you going to use a closed loop system?

Mr. Apicella: Well, we probably need to have them come up so. It's kind of asking those questions through you, Natalie.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Ms. Barnes: And Natalie, can I ask you another quick question?

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Ms. Doolittle: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: You said that on that Centreport Parkway that because they bump up against another industrial parcel that they don't have to have any kind of landscaping?

Ms. Doolittle: Correct. And it's actually with, I think that's the recently approved project Ivy site.

Ms. Barnes: Oh, yeah, I remember that. So they don't have to have it, but could they have something along there to keep Centreport Parkway not looking so industrial? Is that, is that a possibility if they wanted to do that?

Ms. Doolittle: If they want to do it, it's just not a requirement.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Sort of a related question. I'm sorry, if you'd put the site plan back up. What, what are they going to do to mitigate the impact for, I think there's at least one residence there. Are they doing any screening there?

Ms. Doolittle: I'm not sure where the residence is.

Mr. Apicella: If you could pull up... there was another, I thought I saw what looked like a home there. Is there not? Maybe I'm...

Ms. Baker: Are you talking to the east, south, kind of southeast?

Mr. Apicella: I'm talking to the west.

Ms. Baker: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. What's... I'm sorry, to the northwest. What is, what is that?

Ms. Doolittle: That's McGrath Court.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, okay. So there is no, there is no other residential?

Ms. Doolittle: No, it's all surrounded by M-1 except for to the south with the...

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thanks for the clarification. Any further questions from staff? Thank you, Ms. Doolittle. Sorry, would the applicant like to come forward? So I don't know if you have a presentation or not. But I think the, kind of springboarding off of Ms. Barnes's comments and then Mr. Shelton's as well, there's not a lot of public information about what's going on here. So if you can just kind of give us the lay of the land, what, what, what is this project? How might it impact the neighborhood water usage, electricity, the kind of things you probably know that we were interested in when we were developing the data center guidelines.

Michael Gregg: Yeah, sure. Can we pull up the plan again, maybe it'll leave some context. Obviously the surrounding area here... I don't know how to use this thing... but here across directly – this is fine for now. Is there a way to touch it up?

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Doolittle: Yeah, you can just go back and forth.

Mr. Gregg: Yeah, the GDP or the tax map. Well, directly across Mountain View, obviously it's residential, but like you said it's over 1,000 feet I want to say or 900 feet. There's wetlands and RPA and trees, dense trees across from there. We have a wooded area to the south of the parcel. And then across the street, there's a warehouse, a vacant warehouse and then the McGraph trailer facility and then there's an industrial park obviously across the street. As far as power, the other parcel here, the triangular parcel is where the substation will be located. Then we have four obviously buildings there. As far as water and sewer, the current design is for a, to provide water and sewer tapped into our system. But ultimately it could go to reuse water if and when those capital improvement projects are done through the County. There's also the opportunity here to go to closed loop at a different point, depending on the user.

Mr. Apicella: Have you engaged the Utilities Department to, so they understand and you understand what that water usage is going to be until the reuse water is going to be in place and how that's going to impact the system, so to speak until, until that comes online.

Mr. Gregg: Yeah, we've done calculations and determined all those calculations, we've provided those demands to the Utilities Department.

Mr. Cook: And I'll step forward with this. Adam Cook here. I'm the Managing Director of Development for Peterson Companies. We've been a partner with Stafford in developing north of Centreport Road and have other projects in front of your team right now and have been instrumental in widespreading public dialogue around the creation of the data center ordinance that's been put in place. In regards to the design of this site, I think we can say with about 99% assurance at this point in time, we're in conversations with an end user who uses a closed loop system. So the timing on confirming that that deal is actually a done deal is about 120 days out. But at that time, you know, we'd be happy to announce that, you know, we're no longer interested in tapping into potable water at all. But this is a closed loop system. So while that deal isn't done, we're in a due diligence period with them. The clock started ticking yesterday, and we have 120 days until that transaction comes to a close. So we're very far advanced in that and that would take us completely off of the requirement for potable water to serve as a cooling factor because it will be that closed loop system that doesn't require that. Potable water will still be needed for the occasional toilet flush or sink. In regards to the power, the question was asked earlier, is there a commitment? Yes, there is a will serve letter issued by Dominion already for this facility based on the onsite development of a substation.

Mr. Apicella: And are you going to need to CUP for that substation?

Mr. Cook: No.

Mr. Apicella: No. Really?

Ms. Barnes: Really?

Mr. Cook: I don't believe so. Well, if... we won't, Dominion might. Dominion would be filing that process.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Mike's kind of nodding over there.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Sellers: What's the build-out timeline? Are you building them all at the same time?

Mr. Cook: So the energization period for the substation by Dominion is Q4 2027. It's the Centreport substation. There'll be a large public process in relationship to that as it does have to go through the full CPCN and SCC process, which includes many public hearings hosted by Dominion. The build-out period would be responsive to that. So we wouldn't want initial building online until that timeframe. So that would mean that the construction of that first building would really be timed to come online with like a Q3 Q4 2027. It's about an 18 month construction cycle. So if we backed out from there, it would be about kind of mid-2026 that, you know, you would see a building foundation and then later that year, vertical building, tilt up going in.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. And then you would build them all back to back or does Dominion...?

Mr. Cook: We haven't figured that out exactly yet. So that's something we have to work through, yeah.

Ms. Sellers: And you work through that with Dominion?

Mr. Cook: Correct.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, okay. You just used acronyms and coming from both DOD and transportation...

Mr. Cook: Sure. Oh, I love to; it was SCC and CPCN that gotcha.

Ms. Sellers: You used a whole new line of acronyms that I'm like, what is going on.

Mr. Cook: So, we call it the alphabet soup of rezoning usually, but so SCC is just the state level Commission; I forget what it stands for. But it's the state level Commission...

Mr. Apicella: State Corporation Commission.

Mr. Cook: Thank you, thank you. That was it. So the state level corporation, they're essentially the entity that Dominion has to go to, to approve their works. The CPCN is the process that Dominion has to go through to submit this request to the SCC. And that requires a big multi-phase public notification and public hearing session for the work that Dominion does. That's all led by Dominion and the SCC, which is that state designated agency.

Ms. Sellers: So we're seeing this so early to prepare them for those processes.

Mr. Cook: We're out ahead of them, correct.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, okay, that makes sense.

Mr. Cook: And normally as was mentioned in the presentation, this wouldn't come in front of the Planning Commission in this format, but because it's a proffer that's quite old and quite dated, it's, it's, it's anachronistic to your guy's process now that you'd be seeing this type of a presentation and this type of a meeting.

Ms. Barnes: I guess you could have gone with a proffer amendment instead of a... That was one way to go.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Cook: Well, yeah, well, I mean... Now you tell me.

Ms. Sellers: Not all those Supervisors are still... inaudible.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Again, I'm going to make a recommendation that you take a look at what we passed with our data centers and try to make sure that we look at noise abatement, since we're going to have 499 townhouses close by, and some of our other data centers have already talked about encapsulation of the generators and, and work with the County on that aspect. We don't want to be a noise hazard; I know you don't either.

Mr. Cook: Let me, let me set your concerns aside with that. So first and foremost, we were instrumental in being a part of the working group that involved community members, elected officials, staff, and members of development community kind of create a lot of those standards. I think, in fact, we proctored those along and helped Stafford choose some of the more stringent and stricter versions to introduce to the ordinance, really under the banner of let's learn from what other communities that might be more advanced in data center experience would do differently if they had the chance to reset the clock, specifically to both acoustic and tonal studies. That's a part of everything we do regardless. If I could pull your attention to the site plan that I see on my screen, and I'm hoping you see on your... oh, great, there you go. So what I, what I call your attention to is the orientation of sort of the hatched areas on the buildings which are turned inwards, which creates that noise funnel inwards from those generators. Now the generators will all be capped like what you're discussing. That's simply a clean air code that both the sound and the pollution is mandated by clean air code to do exactly what you're talking about about the type of generator. But the generator bays are all facing each other inwards to the building. Also, when you look at the elevation of the site, as you study the plans, you'll notice that the buildings sink down the closer they get to the south end, and the south end is to your left on this, the plans are rotated 90 degrees to the right. So as we start to approach that sort of 1,000-foot distance catty-corner to the development of future planned residential, our buildings start to go subterranean compared to them in terms of final floor elevation. So there's a lot of elements of sound buffering in there. So I don't think that the, the acoustic properties of the site are designed to prevent against that. There's physical screening, the buffering of the buildings, the finished floor elevations, and several other factors reducing any type of sound pollution or sound bleed into adjacent parcels.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: So on September 8, 2023, it looks like the notification letter got sent out. There wasn't really a whole heck of a lot of folks that were, that was sent to. And I, and I mentioned this to staff, the type of use was listed as industrial distribution. What happened there?

Mr. Cook: I'll turn it back over to you guys. I don't know the sequencing of public communications. x

Mr. Mudd: Yeah, so, Cody Mudd, Bohler Engineering. So I think in previous applications that we were looking at this site, that was a, that was a use that we were intending to pursue and this was probably a couple of years back, major grading plans and things of that nature applied for. And I think, you know, with, with, with the current direction we're going with this site, we did make the the use jump over to

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

data center over the past really year, I think. So what you're seeing is that notification is a carryover from our previous application.

Ms. Barnes: But that's the notification that the abutting properties got.

Mr. Mudd: I believe so.

Ms. Barnes: I mean, I've got the, got the certified mail receipt and everything here. And I know that that's, that's a County policy, correct, that we send that out? That's a County policy.

Ms. Baker: It's in the code that notifications are sent out by the applicant.

Ms. Barnes: So if the notifications are sent out, and there was a mistake on the notifications, do they need to be re-sent out?

Ms. Baker: There's nothing that's specified in the code that it would need to be re-sent out. We would highly recommend it.

Mr. Mudd: We certainly have no problem doing that.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And also I didn't see on there, and maybe it's because, you know, there's so many different company names, I didn't see NVR listed anywhere on there. And NVR is probably going to be your biggest, I don't want to say thorn, but maybe...

Mr. Apicella: Stakeholder.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I like that better; stakeholder. That's good.

Mr. Mudd: We know all the folks at NVR very, very well. We're happy to entertain dialogue with them. If a, if a updated public notice specific to this is a request of yours, we can certainly fulfill that. I will say a lot of the adjoining properties, specifically those across the street, we are the owner. So we're sending a lot of notices to ourselves, which is fine, too, as well. We're happy to do that.

Ms. Barnes: Cover all the bases, cover them all.

Mr. Mudd: But we, I absolutely hear your concern. I think NVR will be fine with it. NVR knows what we're doing here. It won't be any surprise to them. But we can certainly do that if you think it alleviates the potential for... *inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: In my experience, you've been, you were here for the last couple of public hearings. Stafford tends to be very civically minded and very organized, and can bring some pitchforks and torches when things, when they don't like things. So my recommendation; I mean, that's at least...

Mr. Mudd: I happen to love your constituents, so.

Ms. Barnes: So do I. I think it would be a good idea if you re-sent that out and it was a data center on there. You don't want to surprise angry people.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Mr. Mudd: Excellent guidance and, to your point, it will, it will grease the wheels and let people know for when Dominion's notices come out as well.

Ms. Sellers: I have a question for staff with this Dam Break Inundation Zone. We just did something with Mr. Saunders about flood insurance. Will this have any impact on that? About structures or changes or something to things in the flood zone? You remember that? And it was in this area because that hotel/retirement... Yeah, I'm just, I mean, I don't know.

Mr. Mudd: We're not modifying the floodplain.

Ms. Sellers: No, it has nothing to do with that. But it's some sort of notification that has to be made. And Mr. Saunders was in here telling us about it.

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

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, the FEMA floodplain, and has to do with getting flood insurance through FEMA and...

Mr. Zuraf: That may have been the Gupta rezoning for that...

Ms. Sellers: No, it was separate. It's the, it's that FEMA thing, where you, where the county has to, we have to put together this ordinance in order for people to get access to FEMA's flood insurance.

Ms. Baker: The floodplain ordinance was amended. That's what John Saunders presented to you all. There are new... based on that, there, the new mapping that was done, there are new properties that are in and outside, not necessarily the Dam Break Inundation Zone, but the flood zones. So there are new, and I don't know the specifics without going back to the ordinance, what all the requirements are, but there were changes to the floodplain ordinance.

Ms. Sellers: And so will this be included in there? And I don't remember if...

Ms. Baker: I'd have to look back at the information, I don't know off the top of my head.

Ms. Sellers: I don't remember if there was like value to property that we had to put in there, or if they put stuff in there, but this is certainly different than a home. But just something to think about as we, because this is right in that flood area. That floods pretty, pretty bad. I mean, we got some time to think about it. But maybe we can reach out to Mr. Saunders and make sure it's covered. Just, I don't know why it just all of a sudden hit me. Sorry.

Ms. Baker: Their department is reviewing the site plan. And so they would make any comments related to the the Dam Break Inundation Zone or the floodplain.

Mr. Apicella: So... go ahead, Ms. Doolittle.

Ms. Doolittle: *Inaudible, not at microphone.*

Mr. Apicella: Okay, please go ahead.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Doolittle: I just wanted to mention that the reason that it probably, they probably didn't send to the Centreport Village owner, is because there is another parcel in between that development and Mountain View Road. So, and they did send it to that owner.

Mr. Apicella: You know, I think that's a fair point. But in discussions that we've had over the last couple of years, we would encourage greater notification than required...

Ms. Doolittle: Yes, I understand.

Mr. Apicella: ... because for the very reason Ms. Barnes indicated that people who are going to be potentially impacted would want to know, and it's better to get ahead of the bow wave than behind it.

Ms. Doolittle: I understand. I just want to make sure it's clear they didn't miss that, because it's not required.

Ms. Barnes: Well, and when I looked at it, because I realized because I think it's, it's either abutting or, I think, what did we change it to, 500 feet, and it's probably more than 500 feet. So technically, they wouldn't have been in that, but I...

Ms. Baker: That doesn't affect, that's only when we're required to send notices; it's in our code.

Ms. Barnes: Ahhh, okay. So this is kind of an oddball...

Ms. Baker: This is a whole separate under our... *inaudible*... ordinance.

Ms. Doolittle: This is just adjacent properties and if it's across the street.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: So, speaking of value, I assume that, presume that you have engaged our Economic Development folks, and maybe the County Commissioner. Can you give us a sense of what the economic impact of this project is going to be in the short term and long term?

Mr. Mudd: Sure, so the, I am unsure if your team has done an independent economic study, I actually have an appointment with your new Acting Director of the, you know, semi new Acting Director of Economic Development on Friday to kind of go through those things. Again, we're very early in the stage and all of that. So we have a meeting this Friday at 11am. And this is one of the things on the agenda to talk through that and what they want to do. One of the things that we have done, you know, we have another development across 95. I'm sure several of you guys are familiar with the Stafford Technology Campus. On that larger campus, which is substantially bigger than this one. We engaged a group called Mangum Economics which is a third party economics firm in the state, they kind of do all those types of economic analysis for all the municipalities. If that's something, you know, we want to look at, I can have that conversation on Friday and see if that's something that she's interested in reviewing for a part of that.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm not going to hold you to this number, but the project that we approved recently, the Stafford, was it Potomac Church, was it \$10 million for the two buildings or \$10 million per building? I don't remember. But are we talking about something like that in the neighborhood of that range for...?

***Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024***

Mr. Mudd: This is 2x that size project. So I would assume that your tax calculation formulas would apply...

Mr. Apicella: Similarly?

Mr. Mudd: ... in a 2x fashion.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Alright. Thank you. Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you very much. Mr. Shelton, this is in your district, how would you like to proceed?

Mr. Shelton: I would like to recommend approval of the preliminary site plan SPR23155250. And again, I ask that you take a look at that, the ordinance and if you feel it's necessary to notify any additional people of your intent, please do so.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Apicella: A motion to approve the preliminary site plan, it's been seconded by Ms. Sellers. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No, sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers? Anyone else? Alright, please cast your vote. Okay, that motion carries 5 with 2 absent (*Ms. Caudill absent; Mr. Martinez left early*). Thank you very much. Congratulations.

Mr. Mudd: Thank you. Have a good evening.

Mr. Apicella: Alright. Moving on to the next item, Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

5. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Ms. Baker: In your packet, as usual, is the Project Pipeline Report for information. But I also wanted to note that our Transportation Division is working on their Master Transportation Plan update. And this will be, the Board will be looking at referring this to the Planning Commission, probably in April. We wanted to give you all a little extra time before it's referred to you. So our Transportation Division is going to be making a presentation at your second meeting in March, March 27th, just to give a little heads up on the plan itself so that when it gets to public hearing, you can have an advanced look at that and have some information that may help on that so. The the Board is looking at that again on March the 5th; if they do choose to do anything, they won't refer it until April. But if they make any recommendations for changes, that would make revisions to the Master Plan at that point, before it gets referred to you we would look at the final version that may get referred to you and then we'll send that out to you all so that you can have a few weeks to take a look at that. So just wanted to let you know about that.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Baker. I understand that we may not have any public hearings at our first scheduled March meeting, I think that's the 13th. Is there a possibility we could cancel that meeting?

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Baker: Yes, there are no public hearings that have been advertised. So we don't have any additional business at this time.

Mr. Apicella: So is there a motion to...?

Ms. Barnes: So moved.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, just gonna take a voice vote on that; all in favor say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Consider that meeting cancelled. Ms. Lucian, finally, a presentation.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

6. Electronic Participation Policy Update

Ms. Lucian: Good evening Planning Commission. This I will keep brief. The Planning Commission currently has an electronic participation policy that's been in effect for a few years. There were some updates to State Code in 2022. So the purpose of adopting the new policy is simply to adopt the changes to State Code. Most of them are minor. I have a brief list I'll go through with you. One of them is that it clarifies that a quorum of the Planning Commission must otherwise be physically assembled if one of the members is going to participate remotely. We already practiced that way, it's just made more clear. It also clarifies the provision for attendance due to a temporary or a permanent disability or other medical condition for a Planning Commission member or a member of that Planning Commission members family, and clarifies that it prevents physical attendance. It limits, it lists the limitation on remote participation, which is no more than two meetings per calendar year or 25% of the meetings held in a calendar year, whichever number is greater. And the last provision that I don't think will apply to any of us but still listed because State Code requires us to adopt everything, would allow remote participation for a member whose principal residence is more than 60 miles from the meeting location. So the policy that you have before you is the updated policy. We can either act on it tonight or I can bring it back at a future meeting. It would just need to be voted on.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Lucian. Is there a motion to approve the updated electronic participation policy?

Ms. Sellers: So moved.

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve.

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Ms. Sellers got it and Ms. Barnes. Please cast your vote on the motion to approve; I don't think we need discussion. Okay, that motion carries 5 with 2 absent (*Ms. Caudill and Mr. Martinez absent*). Thank you, Ms. Lucian.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

Ms. Lucian: Thank you, Planning Commissioners. The only other thing I will mention about State Code is that that same code provision allows some public bodies to have completely remote meetings. However, the Planning Commission was not one of those lucky groups.

Mr. Apicella: Aww, bummer.

Ms. Lucian: So I'm sad to inform you that we cannot do that.

Ms. Barnes: Unless we have Covid again.

Ms. Lucian: Yes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

7. Historic Preservation Awards Nomination

Mr. Apicella: Please don't say that. Okay, moving on to Chairman's Report. Well, what I have listed here is the Historic Preservation Awards nominations. There was an item in our package. Normally what we do is ask staff if they have any recommendations. So I'm going to pitch it back over to Ms. Baker. Do you have any thoughts or comments on this?

Ms. Baker: So if you all aren't aware, we've now had a Cultural Resource Specialist that's been on staff for just about a year now. So she is the one that is the liaison that has been working on these Historic Preservation Awards. And she did provide a few items. There, I guess, first to explain, there are four different categories. So they would look at recommendations from this Commission, the Architectural Review Board, and the Historical Society, and I believe there was one other. But they would entertain any, any nominations, and then typically, the Historical Commission would vote on that. But if not, if the Historical Commission doesn't, then our, we haven't determined the process yet. At any rate, she had four recommendations. And I don't have all the specific details on it, but under the Lifetime Achievement Award, looking to nominate Norman Schools. If anybody knows Norman, he has done a lot of work over many, many years. And we can provide more of that to you if you're interested. There's also a Volunteer Award for Jerrilyn Eby. I know she has also been involved in Stafford County history for many, many years, written a lot of books. The third is a Homeowner Preservation Award for the Hilkers down off of Warrenton Road, and that is for restoring a private residence. And then an Emerging Preservationist Award, Tyler Knutson, who is a, did his Eagle Scout project at the Civil War Park. You all may recall, they recently moved the rocks, referred to as buzzards roost that had inscriptions from Civil War soldiers, those were moved to the Civil War Park and, and this gentleman had volunteered his time to put up fencing around that display. So I just thought I would bring those to your attention. And you all have until the 31st so you could potentially make a recommendation if you want tonight or at your next meeting in March.

Mr. Apicella: So if I may recommend if staff could maybe flesh out the a little bit more details on those recommended awardees, and we could take it up at our March 27 meeting along with any other recommendations that Commissioners might have on their own. Does that work for everybody?

Ms. Baker: And if you all have any and want to let me know in advance of that meeting, then we can bring that, have some more information to bring back to you all at one time.

Planning Commission Minutes
February 28, 2024

OTHER BUSINESS

8. New TRC Submissions

- [24155491](#); Centreport Village Sec 2B & 4A - Hartwood Election District
 - A construction plan for 107 single-family lots located on the east side of Centreport Parkway between Mountain View Road and I-95 on TM 37-30A and 37-30D, zoned R-2, consisting of 95.50 acres, within the Hartwood Election District.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks Ms. Baker. Alright, moving on to Other Business, it looks like Mr. Shelton you have some TRC business coming up.

Mr. Shelton: I just want to say that Rogers Staubach would be very pleased on what we've accomplished tonight with the data centers, and now this, 499 townhouses, and for those of you that don't know who Roger Staubach is, he was a quarterback for the Dallas Cowboys and he's the envision of Centreport. That shows my age, by the way.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. January 10, 2024

Mr. Apicella: Thank you for that historical tidbit, Mr. Shelton.

Ms. Barnes/Mr. Martinez: You got a nomination.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, moving on, approval of minutes, January 10, 2024. I think Ms. Barnes may have had some slight modifications so we'd be voting on a corrected version. Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve.

Mr. Martinez: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, just take a quick voice vote on that. All in favor say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that passes. With no further business before the Commission, we are hereby adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:52 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the February 28, 2024, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.