

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

March 27, 2024

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, March 27, 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 (remote), Carlos Bratton, Kelsey Caudill Martin Martinez, Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Kathy Baker, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Nancy Kotting, Amy Taylor, Mike Zuraf

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes needs to participate remotely tonight for medical reasons. Is there a motion to allow her to do so?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to allow Ms. Barnes to connect remotely.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second? Okay, thank you. We'll just do this by voice vote. Everybody in favor, please say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

1. Presentation of Proclamations

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Okay, motion carries. Are there any changes to the agenda? Alright, seeing none. We're going to start with a presentation of Proclamations tonight for Mr. Al Bain and Mr. Dexter Cummings. So we'd like to recognize our two former colleagues who represented the George Washington and Griffis-Widewater Districts. Mr. Bain, will you please come forward? Mr. Cummings could not be here tonight, but we're still going to read his Proclamation.

A Proclamation recognizing and commending Albert Bain for outstanding service on the Stafford Planning Commission and to the citizens of Stafford County

WHEREAS, Albert Bain served as the George Washington representative on the Stafford County Planning Commission from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2023; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Bain served as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission in 2022 and 2023; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Bain served on the Cluster Development Standards – Phase 2 Cluster Committee, Cluster Development Standards – Phase 3 Policy Committee, Lot Shape Committee, Rural Zoning Committee, HCOD Ordinance Committee, Land Conservation Committee, Cluster Ordinance Committee, Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update Committee, Solar and Energy Storage Committee, Public Notification

***Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024***

Committee, Commercial Kennel Committee, and Data Center Committee; and participated with TRC meetings and review of plans; and attended the Architectural Review Board meetings as the Planning Commission representative in 2020, 2022, and 2023; and participated in such major initiatives as Healthy Growth, and Downtown Stafford; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission desires to thank Mr. Bain for his outstanding efforts to ensure that Stafford County continues to be one of the best places in Virginia to live, work, and play, and to preserve the County's unique history and environment for future generations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission desires to recognize Mr. Bain for his commitment and service to the Planning Commission and the community;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Planning Commission on this the 27th day of March, 2024, that it be and hereby does recognize and commend Albert Bain for his outstanding and dedicated service to Stafford County and its citizens.

Mr. Shelton: We'd like to give you this as a token of our appreciation. And then there's your piece of rock.

Mr. Bain: Ah, how about that. Very nice. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Is there anything you'd like to say Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: I'm tired after all of that. Gee, I had no, no recollection of all of that. But it was an honor to serve on the Planning Commission. Everybody I worked with, both on the Commission and on staff, were wonderful, intelligent, hardworking people. And they all gave their everything they could to try and to make Stafford a better place to live. And I think that's evident by the fact that Stafford continues to be under tremendous pressure for growth, because people want to move here and live here. But from my perspective, we want Stafford to remain more rural than residential and commercial. And so I hope the Planning Commission will continue in that endeavor. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Bain. And again, on behalf of the Planning Commission, thank you for all that you did for us.

Mr. Shelton: Oh, the official plaque. Oh my gosh. You can carry that all over White Oak.

Mr. Bain: I can. And how many people will shoot at me.

Mr. Shelton: Probably 8 or 10.

[Laughter]

Mr. Bain: Thank you all very much.

[Applause]

***Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024***

Mr. Apicella: While he's not here, I'd like to read the Proclamation for Mr. Cummings as well.

A Proclamation recognizing and commending Dexter Cummings for outstanding service on the Stafford Planning Commission and to the citizens of Stafford County

WHEREAS, Dexter Cummings served as the Griffis-Widewater representative on the Stafford County Planning Commission from January 1, 2020, through December 31, 2023; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cummings served on the Senior Housing Committee, Minor Proffer Amendment Committee, Land Dedication Committee, and A-2 Committee; and attended the Architectural Review Board meetings as the Planning Commission representative in 2021, as well as the Economic Development Authority meetings as the Representative from 2022 through 2023; and participated in such major initiatives as Healthy Growth, and Downtown Stafford; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission desires to thank Mr. Cummings for his outstanding efforts to ensure that Stafford County continues to be one of the best places in Virginia to live, work, and play, and to preserve the County's unique history and environment for future generations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission desires to recognize Mr. Cummings for his commitment and service to the Planning Commission and the community;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Planning Commission on this the 27th day of March, 2024, that it be and hereby does recognize and commend Dexter Cummings for his outstanding and dedicated service to Stafford County and its citizens.

[Applause]

Okay, we have another presentation on the agenda, the Transportation Master Plan Presentation by Mr. Matthew Lehan. Is there a overview of the presentation?

2. Transportation Master Plan Presentation by Matthew Lehan, Transportation Planning and Funding Manager, Capital Projects

Ms. Baker: While he was coming up to the podium and they're getting the item up on the board, I'll just note that, so Matthew is the Transportation Planning and Funding Manager with our capital Projects Division. He's going to provide an overview of the proposed Master Transportation Plan. In the next month or so the Board is going to be referring this item to you all. This is a part of the comprehensive planning process. The Transportation Plan is a part of the Comprehensive Plan. This will be a more detailed strategic component of the, which would complement the Comprehensive Plan, become a separate element of the Comp Plan. So Matthew is here tonight to give you all an overview, because there will likely be a fairly short turnaround time when it comes to the Commission with regard to the changes to the Comprehensive Plan. So he'll give you all an overview and let you ask questions at this point so you'll be ready when it comes to you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Baker. Mr. Lehan?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Lehane: Awesome. Well, thank you for the introduction. As she stated, my name is Matthew Lehane. I am the Transportation Planning and Funding Manager for Stafford County. Today I'm here to discuss the Master Plan. In 2022, we started work with a consultant. And our work has developed, worked around the strategic plan to develop a multimodal infrastructure and transportation system for Stafford County. We have a draft plan, which is in three phases. Phase 1 is our existing CIP out to FY29 and 30. Phase 2 is the short term roadway projects and multimodal projects. And Phase 3 is a long term vision plan of roadway projects. Phase 1, our CIP is everything we currently have going on; projects nearing construction, projects in design, projects that have not yet started. These, too, are short term roadway projects. These are projects we're working on current grant applications for such as through the state SMART SCALE Program, or Revenue Sharing Program, and many of these already moving forward in grant applications. Lastly, we have multimodal projects. There's 30-plus multimodal projects that we're looking at throughout Stafford County, mostly trails or sidewalks, to help fix current gaps in the system. This is a list of where those short term roadway projects, the details on them, and an analysis of them, estimated cost, and there should be further information in the packet in the master plan document. Phase 2 is multimodal, as I mentioned 30-plus locations throughout the County. We're looking at sidewalk gaps and trails, and a Stafford Heritage Trail, a north-south trail throughout the County to connect cultural and tourism destinations. And then transit, several strategic plans that our transit agencies are ongoing, over 400,000 riders in FY23. Phase 3 is our long term vision plan to help solve some of the regional and localized restrictions our community has on our transportation system. We look at regional mitigation for geographic challenges, the outer connector, bypass studies, and then we also look at more localized options. So localized mitigations, such as some road widenings, and some new roadways, which we're working on throughout, say, a western network in Stafford County, west of I-95. And these are projects that are better suited outside of conventional funding streams such as SMART SCALE. There's several instances such as state action or federal grant applications or land use decisions. Next steps, we have three documents; we have the Master Plan Blueprint, and really our plan. That's what's in your document ... sorry, that's what's in your packet today. We also have our Master Plan Study, which we're working on buttoning up the 300-plus page document. And then we have our Impact Fees Roadway Improvement Plan, which will also at a later date be coming forward as well. The Master Plan includes over \$1 billion in transportation improvements that we worked with VDOT and other localities and staff to move forward. So we also look at our funding outlook. How do we fund these projects? How do we allocate funding in our transportation funds for roadway and multimodal projects? And how do we fund additional projects in the future such as impact fees, or Regional Transportation Authority? Just a brief overview of where our schedule has been at. We discussed this with the Board of Supervisors in September, October, November, January, February, and we're here today having an initial discussion what I would consider step zero with the Planning Commission. Step one is when, as she mentioned, it actually comes before you all. But this is step zero to give you all a very brief overview of where we're at. With that, I'm happy to take any questions. I know that was quick, but just a very brief overview of the phases in the Master Plan, and our next steps moving forward as we look to move forward to this process.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Any questions? Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Probably more of a, more of a statement, and probably should make the disclosure statement that I am a member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board. And so I just kind of want to give my comments but I don't want them to be implied that this is an indication of support for a project and remember that it has to go through the the process. But as I went through this plan, I think it's actually really good. And I was reading through it. And something the Commonwealth Transportation Board has talked a lot about is how land use then fits into these larger things, which is some of the funding

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

mechanisms that you talked about. And I hear it a lot with SMART SCALE, it's called a grant program. It is not a grant program. It is an algorithm prioritization scale.

Mr. Lehane: Yep.

Ms. Sellers: Right. And so there are two funding programs within it. And so that would be my only thing is there could be some tweaks to the Master Plan that would allow it to really feed in nicely to some of these funding programs. And you could change some of the wording in here like major arterial roads. If you change that to like...

Mr. Lehane: High priority projects.

Ms. Sellers: ... high priority projects or, then we can, it ties in very nicely to where the state is headed. And so particularly in those high priority projects, for 17, I-95, and Route 1 because those are the only three that we really have, you can tie right in to that. The other part that I put in here is with the, with the multimodal or the trails, you put accessibility and trails together. So the state through the General Assembly actually has a new Trail office. And last week or last, I think it was last week we had the CTB, and we got a briefing on the Trails Office. And so the Potomac Heritage Trail is not on the list, but it could be something that if you guys started putting this together, you could work with your delegation to maybe bring that up and say, hey, could this be part of this program, this Trails Office. So, so I think you have all the pieces here. And it's really nice to see. And hopefully more localities will do this and follow down that path. Because I think this is the direction that the state wants to go and wants to see. And you guys have all the work here.

Mr. Lehane: Thank you. And to give you a great example of the Potomac Heritage Trail, when we look at the map for the trail, it stretches from Pennsylvania all the way down to the Northern Neck. There's a gap in Virginia, which is, which is Stafford County, in general. So that's, that's one of the things that we're looking at and, you know, using this as a, you know, a north-south trail through Stafford County to connect cultural destinations, connect tourism, connect the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail, connect the Civil War Park, connect to the Stafford County Government Center, but then also connect the Potomac Heritage Trail with Prince William County, and out towards King George County, as well as we move through that with the Dahlgren Heritage Trail as well.

Ms. Sellers: And I did see one more thing on here – freight. So something that I don't remember seeing in the plan, but it's free. And we're seeing a lot of industrial spaces come on board here. And there are two programs that I don't remember as a Supervisor seeing the County really use and I haven't seen as a CTB member this, I've only seen a couple of them, but we have, you know, the rail industrial access program. That is an underutilized program. And then we also have where you can do it for parks, you can do it for airports. So there are all these little nuance programs that are out there that are available for transportation. So I would recommend if there are, you know, access points, anything surrounding the airport, maybe highlight that separately, because there is a program to help fund some of that. If there's anything out there for to access parks or recreational type facilities, separate that out. Freight is a big one, because it is, it is one of the land use and economic development components.

Mr. Lehane: Right.

Ms. Sellers: So separate that out.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Lehane: Yep, certainly. And to add to that, you know, the... *inaudible*... has a great example of something that could potentially depending on how it's prioritized be part of an airport access program or freight, as well. It provides unique connection to the airport, but also very unique... *inaudible*. A lot of these projects of the list I have here, a good number of them are SMART SCALE applications. So we are actively trying to move forward with a lot of these projects as we look at the Phase 2 FY29, 30, 31, 32, a lot of these are part of that. And we'll continue to look at some of those programs you mentioned. So thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Sellers. Other questions? When do you think we'll get our first action item on this?

Mr. Lehane: That's a great question. I believe it was discussed, you know, maybe sometime, May maybe. So within that, that, you know, maybe a month later. We'll, we'll be bringing this back to the Board hopefully within the next month or so. And from there, assuming all goes well, we look to move forward to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Lehane.

Ms. Baker: And just one thing of note, Mr. Chairman, the Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan will have to be modified accordingly to reference this, this new plan. So staff would be working separately on that. I mean, it would come as a component, but our planning staff would be working on that. And just again, updating references, update maps would be updated in accordance with what the master plan shows.

Mr. Lehane: The nice part is that several of these projects such as the western network item that we have, Mine Road Extension/Enon Road Connector, which is one of our SMART SCALE applications, is already in the Comprehensive Plan. We're trying to just build upon that and say these are our priorities, we really want to get these funded, we want to get these constructed either through grant programs are through land use action or other state or federal means.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Lehane: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: 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 for the three public hearing items on today's agenda. There'll be separate comment periods for these public hearing items when they come up. This is not interactive conversation. 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. So if anyone would like to speak on any item again, except for the three public hearing items, please come forward. Seeing no one rushing to the... Oh, we've got somebody.

Mr. Jackson: I don't know about rushing these days, but I'll get there. Good evening. Thank you for allowing us the time to come in and talk with the representatives of our government. My name is Julius Jackson. I just wanted to bring up to the board, propose that you would relook the Comprehensive Plan and reevaluate the current areas approved for cluster subdivision developments within the County, and look at removing or adjusting some of those boundaries. I have a lot of the different roads basically from the northern area in the County, south down towards Kellogg Mill Road, just a little south and then east from Poplar Road in Hartwood over towards Mountain View. A big portion of the basis for this is the

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

hydrological soil composition within that area does not allow a lot of runoff. And with developments, cluster subdivisions, roads going in, building footprints, it exacerbates that runoff. So we're putting more, more runoff instead of it going back into the ground into the aquifers, which is another concern drawing from the aquifers from all of those developments and affecting the groundwater for agricultural activities and the people living out there now. You know, we're putting more contaminants potentially into the Chesapeake Bay. I know that my property is much more inundated now with the two developments that have gone up around me and the potential for a third on another side. My creek turns into the Jackson River than Lake Jackson every time it rains now and filling up what was the 100-year flood boundary. So just something for the board to consider. I would ask you to look at that. And would be happy to provide any maps or additional information. Mr. Shelton, Hartwood District, happy to provide that to you. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Anybody else? Alright, seeing no one I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting and move on to the first public hearing, the Samuel and Dorothy Jackson Historic District Rezoning. Ms. Baker?

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. RC24155514; Zoning Reclassification – Samuel E. and Dorothy S. Jackson Property – A proposed zoning reclassification of Tax Map Parcel No. 40-32B consisting of 0.2875 acres zoned A-1, Agricultural and HR, Historical Resource Overlay Zoning Districts (Property) to remove the Property from the Historical Resource Overlay District. The Property is located on the east side of Old Fort Lane, approximately 575 feet south of Courthouse Road, within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: July 5, 2024)**

Ms. Baker: Yes, please recognize Nancy Kotting, who is the Cultural Resources Specialist for the County.

Mr. Apicella: Welcome, Ms. Keating... Kotting, sorry.

Ms. Kotting: Chairman Apicella and members of the Commission. It's a pleasure to present this to you. Again, I'm Nancy Kotting. And I'm the Cultural Resource Specialist for the County, of course based in the Planning and Zoning Department. So what I have for your review this evening is a zoning reclassification. This is for Tax Map Parcel 40-32B in the Aquia Election District. It encompasses 0.2875 acres, and it is currently a Historic District Overlay with the underlying zoning of Agricultural, A-1 which it will retain. The applicant is seeking the removal of the Historic District Overlay. The Jacksons acquired this property in 1986. In 1985, on this parcel was placed a Historic District Overlay because there is a National Register... subsequently listed National Register resource on the adjoining property. When the Jacksons purchased this parcel in 1986, the Overlay District zoning stayed with it. And the parcel is obviously adjoining their primary residence, and they would simply like it removed. So you'll see a little bit of background. Properties that are within the Historic Resources Overlay are subject to review and approval by the Architectural Review Board for exterior changes and new construction demolition, and alterations to buildings and structures. The purpose of the Historic District Overlay if you're interested is to protect against destruction of and encroachment upon historic resources. Again, the Architectural Review Board reviews exterior changes according to national standards that are maintained by the National Park Service. Here you see an aerial view of the properties. And you'll see in the yellow line there the parcel in question which is 40-32B. Located on Parcel 40-32 is Brockman's Fort which is the National Register resource. And again, you'll see here their residential property is at 40-33A. And here's an overview of the fort. And I was just informed by the applicant, the owner of the

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

property whose family has been here for three generations, that she grew up in a home that was located on this fort, and has subsequently been removed. So staff recommendation is approval of Ordinance O24-13, which would remove the overlay district. We don't anticipate any effect on the overlay district historic resource located next door of this change. And of course, the underlying zoning designation will remain, which is Agricultural, A-1. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you Ms. Kotting. Questions for staff? I have one quick question.

Ms. Kotting: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And it's not particularly about the parcel that's in question here. But parcel 40-32B, has the County approached the owners to potentially put a conservation easement on that parcel?

Ms. Kotting: We have not put a conservation easement on it that I know of. But it would be an excellent suggestion if they were so interested in doing it. It is completely private, there's no public access to it. So I don't necessarily, it's zoned Agricultural, all adjoining parcels are Agricultural, so I don't necessarily anticipate any encroachments but never say never. It's an excellent suggestion.

Mr. Apicella: How large is that parcel?

Ms. Kotting: That's a good question. I can certainly find out for you.

Mr. Apicella: One last question.

Ms. Kotting: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So and it may either be to you or Ms. Baker. Would they be eligible for the PDR Program?

Ms. Kotting: I believe so, but it depends on the size of the parcel.

Ms. Baker: You need a minimum of 20 acres for the PDR Program.

Ms. Kotting: And I don't believe it's that large.

Ms. Baker: She's looking up the... 40-32 is the main.

Mr. Apicella: While she's looking, are there any state programs that the owner of that parcel could potentially consider like the VLCF?

Ms. Kotting: I would not think so. You know, this is, you know, part archaeological, it's not architectural, so to speak. It's, you know, something that I think the Overlay District is adequate protection for it under the current circumstances. But I would certainly...

Mr. Apicella: But it could be developed, they still... they don't have go through the Architectural Review Board so.

Ms. Kotting: Correct.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Apicella: I'm just thinking that this is, from what I read in the background material, a pretty significant parcel that...

Ms. Kotting: It is. It's one of the most intact forts, readouts that we have in the County. And again, it's listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but that doesn't certainly prevent it from being encroached upon. And, it, you know, it could be lost.

Ms. Baker: Mr. Chair, I might add, though, if it, if there were any proposals for new construction of any kind, including structures on the parcel, they would have to go to the Architectural Review Board. At that time, the ARB would review all aspects, whether it is impacting any any resource on the property. So that is the protection that the fort property is going to retain even if this small piece comes off, but the fort does not... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: I mean I get it. I just, we have a land conservation person now, right?

Ms. Baker: We do.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just wondering if we could work with that person to consider what the options are, maybe present those to the owner, they can choose whether or not to move forward with it.

Ms. Kotting: That's an excellent idea, and I will certainly pursue that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Kotting: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, go ahead Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: So does this owner own both those parcels, with the fort on it?

Ms. Kotting: No. 40-33A and 40-32B are owned by the Jacksons, Dorothy and Samuel Jackson.

Ms. Sellers: Oh, okay, okay. And it was a previous the family had a house on it where the fort is.

Ms. Kotting: Correct, and I'm sorry if I wasn't clear on that earlier, yes. They owned it previously.

Ms. Sellers: So, I was just confused on how the government put an Overlay District on top of a property and they weren't involved in that. Okay. I was very confused there for a minute.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, last call for questions? Seeing none, thank you, Ms. Kotting.

Ms. Kotting: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm going to open the public hearing on this matter. Again, this is an opportunity for the public to comment. Before starting your thoughts and 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. So if you'd like to speak on this item, please come forward now.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mrs. Jackson: Good evening. I am the person, Dorothy S. Jackson. My husband is Samuel E. Jackson. He's not able to be here, he's 95 years old in a wheelchair. And we purchased this in 1986. Our house does not sit on the historical district. It had nothing to do with the historical district. We've been in our house for since 1963. And we purchased this little piece over on the side that came off from the old fort area. My uncle bought it in 1904. He died in 1947. He left it to my sister, and she owned it up until 1984. She sold it in '84 to Mr. Brockman. And from Mr. Brockman, Mr. Mounts got it, and turned it over to the County. And from there, it went to the state. But we bought this little piece of property on the side in 1986. And as we drive up my driveway, my house sits to the right, and this little piece of property is over to the left. And I came before the Supervisors almost two years ago asking them could they take our house off of the historical district, because our home, the house we built there in 1963 had nothing to do with that piece of property. And so it's two different pieces of property all together. And now we are asking that you all see fit to release that little piece of land over on the side that we may have that. We don't know if we'll have to sell it. I'm 92 years old. I don't know if I'll have to sell it. I'm a resident of Stafford. I've been here all my life. I was born down in the Brooke area. My husband was born down in Marlborough Point area. And we've been in this County all our lives. And we just asking that you would see fit to move that little piece of parcel of land before we leave the earth so when our children or whoever inherit it, it won't be all tied up. We'll have it all together. But we got two separate deeds, one deed for our home, and one deed for this property piece of land. I thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. Would anybody else like to come forward and speak on this item?

Mr. Myers: Good evening everybody, John Myers, just down the hill from the piece of property. I just wanted to make mention that in the letter I received via certified mail from this board, that the piece of property in question is 0.2875; so it's just over a quarter acre. And anybody that's been up there knows that it has absolutely no impact at all on the fort itself or where the way you view it or anything. That's all I'd like to say.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Anybody else? Alright, I'm going to close the public hearing on this item and move it back to the Commission. I'm sorry?

Audience member: Inaudible, not at microphone.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Did you want to come forward and speak on this, ma'am? That's Alright. Thank you for letting me know.

Ms. Mounts: I'm Rebecca Mounts. My parents owned the fort and we are 100% for this. So that's all I'd like to say.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. So just to be sure, anybody else? Alright, seeing no one, I'm going to close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Martinez, this is in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve zoning reclassification RC24155514.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to give this one to Mr. Shelton on the second. So thank you, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Shelton. There's a motion to approve the rezoning of the Samuel and Dorothy Jackson property. Any comment, Mr. Martinez?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Martinez: Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman. This is a common sense reclassification for the Jackson family. And as the staff mentioned, this will have very, very minimal impact to the existing historical resource identified. It will help the family, and the neighbors support it as well. So I recommend the Planning Commission support. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Martinez. Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No additional comments.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Alright, please cast your vote on the motion. Ms. Barnes, how do you vote?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. That motion carries 7-0. Thank you very much. Congratulations. Moving on to the next agenda item. I think we're probably going to handle those two together, Dominion Energy - Coal Landing Rezoning and Dominion Energy - Coal Landing CUP. Hi Ms. Taylor.

4. RC23155010; Zoning Reclassification – Dominion Energy – Coal Landing Substation – A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 30-152A, consisting of approximately 1.349 acres (“Property”), to allow a public utility, specifically an electrical substation. The proposed proffers would require development of the Property to be in general conformance with the generalized development plan unless a final site plan is required; limit permitted uses on the Property to an electrical substation and specified accessory and ancillary uses in support of an electrical substation; require installation of specified landscape screening; and require installation of specified stormwater drainage improvements. The Property is located on the south side of Coal Landing Road, approximately 0.5 miles east of Greenridge Drive, within the Aquia Election District and is subject to a concurrent request for a conditional use permit. **(Time Limit: July 5, 2024)**
5. CUP23155011; Conditional Use Permit – Dominion Energy – Coal Landing Substation - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a public utility, specifically an electrical substation use, in the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 30-152A (“Property”), to allow for expansion of the existing substation, and to permit structures and fencing to exceed the maximum allowable height within the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District. The Property consists of approximately 1.349 acres and is located on the south side of Coal Landing Road, approximately 0.5 miles east of Greenridge Drive, within the Aquia Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent request for a zoning reclassification to the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District. **(Time Limit: July 5, 2024)**

Ms. Taylor: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I'm Amy Taylor with Planning and Zoning and I'm here this evening to present the next items on tonight's agenda. I'm sorry, I seem to have misplaced the clicker. Nancy, did you take the clicker?

Mr. Apicella: It goes for a lot on eBay, let me tell you.

Ms. Taylor: Thank you. Okay, the next items on tonight's agenda are a request for a reclassification and a conditional use permit for Dominion Energy - Coal Landing Substation. This request is to rezone

1.349 acres from A-1, Agricultural to the M-1, Light Industrial zoning district, including a conditional use permit to allow a public utility, specifically an electrical substation, and to permit structure and fencing heights to or, excuse me, fence... permit structures and fencing to exceed the maximum allowable height permitted in the M-1, Light Industrial zoning district. This is associated with Tax Map Parcel 30-152A located in the Aquia District. And the applicant and owner is Virginia Electric and Power Company doing business as Dominion Energy Virginia. As shown here in blue, the site is located along the south side of Coal Landing Road approximately half a mile east of Green Ridge Drive. The property is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural, and surrounding zoning districts are R-1, Suburban Residential to the north, and A-1, Agricultural, to the east, west, and south. As noted the property has been zoned A-1 before, since before 1978 and is not subject to any existing proffers. Dominion Energy acquired the property in 1957, and the substation has, was constructed and placed into service shortly thereafter. And while the specific date of service is unknown, the substation has remained in continuous operation since at least the early 1960s and predates the enactment of the County's zoning regulations in 1964. As such, the facility is considered an existing non-conforming use. This is the GDP which does depict the existing site layout, including the location of the existing substation compound, as well as the proposed area of expansion. As shown, access to the site is provided by way of two existing entrances along Coal Landing Road. The primary entrance is a 40-foot wide gravel driveway located in the northeast corner of the site, as shown here in blue, and which also serves as ingress/egress for several parcels to the southeast. And a smaller secondary entrance is located in the northwest portion of the site. Most of the site is occupied by the existing fenced compound which houses a variety of structures and equipment, and is located approximately 180 feet to the closest residential structure near the southwest corner of the site. An additional residential dwelling is also located approximately 320 feet to the east along Coal Landing Road. And the proposed 2,000 square-foot expansion will be located in the southwest corner of the site as shown here in yellow, and will include replacement of multiple pieces of equipment, installation of a new transmission support structure referred to as a backbone structure, and that is shown here in red, and a retaining wall replacement of the existing security fence, as well as off-site drainage improvements. Landscape screening will also be provided along the western portion of the property... excuse me, the western property line to address visual impacts in the area of the proposed expansion. And since the substation is an existing use, the location of some of the existing equipment does not meet the minimum 40-foot yard setback for the M-1 zoning district – excuse me – but will maintain the existing front yard setback between the existing equipment closest to Coal Landing Road and the northern property line. And I'm going to attempt to draw that for you. There is this existing equipment here closest to Coal Landing Road is currently 13 feet – yep, not gonna work today – here we go. The distance is between these two different pieces of equipment is 13 feet to the existing property line. They are along Coal Landing Road. Excuse me, sorry, I lost my place. But they will maintain the existing front yard setback of 13 feet between that existing equipment and the closest the property line there along Coal Landing Road. There is installation of the new backbone structure will also not meet that minimum setback requirement and must be placed within the required 40-foot side yard setback in order to accommodate adequate distance from other established equipment within the compound. And as shown on the GDP, a 32-foot setback is proposed between the new backbone structure and the western property line adjacent to Tax Map Parcel 30-151P. And again, that dimension on the GDP is shown here. And that distance will go to the proposed backbone structure shown here in red. And that again is a proposed distance of 32 feet. Since encroachment of that required side yard setback would create a new non-conformity, the applicant has proffered a reduced setback of 32 feet associated with this structure only. And acceptance of the proffers by approval of this request would relax those code requirements for this specific scenario, and allow the applicant to install the new backbone structure without creating a new non-conformity. The new backbone structure will also be approximately 74 to 77 feet in height, which will exceed the maximum height of 65 feet for structures in the M-1 zoning district. The existing fence surrounding the compound will also be replaced as part of the proposed

safety improvements and will be increased to 12 feet in height, which will also exceed maximum height permitted for fencing in any side yard setback. Exceptions to both the proposed structure height and fence height have been requested as part of the CUP application. These are the existing conditions and the subject parcel is located along Coal Landing Road. And, as discussed previously, it is developed and currently used as an electrical substation. The existing fence compound occupies approximately half of the site which houses various structures and equipment. And due to the nature of the existing site, the existing use, the site is open and has very little existing vegetation and is not screened or buffered from adjacent uses. Although the area of the proposed expansion is fairly well screened by existing mature tree cover located just off site on the adjacent parcel to the southwest. Site topography within the gated compound slopes gently towards the northeast, and while the grades outside the compound are sloped more significantly in the southwest corner of the property. There are no environmentally sensitive areas or resources present and, as shown, the property does have frontage along Coal Landing Road and access to the site is currently gated. This is a street view of the property as seen from Coal Landing Road and this is located just east of the site directly outside of the primary access or gate to the property. And this is a street view also of the site from Coal Landing seen from the west and you are seeing the secondary access into the site there as well. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the property as being within the Suburban Land Use designation which are areas of the County where suburban scale of development has been determined to be the most appropriate. And while the land use plan does not, oh, does include development standards that support certain types of residential, commercial, and industrial development within suburban areas, it does not directly address infrastructure facilities, including electrical transmission and distribution facilities. As this is an existing substation facility adjacent to an established electrical transmission corridor, staff believes that the substation is both appropriate and consistent with the Comp Plan recommendations as it relates to the expansion of public utilities, and that the proposed expansion will support future growth in the surrounding area. The following are a few of the proposed proffers which will help offset any potential negative impacts, and would require the property to be developed in general accordance with the GDP. Limit permitted uses on the property to only an electrical substation, including specific supporting accessory uses; maintain existing yard setbacks associated with existing structures and equipment; relax the yard setback requirement to 32 feet to allow installation of the new backbone structure without creating a new non-conformity; and provide additional landscape screening along the western property line and stormwater drainage improvements as depicted on the GDP. And these are a few of the proposed conditions which will help offset any potential negative impacts, which would also allow for development of a public utility specifically, again, an electrical substation; require the site to be developed in substantial conformance with the GDP; limit the height of structures associated with the substation to no more than 77 feet; and limit the height of fencing to no more than 12 feet. It would also require landscape screening along the southwest portion of the site to be provided in the form of understory evergreen trees. And also includes other standard language associated with similar types of facilities, such as limiting the storage of commercial vehicles; requiring the facility to be secured with a fence; prohibiting the storage of hazardous materials; limiting hours of construction; and removal of the substation once use has been discontinued.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Taylor, before you move on, what, can you tell us what understory evergreen trees means?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, Stafford County has a landscaping manual in place which dictates at the time of site plan what types of plantings are required in certain areas. And it also dictates the size of those plants. Per the DCSL manual, understory trees are classified as any tree that has a mature height of 10 feet to 40 feet in height. So at the time of expansion, when the applicant comes in with a site plan to pursue this expansion, they would be required to plant evergreen trees along that property line that

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

would be within that mature height range of 10 feet to 40 feet. At the time of planting, the trees themselves would have to be a minimum of six feet at the time of planting.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, the reason I bring this up, and not to jump in before anyone has any other questions, if you bring up that picture where it showed the house – it seems to me that whoever lives there... is that a house or is it a... yeah, it looks like a house to me...

Ms. Taylor: It is a house.

Mr. Apicella: ... that, that person would want some pretty significant understory sized trees in that area, something more than 6 feet or even 10 feet. So how do we know that we're going to get something of significant size for that person who's closest to this project?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, staff did discuss that with the applicant during the evaluation process. And obviously, due to the nature of the site, Dominion Energy does not permit trees of any large size within the proximity of those overhead power lines and high voltage transmission lines. They have indicated that the maximum height that Dominion will permit within the proximity of the site is a maximum height of 8 feet. Staff did encourage the use of the understory trees which would meet that requirement.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, and we were, we were on the conditions. Okay, so we were doing... I'm sorry, did we get all the way through the conditions? I'm sorry.

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible*... the ones; I'm sorry.

Ms. Taylor: Okay, we were limiting the hours of construction and then removal of the substation once the use has been discontinued. Staff evaluation and finding – staff does find that the positive features or aspects associated with the application are that the proposal is consistent with the existing use and the operations on the site. The proposal will allow for the necessary expansion of the existing substation which also supports future growth in the surrounding area. The existing and proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed proffers would limit permitted uses to only an electrical substation and would provide the additional landscape screening to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable. And the proposed conditions would also help mitigate potential negative impacts. And staff finds that the negative aspects with this application are that the expanded use will create visual impacts on adjacent residential properties which cannot be fully mitigated, and that the proposal would also relax yard setback requirements to allow the installation of a new structure to avoid creating a new non-conformity. Staff is supportive of the project and does recommend approval of both the reclassification application, with proffers, pursuant to O24-14, and the CUP application, with conditions, pursuant to resolution R24-124. In addition, these applications are also, have also included a request for a time limit extension to extend the 12 month time limit for the Board to act. And that request is the next item on this evening's agenda should the Commission choose to defer these applications to a later meeting. And that does conclude my presentation. I'm ready for any questions.

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

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Shelton: I have two questions. One, I assume that this is an enhancement of the distribution system to north end of Stafford?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Shelton, staff is not entirely clear regarding what service area that this would provide for so I would have to defer to the applicant for that.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: But it is certainly an expansion of the existing system there.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you. Second question, you elated, related to the fencing, is fencing of the entire area included for security purposes?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Shelton, that is also correct. They will be replacing the existing 8-foot fence with a 12-foot fence around the entire perimeter of the compound.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Alright, seeing none, thank you, Ms. Taylor. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. LeClaire: Good evening, I'm Kyle LeClaire. I work with Clinical Geosyntec. I'm working on behalf of Dominion Energy for this project. I'll recognize my colleagues here; I've got Stephen Brooks, he's part of the permitting team at Dominion, and Demetrius Pearson, who's the project manager for this particular expansion project. I can't add anything more. Ms. Taylor did such a great job with the staff report. I can't add anything more than what she has done. But I would like to say, to answer the one question, this is a reliability project. The backbone structure basically splits a circuit and allows a little bit more bisection within the, within the substation itself. There's two transformers sits there and allows them to control those transformers a little bit more efficiently. If one goes down, they can transfer the power and then they've added switches to do that inside the substation itself.

Mr. Shelton: So we'll be increasing the Kba from this substation?

Unknown speaker: No, sir, no, sir.

Mr. LeClaire: I'm a civil engineer by the way.

Unknown speaker: This is a newer used substation, these transmission and...

Mr. LeClaire: Why don't you come down here.

Unknown speaker: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, we won't, we won't be in...

Mr. Apicella: Can you state your name, sir?

Mr. Pearson: Demetrius Pearson.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Apicella: And you're with Dominion?

Mr. Pearson: Yes sir. Project Manager with Dominion Energy. We won't be increasing the Kba for the transformers. There's two existing transformers there. The switch has being installed for reliability purposes. So if something were to fail, we could isolate and move load over. This substation is a dual use substation. So you have transmission and distribution together. Both there.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Pearson: You're welcome.

Mr. Apicella: Questions for the applicant? Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, Ms. Sellers?

Mr. Martinez: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Ms. Sellers: Go ahead.

Mr. Martinez: For non-electrical engineers, what is a Kba?

Mr. Pearson: Transformer size, I'm sorry.

Mr. Martinez: Thank you.

Mr. Pearson: You're welcome.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: That was it.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, okay. Back to the viewshed issue for that one particular neighbor, is there anything else you can do to mitigate the impact? So again, a 6-foot tree is not going to do much for that person.

Mr. LeClaire: Yeah, I do know that our team has been in contact, I believe the property name is Mr. Terrell, if I pronounced correctly. They've been in contact with him. I don't know the substance of those conversations, but he is aware of the project. Our Dominion public's teams have been reached out to him and have that conversation. As far as the viewshed, what we've done is try to plant that on that border with those trees as much as we can. Obviously, when you have a backbone structure that's going to be plus 70 feet tall, it is going to be hard to protect that view shed. I will say this, the security fence that we do plan to put around this particular substation as a second project – the first project is expansion, the second project is a security fence that goes around the outside – that is a 12-foot fence. That is a tighter mesh on that, that security fence. So it is more opaque than what you see out there today. Today is the wider, the wider kind of mesh; this security fence will have the tighter mesh on it.

Mr. Apicella: Is that going to be right on the property line or is there going to be some distance between that fence and the property line?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. LeClaire: There'll be some distance for that, yeah. And if you pull up the GDP at some point there, it's in your packet there, you can see the outline of that fence on the GDP.

Mr. Apicella: Would you consider putting a wooden fence or some other fence on, right on the border of that property line?

Mr. LeClaire: If the count... we could potentially, we'll have to go to our team, if that's something that seems reasonable, certainly. The only thing that we caution against putting a fence up, and then if we have the vegetation that we proffered to put in that we have distribution lines in there that we have to maintain as well. So that would be my only caution is trying to maintain those buffers against those distribution systems that we have in there. So, um...

Mr. Apicella: So you lost me there. So you've got, you've got your fence...

Mr. LeClaire: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... along the perimeter...

Mr. LeClaire: That's right.

Mr. Apicella: ... but not right on the property line.

Mr. LeClaire: Not right on the property line, there's a space.

Mr. Apicella: And there's some distance between that fence and the individual's property line.

Mr. LeClaire: Right, and then there's existing...

Mr. Apicella: So what's going...

Mr. LeClaire: ... there's existing distribution lines in that particular area. On that western property line, there's existing distribution arial lines in there that feeds this distribution system.

Mr. Apicella: But right, right on that person's, so I'm just trying to... I don't know what that distance is... but right at that person's property line, where you border that person's property line, is there transmission lines right there?

Mr. LeClaire: There's distribution facilities in the area along that property line, yes. Between the substation fence, the security fence – there you go, perfect. Is there a pointer here? I don't have a point on this. But if you look right now, for example, if you go back to the previous image... this pen right here? Technology. This is the security fence that will be proposed. This is the property line. There is existing overhead that runs, distribution, runs right in that particular area there. Okay? Does that clear that up as far as where things are sitting?

Mr. Apicella: Somewhat. I, you know, again, I guess we're not going to be able to fully address it now. But I would just ask you to continue to work with that property owner and see what you can do to mitigate the visual impacts.

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. LeClaire: Sure. And we're willing, if it's a board fence we can put up there and as long as the, the planning folks and the site plan folks are okay with us putting a board fence along that property line, that's something we'll definitely consider. Hopefully that answers your question with regard to that, but.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thanks. Mr. Shelton, did you have any other questions?

Mr. Shelton: Would the applicant consider slatting that chain link fence?

Mr. LeClaire: The fence is, the fence, that security fence that will be going up eventually is a tighter mesh. It's not something you put slats in like the old traditional chain link fence that you would normally do in the past. This is a fence that it has a tighter mesh. It's a little more opaque. In other words, you can't quite see through it. You can see through it a little bit. But the reason it's a tighter mesh is for security reasons, ballistic reasons, you know, things of that nature. So it's not something you necessarily slat. But it will be something that's a little bit more opaque than what you would see on a customary chain link fence that you would normally see on legacy substations.

Mr. Shelton: One other question, doesn't the State Corporation Commission require you to have a chain link fence of a certain height, around the distribution?

Mr. LeClaire: Yes, that's why... Yeah, that's why this is going to be a 12-foot fence, security fence.

Mr. Shelton: So I don't think wood would work if I'm correct.

Mr. LeClaire: No, no. No, that would not unfortunately.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. LeClaire: Appreciate the question, though.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? Alright, seeing none. Thank you, sir.

Mr. LeClaire: Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm going to open the public hearing on both the rezoning and the CUP. This is an opportunity for the public comment on this matter. 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. So if anyone would like to speak on this, these two items, please come forward. Alright, seeing no one I'm going to close the public hearing on these two items and bring it back to the Commission. Mr. Martinez, these are in your district if you want to consider taking any action, we need to take them up separately.

Mr. Martinez: We need to take them up separately?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Martinez: Okay. I make a motion to approve zoning reclassification RC23155010.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Shelton. Any further comments, Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez: No additional comment. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No additional comment, sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Alright. Please cast your vote on the motion to approve the rezoning. Ms. Barnes how do you vote?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. That motion carries 7-0. Mr. Martinez on the CUP?

Mr. Martinez: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve CUP 23155011.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Sellers: Second.

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

Mr. Martine: No further comment. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers? Anyone else? Alright, so motion to approve the CUP, please cast your vote. Ms. Barnes how do you vote?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Motion carries 7-0. Thank you very much Ms. Taylor and the applicant. Moving on to the next agenda item; no Unfinished Business. We were to consider a potential time extension, but we don't need to because those items were not deferred. So looks like we're up to Planning Director's Report, I think. Ms. Baker?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

6. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Ms. Baker: I don't have any any report this evening. Just for your information, the Project Pipeline Report that is in your package.

Mr. Apicella: What's the status of the April 10 meeting?

Ms. Baker: We do not have any public hearings scheduled for April 10th.

Mr. Apicella: So can we possibly cancel that meeting?

Ms. Baker: I am not aware of any additional items that need to go for that meeting. The next meeting would be April 24th.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a motion to cancel the April 10 meeting?

Ms. Sellers: So moved.

Mr. Shelton: Motion to cancel.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Ms. Sellers got it. Got a second by Mr. Shelton. Just do this by voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed?

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: The ayes definitely have it. So the April 10 meeting is hereby cancelled. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

7. Historic Preservation Awards Nominations

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Lucian. Chairman's Report. So we've got a package regarding the Historic Preservation Awards nominations that Ms. Baker provided, specifically on outstanding developer. And they have recommended the Capital 95 Logistics LLC Oakenwold. Ms. Baker, do you have anything to add to the package that you provided?

Ms. Baker: Not necessarily. We did provide a copy of the report which talks about the mitigation of what the developer is doing on that site. I know they are doing a data recovery for the archaeology there; distribution of an architectural report that they are going to do on all of the structures that are out there. Most of the structures were pretty well deteriorated and not really salvageable. They did allow the

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

County to go in and do some salvage work on the materials. And some of that is still in process. But they're also salvaging some, which I think is pretty neat, Aquia sandstone that apparently is going to go to help for a restoration project at Mount Vernon. The, and they're going to collect historic images and they're going to have reports written with the history of Oakenwold, which is the farm complex and all the structures and everything that occurred, and they're going to distribute those documents to the library and other historical groups for access. So, any questions...

Mr. Apicella: Some great information, Ms. Baker. Any comments on the proposed recommendation? Is there a motion to accept it?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to accept.

Mr. Apicella: Second? Okay, just do this by voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed?

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: The motion carries. Okay, great. So we have a nomination. Other Business – TRC. Looks like you got some work going on in Hartwood for the Staffordshire preliminary plan, Mr. Shelton. Approval of minutes. Is there a motion to approve the January 24, 2024 minutes?

OTHER BUSINESS

8. New TRC Submissions

- [24155545](#); Staffordshire – Hartwood Election District
 - A Preliminary Plan for 336 residential lots located on the west side of Hulls Chapel Rd north of the intersection with Lake Breeze Way on TM 36-39A, 36-66, 36-67, 37-5, 37-6, 37-7, 37-8, 37-9, 37-10, zoned R-1 and A-1, consisting of 1070.62 acres, within the Hartwood Election District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. January 24, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed?

Planning Commission Minutes
March 27, 2024

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Ayes carry. Motion to approve the February 28, 2024 minutes.

10. February 28, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Ms. Sellers: So moved.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed?

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:03 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the March 27, 2024, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.