

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 8, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, January 8, 2025, was called to order at 6:15 PM by the Director of Planning and Zoning, Michael Zuraf, 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, Kelsey Caudill, Kecia Evans, Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Brian Geouge

Mr. Zuraf: I'll go ahead and call the roll. Commissioner Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Here.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: Present.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Here.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Bratton.

Mr. Bratton: Present.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: Here.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Evans.

Ms. Evans: Here.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Here.

Mr. Zuraf: Chairman, we have a quorum. Oh, he's not a Chairman yet. So tonight, the next item on the agenda is the Election of Officers. I will go ahead and lead us through the election of a Chairman, and then at that point turn the gavel over to the newly elected Chairman. So I will go ahead and we will, how it will work is take nominations and vote for nominations in the order that they are received. Are there any nominations for Chairman?

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. A. Election of Chairman

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Zuraf, I'd like to nominate Steven Apicella for Chair.

Mr. Zuraf: Are there any other nominations?

Ms. Sellers: I'd like to put up... Ms. Caudill, we'll put you up. Somebody else. And only reason I say that is we keep passing the Chairman back and forth between the same two people. So I'm going to put up, you know, Ms. Caudill, I'll put up, Mr. Bratton, you guys have been here, even Mr. Shelton. But I do think we need new blood, so if one of the two of you would accept it, I'll put you guys up.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, any other nominations? Okay, so I have nominations for Mr. Apicella and a nomination for Commissioner Caudill and Mr. Bratton. Okay, so first we will vote for for Commissioner Apicella for Chairman. Everybody, please cast your vote... oh, and we do not have the electronic thing, so let's go ahead and do a, I'll do a roll call vote. So I'll go through and everybody say what they wish. Commissioner Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Aye.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: Aye.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Caudill? And this is vote for Mr. Apicella for Chairman or not.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Zuraf: Commissioner Evans?

Ms. Evans: Abstain.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. And Commissioner Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. We have a new Chairman, Commissioner Apicella, and you are elected by a vote of five for, one against, and one abstention. Congratulations.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf, and thank you to my colleagues. So the next order of business is election of a Vice Chairman. Are there any nominations?

B. Election of Vice-Chairman

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Ms. Barnes: I'd like to nominate Mr. Billy Shelton, please.

Mr. Apicella: Are there any other nominations?

Ms. Sellers: I'd like to put Ms. Caudill up for that one as well.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Thank you, Ms. Sellers. Any further nominations? All right, we'll take them in the order that they were presented. First with Mr. Shelton. Please cast your vote. I'll go in the order of my left to my right. Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: That's an aye. Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes aye. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: Abstain.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay that motion carries 4-2 with one abstention. Congratulations, Mr. Shelton. Nominations for Secretary?

C. Election of Secretary

Mr. Shelton: I'd like to nominate Kristen Barnes.

Mr. Apicella: Are there any other nominations?

Ms. Barnes: I'd like to nominate Kelsey Caudill.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All those... so again, we'll take them in the order that they were presented. Mr. Bratton, how do you vote for Ms. Barnes?

Mr. Bratton: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

***Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025***

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes aye. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

Ms. Barnes: I won't take offense.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: Abstain.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm trying to remember, so that was three, three and one abstention. Okay, for Ms. Caudill. Mr. Bratton, how do you vote?

Ms. Barnes: You can vote yes even if you voted whatever.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, if you voted no the first time, I mean, if you voted yes for Ms. Barnes, you can still vote yes for Ms. Caudill or no for Ms. Caudill. It's your choice.

Mr. Bratton: Which one of y'all really want it more? It doesn't bother me either way.

Ms. Barnes: It's an easy job. If Kelsey wants to do it, I'm fine with that.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton, how do you vote for Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No hard feelings, whatever, whatever the rules say, whatever we have to do it fine.

Mr. Bratton: Okay, so I don't have to vote how I voted last time?

Mr. Apicella: No, you can vote differently.

Mr. Bratton: Okay, I'm going to vote for Ms. Kelsey then.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Shelton: No.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes yes. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: I'm going to abstain.

Mr. Apicella: And Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so that is four, one, and one, if my math is correct. All right, congratulations Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you.

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: All right. Moving on to, again, congratulations to the team. Welcome back to 2025. Happy New Year. Are there any declarations of disqualification? All right, seeing none. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Zuraf: No, there are no changes.

Mr. Apicella: All right, I'll now move on to the public presentations portion of the meeting. The public may have up to three minutes to comment on any matter except the one public hearing item on today's agenda. There'll be a separate comment period when that item comes 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 during the public presentations portion of the meeting, now is your opportunity.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. Happy New Year to everyone 2025. Nominations are to be seconded, right? Correct? I didn't hear any second procedures. Thank you for your consideration in my perspective and consideration. Thank you, Commissioners for considering minutes after public presentations. This seems fitting. Some Board directives approves minutes prior to public review and hearings as one, as one hears it for the first time in the translations. This gives no margin for minutes translations to be reviewed by the public if it's read before public speaking. Page 9 of 446 of the Board of Supervisors' December 17, 2024, packet states, Timeline of a Stafford data center was, was 2020 to 2025. Please note 2022 budget document had no mention of industrial projects of such and the public was not informed until 2023 as of March 27 with the major planning and zoning changes with data centers. With staff and a comprehension plan finally posted at that same time, this is two and a quarter years before the public was given the announcement. Next point. Subdivision Comprehension for agent. As I go online to Stafford County Development Review Meetings and a new applications listing, I find agent used as a third party legally and not a representative with Stafford. So it'll say, it will actually say agent colon. And this will, this is most likely the case, unless it is a special project, and there can be added

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

complexity of revolving doors of LLC's which have... have Stafford perplexed with company agent inheritance. This is a tight future pipeline upon Stafford County. What is the impact to Stafford taxpayers? The Accokeek Center general development plan just popped up December 2024, and three more proposed data centers are listed within the design. And there's a heavy RPA north of the center. Is this a pattern with water, RPA, and data centers? What is the impact on the Stafford public? And now I'm out of time. Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Anyone else? All right, I'm gonna close the public presentations portion of the meeting, and before we move on to the public hearings, I'd like to welcome aboard Ms. Kecia Evans, who will be serving as the Aquia District representative. We worked on the BZA together, and I'm confident she's gonna do an excellent job as a new Planning Commissioner here in Stafford County.

Ms. Evans: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Moving on. Mr. Zuraf, Public Hearings, the Departure from Design Standards, Austin Ridge Logistics Center. Please

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. WAI24155524; Departure from Design Standards – Austin Ridge Logistics Center – A request for a departure from the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Screening and Buffering (DCSL) Manual Section 110.3, "Transitional Buffers" on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-68, 38-69, 38-70A, and 38-78 (Property), zoned M-1, Light Industrial. The Property consists of approximately 182.72 acres, located west of Interstate 95 and north of Accokeek Creek, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: March 9, 2025)**

Mr. Zuraf: Please recognize Brian Geouge for the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Geouge, how are you?

Mr. Geouge: Doing well. Good evening. Congratulations, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Shelton and Caudill. Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. I'll be presenting item number 2, which is a request for a Departure from Design Standards for the DCSL, our landscaping manual, specifically Section 110.3 for transitional buffers. And this is related to the project known as Austin Ridge Logistics Center on multiple parcels shown here totaling 182 acres roughly, within the Hartwood District. The applicant is Ryan Marshall with NP Austin Ridge LLC, who is in attendance tonight. All right, I'll start off by giving you an idea of the location of this. This is on the west side of Interstate 95 not far from here, just south of Courthouse Road, between Accokeek Creek at the south end and Cedar Lane at the north end. The site is currently under development, which is not reflected in this aerial photograph. This was probably taken about a year ago. However, you can see in this photo that portions of the site have been cleared previously for agriculture and forestry purposes. And this site was subject to a zoning reclassification which was approved back in December of 2022, and that was provided as Attachment 7 of this packet. And there's also an approved site plan for this development, which is a warehouse development totaling about 2 million square feet. It's four buildings shown here. That site plan was approved about a year ago. The approved site plan included a transitional buffer along the southern property line that abutts RPA area, and that's the... or a portion of that buffer, at least, is what the applicant is requesting a departure for, and that departure area is shown here in red. Should this departure request be approved, the applicant intends to submit a site plan revision to remove some of the

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

plantings that are shown in this approved site plan. And here's a closer look of the departure area. Again, the applicant's requesting this departure along a portion of the southern boundary shown here. The total length is about 4,300 feet. Staff notes that the majority of this area is located along a finger of wetlands and RPA that extends into the developing site. Although the DCSL requires a transitional buffer in this area due to the configuration of the property, a buffer in this area would be located between the proposed warehouse distribution center buildings. And, at least for this portion, it's not really buffering the use, per se, because it's kind of buffering itself. And here's a closer look at the approved landscaping plan, just showing the details of the proposed plantings in that area. And here's an exhibit showing the approved site plan overlaid on aerial imagery with the RPA shown in green. You can see the RPA along Accokeek Creek is pretty extensive through here. It ranges from about 500 feet to over 1,000 feet in width. The applicant has submitted a justification as to why they're requesting relief here, and their justification states that the RPA essentially provides the buffering to the adjacent property to the south, and that area is very unlikely to be developed, at least within that RPA area. So the RPA is essentially achieving the buffer here, although our DCSL does not permit the applicant to take credit for off-site areas such as the RPA. And there's some additional exhibits provided with this request. This one, basically the area highlighted in orange shows the portion of the RPA that extends onto the developing property. Portions of this RPA were previously cleared of vegetation, as shown in that earlier aerial. Many of these RPA re-establishment areas, shown in orange here, coincide with the transitional buffer area. So what the applicant has to do because of the proposed use and that the RPA areas were previously clear, they actually have to re-establish those with this project. So the applicant will be re-establishing these areas in orange, regardless of the outcome of this departure request. And the applicant has also provided this exhibit. This basically shows the transitional buffer areas outside of the RPA replanting areas. So if a transitional buffer was provided, basically we would be getting plantings in the areas in blue. So you can think of this as a more representative example of what they are requesting a departure for. I'll also note that in their request letter, the applicant has committed to establishing no mow areas, in these blue shaded areas, which should, over time, allow for some natural re-establishment of forests. And in conclusion, transitional buffer requirements are intended to mitigate impacts of adjacent and compatible uses. And staff does not believe that granting this departure will result in adverse impacts to adjacent properties. As noted, the majority of the departure area is located in an area that provides limited benefit for buffering. The potential for adjacent and compatible uses in close proximity to this property line is minimal. The on-site RPA areas shown will be fully re-established regardless of this. And with tree quantities that are much higher than our normal transitional buffer requirements and the commitment to establish no mow zones are all supporting factors in this. And staff believes that the applicant's request meets the requirements for a departure and recommends approval of PCR 25-01. And I'll be happy to take any questions.

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

Ms. Barnes: So at one point in the report, it says that the surrounding property is unlikely to be developed. What does unlikely mean?

Mr. Geouge: So what that was referring to is the adjacent area that immediately abuts the property line. So basically the RPA area extending, you know, 500 to over 1,000 feet. Developers are unlikely to try to develop in an RPA area because there are restrictions, obviously, and additional approvals required for that. Sometimes, well, for more major impacts, they'd have to go to the Ches Bay Board for approval.

Ms. Barnes: So most of the time that's, that's just prohibited, basically?

Mr. Geouge: Correct.

***Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Can you pull up slide number 11, I'm sorry, 9?

Mr. Geouge: Slide number 9. Okay, this one?

Mr. Apicella: Yes. Adjacent parcel number 12. I see that on here a couple of times. So is that one big lot, or is it several portions of a lot, or separate lots?

Mr. Geouge: You could probably see it better on this view. So parcel 12 would be this one. So it kind of extends down and around this little island parcel here.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And go back again to number 9 or 10. So a good portion of the RPA is centered between the submitter's, the applicant's two buildings. Is that correct?

Mr. Geouge: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Have we done this before? I mean, as I, as I see this request, it's sort of outside the norm.

Mr. Geouge: It is.

Mr. Apicella: Have we reviewed and approved any like this in the past that you're aware of?

Mr. Geouge: None in my experience. The ones I've dealt with usually relate to some kind of impediment or restriction along the property line, like an easement or something along those lines.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: So there's no actual hardship here. There's just, the applicant has come up with what you and the applicant thinks is a better way of dealing with this, this buffer here. There's no actual hardship.

Mr. Geouge: I'll defer to the applicant on any further justification or hardship. I'm not going to speculate anymore on that one.

Mr. Apicella: All right, last call for questions. Thank you, Mr. Gouge.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you.

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

Mr. Marshall: All right, perfect. All right. Well, thank you guys. Thank you, Mr. Geouge, for the explanation there. My name is Ryan Marshall, speaking to you guys tonight on behalf of NorthPoint Development. That NP Austin Ridge is just a project entity we've set up as we've started construction here. I won't spend too much time here. Lots of familiar faces up here. A couple folks that did not see our initial rezoning. But a quick rundown on NorthPoint. You know, we're a national, primarily industrial developer. We do some multi-family, starting to do some data center work. But really, you know, the bread and butter business is industrial distribution, warehouse, logistics, development. One thing I like to highlight on this slide that I think really differentiates us from a lot of our competitors all over the country is that we're long term holders of our development, which means, you know, five years

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

down the road, if the county inspector calls the property manager and says, hey, your grass is too long, that phone is probably ringing in my neighbor's office in St Louis. So we're around for the long haul. We like to do things right the first time. Don't try to, you know, skimp out and do it the cheap way, because we know we're going to be out of the project in six months. We own these things long term, and I think that speaks to kind of how we view the world, and, you know, how we like to partner with the communities we invest in and, and, you know, work collaboratively with you guys. But up on the screen here a couple tenants I mentioned. We're a national developer. Have quite a few relationships with the largest industrial occupiers across the country, several of which on this list are familiar with our Austin Ridge site. No, uh, no leasing to report just yet. But as you'll see, we're we're chugging through construction right now, so still maybe a little early in the game. And you know, have certainly gotten some inbound interest on the project. Won't spend too much time here. Mr. Gouge gave a good run down of kind of where we're located here, not too far away at Courthouse Road and I-95. Roughly a 188-acre development, including the new road that we're constructing, the extension of Austin Ridge Drive, as was noted, about a 2 million square-foot development at full build-out, representing a total capital investment of over \$280 million and bringing projected 738 to 842 full time operational jobs on top of the construction jobs that will be created. As was noted, secured rezoning approval in December 2022. Since that time, we have been working with staff on site plan. I think we're on site plan revision number two, Brian. We just really like working with Brian, so trying to keep his his docket full. But set of proffers at that time of the rezoning in 2022, none of which are the subject of the request this evening. I wanted to provide a quick construction update. So the first phase of development here, we're working on what's called Buildings 1 and 2 in the approved site plan. So kind of middle of the park, if you will. We've, we're under construction on Building 1, which is a 498,000 square-foot facility, and Building 2, which is a 198,000 square-foot facility. Building Two here you can see in the top left picture, the one with the roof complete, that building's running a couple months ahead of the larger one right now, and that, that first building – I say first building, it's actually Building number 2 – we're tracking completion of at the end of February of this year, so coming up real quick. Building One, the larger one there. These photos are a couple weeks dated. That roof is on now, starting to pave some of that building, targeting delivery of that one in May of this year. So the contractors have been moving real quick out there, doing a great job. And then in the lower left there you see the extension of Austin Ridge Drive getting its intermediate coat of asphalt there. It's a multi-thousand-foot road extension from where Austin Ridge Drive ends today at Odin Drive, and carries that straight due south into our project.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead.

Ms. Sellers: So will Austin Ridge Drive connect then into where that RPA, where that funky slit is?

Mr. Marshall: It... so, not today. There was a proffer attached with that original rezoning. If, if the time comes that that is necessitated for an emergency connection point or secondary access, it would be established. There is no scenario that that would be a public access point on the south side. If and when it's built, it would be emergency vehicles only.

Ms. Sellers: So right now, it just goes into the site.

Mr. Marshall: Correct, yes. So the public portion of Austin Ridge Drive right around our property line hits a cul de sac, goes from being public to private. It, so Austin Ridge Drive, once you hit our property line becomes a private road on-site.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, it's very tempting not to turn down there and see what y'all are doing every time I come to the light.

Mr. Marshall: Yeah. Well, you're more than welcome. Lots of construction traffic so we ask that you be careful. But no, in the next couple months, you know, should have fully paved roads with tenants touring the building, if not occupying it. So we'd love to have anybody down there would like take a look. We'd love to have you guys. So the departure request this evening, Mr. Geouge did a great job of kind of explaining what's in front of you guys. So the red you see here is the, the portion of the transitional buffer along the southern property line that we're asking for some relief from this evening. As he noted, it's about 4,300 linear feet. As you guys did also see here, the orange shaded area are the areas that are subject to RPA revegetation. So the prior property owner completed some timbering, clearing activities prior to NorthPoint purchasing the land. Although we were aware of those activities going on, there was some miscommunication on my part on the scope and the extent of the location of those clearing activities. We did not realize the full extent of them until we were coordinating a round of revisions to our site plan. It was, it was noted that there had been some clearing in areas that NorthPoint had planned to use the existing vegetation as credit to satisfy some of the transitional buffer requirements. When that came to light, it introduced new requirements for NorthPoint in terms of landscaping, since we had to re-vegetate the RPA. And we'll get in... so as Mr. Geouge noted, the RPA revegetation planting requirements are more onerous or dense than the transitional buffers themselves. So what I did here was summarize; the table on top is a summary of the tree plantings in that first row under our transitional buffer requirements. And then the second row under the RPA revegetation plan, as you can see there, more than twice the number of trees will be replanted in this orange area than we would have been planting in the entire red area. So I think that speaks to the significantly increased density of the RPA revegetation requirements. The shrubs do fall a little short of what the transitional buffer requirements would require under our RPA plans. You know, wanted to share that for full disclosure, but we've heard repeatedly from staff, from this Commission, and from the Supervisors that trees are very important to the County. And so also wanted to highlight that we are under, if the departure is approved, we are still doubling the number of tree plantings that the transitional buffer would have otherwise required. So finally, here, just wanted to end with this exhibit to Mr. Geouge's point. The blue area is truly representative of the areas we are, we are seeking planting relief from. The areas along this transitional buffer that you see that are not shaded in blue is what's going to get the RPA plantings. So, you know, still, the point here is that I'm trying to make, you know, not trying to get out of our planting obligations. Still going to be installing, you know, thousands of trees and bushes. You know, a couple reasons led us to this departure. When we first started bidding out the project early last year with a little bit of an aggressive timeline, we were getting feedback from all, you know, half dozen local nurseries that, that we we put the RFP in front of that they were going to struggle to get the number of plantings to satisfy both the transitional buffer and the RPA requirements. We sat down with our contractor, took a deeper look at our schedule, kind of came back to the drawing board, re-socialized that with the nurseries, and that concern started to fade a little bit. And so it was during that time that the departure request came up. You know, since that time, we've made the case to Brian and staff that like he mentioned, you know, we, we view a significant portion of this as a buffer to a buffer to a buffer, if you will, right? We've got the the wetland and the finger here. Obviously, you know, I would consider that undevelopable from a developer's perspective. But, you know, difficult to do. You've got the RPA buffering that wetland and then, you know, the DCSL calls for the transitional buffer to further buffer the RPA. To Mr. Geouge's point, especially along that finger, we're actually buffering our own land use essentially, once you look to the other side of that wetland. So we've got a transitional buffer essentially between two warehouse facilities with the same zoning. And then when we capitalized the project early last year and budgeted, you know, I go through, we budget all this stuff out because we got to go, we got to go get a loan, we got to go raise equity capital, budgeted this project out without the knowledge that

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

we were going to need to install the RPA revegetation, so we had the transitional buffer in our budget. As we got, you know, by the time the RPA revegetation requirements were brought to our attention, we were very far down the path with our equity investor, with our lender, we were unable to modify the budget at that time, and as I mentioned, once the RPA revegetation requirements were brought to our attention, that more than doubled our landscaping budget from an already six figure sum. So you know, kind of a confluence of factors here that led us to the decision to request the relief from you all. Also wanted to note, I believe Mr. Zuraf is in possession of a letter from the neighboring property owner to our south who was not opposed to our request. I don't know, Mr. Zuraf, if that could be read into the record or shared with the Commission, but did want to make sure that, that that was noted.

Mr. Apicella: Which lot is that?

Mr. Marshall: I'm sorry?

Mr. Apicella: Which lot are you referring to?

Mr. Marshall: So common ownership essentially across our entire southern property line. It is maybe a couple different entities, but all rolls up to the same owner.

Ms. Barnes: One of them is Augustine South.

Mr. Marshall: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: And the other one is, looks like it's South Accokeek LLC.

Mr. Marshall: I believe that is accurate, yep.

Ms. Barnes: And you've had discussions with them about this?

Mr. Marshall: We have. Common ownership of those two entities.

Ms. Barnes: I don't, I don't remember seeing that. Do we have it?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't have that letter with me.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Marshall: Also just wanted to note as well, I mentioned we had some proffered tree save areas from the zoning reclassification in 2022. This application tonight is not looking for any relief or adjustment of those obligations. We are also not asking for any relief for adjustment from our RPA revegetation obligations. Just trying to, I guess, level set, you know, what, what we view as somewhat of a superfluous requirement given, given what we're going to be doing on the RPA re-veg.

Mr. Apicella: So when you say your RPA revegetation requirements, I must be missing something here, because I see your parcel. I see parcel 12, which seems to me that most of the RPA is in parcel 12. Am I, am I wrong?

Mr. Marshall: So okay, this, this gives you a good view here. So you can see our property line is essentially the interior side of that red shading. You can see the RPA line here in the purple, and how

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

those two overlap. So substantial portions of the RPA along this transitional buffer actually sit on our property.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And so you're only going to, you're only going to revegetate what's within your ability to vegetate.

Mr. Marshall: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So again, for the parcel 12, what happens there? That portion that's RPA?

Mr. Marshall: Yeah, that's conceivably on, on that property owner, when and if something... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Have you have you reached out to parcel 12, the owner of parcel 12?

Mr. Marshall: We have. In, in pretty close communication with them, but I can't speak to any potential development plans or future plans they have for that parcel. Again, speaking from a development perspective, we did not seek in our development onsite did not seek to alter or modify any RPA. We understand that that is...

Mr. Apicella: No, I get where you're coming from. I mean, have you... it doesn't sound like you did. Did you engage them to consider purchasing their portion that's abutting your, immediately abutting it?

Mr. Marshall: Ah, ah. We have discussed that possibility. Just, you know, have not come, come to terms on a deal.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Marshall: Nor do I expect to in the near term. I think just unaligned interests, for lack of a better phrase.

Mr. Apicella: So, if I understand where you're coming from, it's that the RPA revegetation approach that you're going to take is at least as good at, or as good as, or better than what you would otherwise do for the transitional buffers.

Mr. Marshall: That is our view in terms of the number of plantings being installed.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off. Please, if you, do have any more?

Mr. Marshall: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Can you go back to that, that little miniature spreadsheet that you had that had the number... okay. So if I'm reading this correctly, over on the right hand side, the transitional buffer requirements you would require to plant a total of 615?

Mr. Marshall: Correct.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Ms. Barnes: Of that, 136 are large shade trees, deciduous trees. When you replant those buffers, what kind of trees are you putting in there? Are you putting in native trees to the area? Okay, I'm seeing heads go yeah, okay.

Mr. Marshall: Yes. There's, there's some notes to that effect, in terms of what the plantings will be in our, in our approved site plan. I do believe, as we get to that stage of the development, you know, we'll be working with our landscape contractors to flesh the final details out of that plan. So it may, what's in the site plan may be a little more broad strokes in terms of what's going in. And then when we, when we get to the point of actually installing, we'll have a more concrete...

Ms. Barnes: As long as you're not going in there and planting those darn cypresses that keep falling down.

Mr. Marshall: No, and I can promise you, I don't know if you guys have them here. I've got three of them at my house in St. Louis, those sweet gum trees that drop the... maybe you guys don't have those here, but okay, you do. I see a head nodding. So we won't plant any of those either, I promise.

Ms. Barnes: My other question, my concern is here is when, when you replant, when you replant the transitional or the RPA, it's 112 trees. That's what you're required. The traditional buffer is 136 and that's for the large deciduous trees, which, to me, is the most important section there is to get that, that tree canopy back to what it should be. The understory trees, those are great, but it's, it's that tree canopy that needs to be repaired. And the only concern I have here is that you're going to be putting in less of those large trees, if I'm reading this correctly, that would create that natural tree canopy than you would if you were required to do the transitional buffer requirements.

Mr. Marshall: And and I see where you're coming from with the 112 there versus 136 in the transitional buffer requirements. I would note that I believe you'd take the sum of those four columns in the large deciduous trees left side of the table there, I believe you take the sum of those as, as all of the plantings proposed there would satisfy the appropriate requirements in the DCSL.

Ms. Barnes: Yes, I get that. But it, once again, to me – and this is just, this is just my personal preference – is I would, I would really like to see more of the largest deciduous tree so that we can get back to that natural canopy, because that natural canopy is what is the hardest to replace, because it takes so long to...

Mr. Marshall: Agree.

Ms. Barnes: ... and that natural canopy is what is so important for getting that forest back to its natural condition. So that's just my opinion.

Mr. Marshall: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions for the applicant? All right, seeing none. Thank you.

Mr. Marshall: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'll now open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to give their views on this particular item. Please, before starting your comments, state your name and

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if anyone's interested in commenting on this item, please come forward.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. Thank you for the presentation NorthPoint. That was quite a ravine that we saw, um, on the screen. And so I'm not very familiar with the standards and all the prerequisites, but I would just hope that there's some kind of limiting factor that keeps these heavy industrial moving trucks away from the ravine. I'm going to speak mostly about the packet, not so much about the boundary. So excuse me if it seems to be off, but we were provided with the packet. Continuing on page 88 of 106 today's packet, the Austin Ridge Logistical Center of light industrial defines one mile radius, sketched, leaving out the east and Venture Road Industrial Park, which is 2,000 feet in detail. Understand that the heavy industrial is awaiting application. Please take note of it. Route 1 is labeled Jefferson Davis Highway, outdated important information in reference which should be spelled out as Richmond Highway and updated to current surroundings. The impact of this data center will affect the infrastructure east and south of its boundaries and where the 100 year flood zone and water runoff is aligned with I-95 and also under Route 1. Serving... the serving pump station for this development should stay on the west side of the highway barrier for safety to the current infrastructure as seen. Does this make sense with the barrier request? Maybe. Austin Ridge Logistics Center is 55 acres of this project is in the wetlands. And out of the 182, heavy industrial is waiting. As I mentioned, general, generalized development plan May 29, 2024, three of 15 shows river flowing to dam and pond onsite, in and out. And is not shown in the Comprehensive Plan, Figure 3.10 in Exhibit D, page 23, of 106, today's package. There's very much more information in the packet than before. That's why I'm speaking on it. This comprehensive design dated September 8, 2021. This river is removed from the comprehensive design. Should we comprehend this with this new packet given today. And we have no neighboring list of residents attached to the application here, page 32 of 106...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. I'm sorry, your time's up. Appreciate you.

Ms. Maxson: Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else like to comment? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing on this item. Does the applicant have anything further they'd like to say? All right. Mr. Shelton, this is in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to approve Waiver 124155524. I think the applicant has shown a need. He's established a no mow area. I think one of the problems that he probably inherited was the total deforestation of that project. I see this as a revenue generator and also an opportunity to create a number of jobs for us and Stafford. So I see it as a positive.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. Is there a second?

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Ms. Caudill. Any comments Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

Mr. Apicella: Comments from anyone else? All right. Go ahead, Ms Barnes.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Ms. Barnes: This is, this is a little, I think that this is a very unique waiver, because it's not really showing a hardship, it's just showing a better plan. So that kind of, that kind of puts me in a, in a hard spot, because I really don't, I'm really worried about... I don't want to make this something that we see in the future when someone says, hey, you know, your requirements are all well and good, but hey, look at what we've got. It's much better. Which it is. But nevertheless, I, you know, the the requirement is that you show a hardship. So that's kind of where I'm torn on this.

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: I do have kind of a comment to that with the hardship. I agree with the hardship, but with the better plan, and in this case, this is an interesting area, and I'm trying to go through the Transportation Master Plan that the County just put forward. And I thought there was something in the Master Plan in this area, as far as projects are concerned. And so I think highlighting some of the challenges with the RPA in the area, and in relieving them of, of these nuances, may be a first step, and then looking at just what's going on in the area. Because if we go with the Transportation Plan and we put a road that's going to go there, we're going to need to look at this, and we're going to need their help as we, as we begin to move south to Centreport Parkway. So I think this is not only a hey, this is a better way of doing it. And so you guys brought this to our attention, but it's also a good faith effort in recognizing the challenges of the site. And hey, in a couple of months or years, the County may be coming to you and saying, remember, we were, we were good partners here, so please be good partners with us because we're, we're trying to fulfill and execute our master plan for transportation. And I can't find it here, but I'm pretty sure there's a project or two in that same area. So as you guys are identifying these challenges, maybe help us out a little bit and realizing we're in the same that area too, looking at some things. So, so I'll be supporting this, and good luck with that site, just looking at it.

Mr. Apicella: All right. I'm kind of where Ms. Barnes is. I think it's just kind of a departure from a departure request, but I understand where it's coming from, and I think it does make a bit more common sense to do something that's more feasible and practical and potentially better than what would otherwise occur. But I hope it's not the norm going forward. I'd hate for this to be a precedent. All right, with that being said, there's a motion to approve the departure waiver request. I'm going to do this as a roll call vote. Mr. Bratton, how do you vote on the motion to approve?

Mr. Bratton: Approve it.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Approve.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Apicella votes approve. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Approve.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Approve.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: Approve.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Approve.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that motion carries 7-0. Thank you very much. All right, moving on – Unfinished Business, none. New Business – Application Time Extensions. Mr. Zuraf.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

3. Application Time Extension – A request to grant time limit extensions for action on multiple zoning reclassification and conditional use permit applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, “Review and requirements,” and Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits,” for Stafford One Industrial, Venture Business Park, Sc Plaza, Westlake – UMWF Proffer Amendment, and Celebrate Va – Town Celebrate.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, I'll cover this item. So this, this is a consideration to grant time limit extensions for three applications related to zoning classifications and conditional use permits for two proposed development projects. Our Zoning Ordinance includes various time limit extensions for which applications under consideration need to be acted on within set timeframes. One of the time limits does restrict the amount of time that should be spent on a project to 12 months. But with the case load that's in, that we have before us and general issues of addressing all the comments that we put forward to applicants, there's, we've run into this issue occasionally with projects that end up needing additional time. So we have that before you. The SC Plaza project, there's a conditional use permit for a proposed motor vehicle sales facility. That project was, the time limit was set at December 12. The applicant had submitted, has submitted a request to extend that time limit to June 12 of 2025. The next two applications are associated with a project called Market at Austin Ridge. This includes a zoning reclassification and conditional use permit. This is for a commercial development with various uses on approximately 25 acres. That time limit for that project is March 25. The applicant is requesting extension to September 21 of 2025. Resolution, proposed resolution PCR25-03, that would extend the time limits for these three applications, and that all is noted within the proposed resolution. I'll take any questions at this time.

Mr. Apicella: Questions for staff?

Ms. Sellers: I have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: It feels like we do this at least once a year, where we go through and we extend timelines. Have we looked at maybe we need to check the ordinance and see if we just need to lengthen the time in the ordinance or remove the cap in the ordinance?

Mr. Zuraf: That definitely is something we can look into. I guess the desire is to try to also do good for the applicants to kind of keep the applications moving forward. We did just kind of run into an issue of staff turnover and shortages, and so hopefully, as we are filling vacant positions, some of these requests will be less necessary, but definitely is something we can, we can explore as we get into any future

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

amendments to the zoning ordinances, re-evaluating some of these extension time limits to see if they're just too difficult to really achieve.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. And is six months going to be long enough for the, I can't, there's at least one that has six, six months. Should we just extend them all to a year and give ourselves some time? Or do we have to go, I can't remember, or do we have to go based on what they request? Or can we say, let's go with a year?

Mr. Zuraf: We really shouldn't, we can't be going more than six months because there's another time limit of 18 months of which the Board, of which an application would actually be required to be closed out. And any extension beyond 18 months requires approval from the Board of Supervisors. So really, the Planning Commission could not be making an extension beyond the six month extensions that are here before you.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Zuraf, in both these cases, it's your perspective that neither applicant is purposely holding or delaying moving their projects forward?

Mr. Zuraf: No, I would not say that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further questions for staff? All right, is there a motion to approve the time of extensions for these projects?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr.... okay. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No, sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers? Anyone else? All right, I'm just going to do this by a voice vote. All those in favor of approving the motion recommending approval of the time limit extensions please signify by saying aye

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Okay, that motion carries unanimously. All right, moving forward to Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

4. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to welcome Kecia Evans to the Planning Commission. And I have a few other items to go over tonight. You have, you've received the regular Project Pipeline Report that identifies future potential public hearings. We do have a public hearing at the next meeting. And just looking ahead, on February 12th there are no public hearings scheduled. We don't anticipate any public hearings for that, for that meeting.

***Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Is it too early for us to consider canceling that meeting?

Mr. Zuraf: You can... it's not too early.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Is there a motion to...?

Ms. Sellers: Motion to cancel.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you, Ms. Sellers. Is there a second?

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right, motion that's been made to cancel the February 12, 2025, meeting. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. Thank you.

5. Draft 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Mr. Zuraf: Thank you. The next item that we have, that I have for you, you did receive the draft 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Schedule for your consideration for approval. I'll just point out, as we kind of do every year, in the months of July and August we kind of follow the, the way we've had, way it's happened, is we have canceled the first meeting, the first regular meeting in July and the first regular meeting in August, so there's just one meeting each month. And then in November, we only have the first November and first December meetings, and cancel the second meetings for each of those due to, due to holidays. And then the, and you're free to modify that in any way. And the only other issue that I will point out, I'll point out October 8th, yesterday at the Board of Supervisors modified their meeting schedule. They have, they had a regular meeting that would have been October 7th. They changed that meeting to October 8th. So this, that October 8th meeting would conflict with the Board of Supervisors. So you may want to consider adjusting that date. I would suggest maybe one date, moving it just one day following to Thursday, October 9th, but...

Mr. Apicella: And the room's available that day?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All right, has everyone had a chance to review the draft calendar? Does anyone have any comments, changes, recommendations, motions?

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

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Do we make a motion.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

Ms. Barnes: Although I am entirely irritated that the Board of Supervisors took our night, I motion to approve it with the deletions of the dates as Mr. Zuraf mentioned, as well as moving the meeting to October 9th.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you. Okay, motion to adopt the proposed calendar for 2025 as presented by staff, and further modified in the version we have in front of us. All those in favor say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Okay, that motion carries unanimously. Anything else Mr. Zuraf?

6. Draft 2024 Annual Report

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. The next item, you also received the Draft 2024 Annual Report. So this basically summarizes all the work that the Planning Commission did over the last calendar year. And so let me know if, if the Commission has any any comments or changes, and we can make those modifications and bring it back to a future meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Do folks need more time, or can we go forward with it tonight?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve the draft.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Mr. Shelton. Is there a second?

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Thank you, Ms. Caudill. Okay, there's a motion to approve the presented report to the Board of Supervisors for 2024. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? That motion carries unanimously.

7. Expenditure Report (To Date)

Mr. Zuraf: Okay. The last item I have is you also received, just for your information, the bi-annual Expenditure Report for the Planning Commission. And everything is within budget.

Mr. Apicella: Do we, do we get a bonus for... all right. We don't have to approve that. That's just for information, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that's just information, and that includes my report.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Mr. Zuraf. County Attorney's Report, Ms. Lucian.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Good evening. I just wanted to say welcome to Ms. Evans, and Happy New Year to you all.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. All right, Chairman's Report. Appointments. Does staff want to, since we have Ms. Evans here, who's not been on the Planning Commission, all for a day, do we want to go through what these boards do?

8. Appointments

* Architectural Review Board

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, well, so the the Architectural Review Board, they consider any kind of modifications that, that might be proposed within County designated historic districts. So any kind of structural changes that might occur, anything that requires ARB approval, they would evaluate and consider, consider those, those changes.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Shelton is our current rep, I think. Been having a great deal of fun on that?

Mr. Shelton: I have. I've enjoyed it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. EDA?

* Economic Development Authority (Liaison)

Mr. Zuraf: The Economic Development Authority, they... I don't really get involved too much in the EDA, but I know they're involved with kind of consideration of development prospects, and they're, they have an involvement in that. And I can't really speak to what else they...

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers, do you want to...?

Ms. Sellers: This may be a good time. I sent, I sent the two of you an email back in December and said I felt as though the relationship between the Planning Commission and the EDA should be more deliberate. That, and the Board of Supervisors, to their credit, have, have got on the EDA. Before December, the EDA didn't publish their meetings, they didn't publish their agendas. And although they would challenge that, I would agree with the Board of Supervisors and say they did not, it was not on the county website. And there were three meetings where I showed up on their day, and they would say that morning, oh, we canceled it. And which is odd, because every other meeting that the county holds is on the website, not the EDA. So one of the recommendations that I've made is finding a way to formalize this and what is it that what is it that we want it to look like? How do we want to shape this relationship? And my understanding from watching the meeting, the joint meeting with the EDA and the Board of Supervisors is the Board of Supervisors does want them to be more data driven and intentional. And so maybe a meeting with the Board of Supervisors to say, how do we support that and not just show up and sit there and listen, but be intentional with our time there. And so that's, right now

Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025

it's just we show up and, and sit there and listen and give input when we can, if they want it, which they're not always open to hearing what we have to say. But so it's at this point, there's, it's, it's open to interpretation of what the role is, and I would say, what do we want the role to be? And perhaps that's something we take to the Board of Supervisors and say, what do they want the role to be?

Mr. Apicella: I'm just trying to remember how we got to even provide a liaison to the EDA. That was something more recent, maybe in the last four or five years, we had our work session, kind of talked about what each other's roles and responsibilities were, and throughout there that it might be helpful to have a liaison to show up at meetings and maybe pass on information, kind of be a go between and let us know what they're doing and provide some feedback to them on maybe what we're doing. Sometimes we work across purposes, because their perspective is build, regardless of what the consequences may be, and our role is to mitigate the impacts. So I don't disagree with anything you've said. My sense is we'd probably have to work with them to figure out what they want as well, because they invited us to participate. It wasn't something that's been formalized. I don't even know that the Board of Supervisors formalized that liaison role as compared to the ARB person and the Parks and Rec rep. I think that's kind of institutionalized. So I think we'd have to work through how that might carry out in the future. What additional...

Ms. Sellers: And they recently, they being the EDA and the Board of Supervisors, recently had their, their pow-wow, where they came together, and the Board of Supervisors said, this is our expectation of what you guys are doing. And so it might be a good opportunity to ask that question of, do we want to formalize this? Do we want to be intentional with the, with the relationship? To have some sort of output, and, you know, I hate to say it, but some sort of deliverables, just to, you know, represent the time that we're putting into it, and to show the Board of Supervisors that we're putting a good faith effort into this, and that the relationship is there. Because I do think there are benefits that could be taken from this, a more formal relationship, but it was driven by the previous... it was much better under the previous leadership there of the EDA, and they've had turnover as well on the EDA. And I'm not sure it's, it's, with the new folks on the EDA, if the liaison relationship is seen as valuable in the same way it was. So it may be just time to say, is this relationship still wanted, needed, and should we formalize it, just so that everybody knows we're on the same page.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I think that's something we might want to consider. Parks and Rec Commission.

- * Parks and Recreation Commission (Non-Voting Member)

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, simply, the Parks and Rec Commission is a group that considers any improvements to the County's parks, parks and recreation facilities, which happen on a regular basis.

Mr. Apicella: And Mr. Martinez was our rep?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: All right, so I'll just open up the floor to anyone who's interested. I'll go through each one. Who's interested in serving on the ARB?

Mr. Shelton: I would like to stay on.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, everyone good with that?

***Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: Aye. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Apicella: All right, Economic Development Authority? Ms. Sellers, you interested in continuing that?

Ms. Sellers: I'm happy to stay on it, yes.

Mr. Apicella: All right, Parks and Rec, I believe, Ms. Evans, used to serve on the Parks and Rec. Any interest in serving?

Ms. Evans: I'll do Parks and Rec.

Mr. Apicella: Awesome. Everyone okay with that as well? Great. So I think we filled the tree. Thank you, everybody. And we'll have an ongoing discussion about the EDA. Maybe you could start that discussion with them, and maybe another work session might be helpful. I don't know, but have that conversation, see how we can progress forward with them. All right. Other Business – some TRC submissions which are available via the link I think. Last item on the agenda is the Approval of Minutes for the November 13, 2024 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. New TRC Submissions

- 24156071 - Stafford Technology Campus -South Campus East
 - A major site plan for construction of four (4) data center buildings located on the east side of Richmond Highway between State Shop Road and Perchwood Drive on TM # 38-124, 38-29 & 38-29A, zoned M-2, consisting of 476.61 acres within the Falmouth Election District.
- 24156033 - Stafford Technology Campus - South Campus West
 - A major site plan for construction of five (5) data center buildings located on the east side of Richmond Highway between State Shop Road and Perchwood Drive on TM # 38-124, 38-29 & 38-29A, zoned M-2, consisting of 503.84 acres within the Falmouth Election District.
- 24156095 - Stafford Co Util Hoof & Claw Pumpsta
 - A major site plan for a new wastewater pumpstation to replace the existing Hoof and Claw pumpstation located on the south side of Kings Highway between Enola Road and Washington Square Plaza on TM # 58-5D, zoned A-1, consisting of 0.22 acres within the George Washington Election District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

10. November 13, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Sellers/Ms. Barnes: Second.

***Planning Commission Minutes
January 8, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: All right, all those in favor of approving the November 13, 2024 Planning Commission meeting minutes say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. I'm sorry?

Ms. Barnes: Abstention?

Mr. Apicella: Oh, did you have seen Kecia? I'm sorry.

Ms. Evans: I just wanted to say no, I didn't say anything. I actually voted to approve. I did not abstain.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a protocol on that when somebody's not...?

Ms. Lucian: It's up to your comfort level.

Mr. Apicella: So if you're okay with it, I'm okay with it.

Ms. Evans: I'm okay with it.

Mr. Apicella: All right. So that Motion carries unanimously. With no further business before the Commission, we are hereby adjourned. Please drive carefully.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:22 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the January 8, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.