

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 9, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 9, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella Willie Shelton, Jr., Kristen Barnes, Carlos Bratton, Kelsey Caudill, Kecia Evans, Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Rysheda McClendon, Stacie Stinnette, Ramin Sadiq, Amy Taylor, Brian Geouge

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualification? All right, seeing none, are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, no, there are no changes.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you. All right, I'll now open the public presentation portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to 3 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 1 minute left. Red means your time is up. So if anyone would like to provide any public comments, now is your opportunity.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. In the March 26, 2025 Commission minutes, there are occurrences to double that, meaning that that as two words of which it it translates to it is not that. There were eleven occurrences in the agenda. There are over 20 occurrences on Stafford web search when you search on it. Errors of double use found in Planning Commission, Zoning Appeals, Architectural Review, our Agricultural Commission, and the Board of Supervisors, and much more. Arbors of Stafford, March 26, 2025, please understand the Director provided the proffer statement at the last minute, allowing the Commissioners to review it before the vote on that day, March 26, 2025. This is not what the by-laws specify. The Director of Planning and Zoning could not think of any other projects near the Arbors of, with affordable housing projects in Falmouth District close to South Campus Boulevard when asked by the Commissioners, March 26, 2025. However, clearly the Director mentioned an application extension for Attain at Stafford earlier that month on March 4, 2025. This brings notice to why last minute must stress the budgets before staff is overworked and information isn't properly directed when asked. The public needs proper planning and traffic, traffic reports, which are to be in the best interest to the public and the budget at hand for Stafford. A traffic report should not be recopied from another address. Is the project dedicating the 2.4 acres of parkland specification for its number within its develop, development, page 23 of 623, Brownfield Enviromental Records. Acres access, assessment cleanup and redevelopment exchange system, page 412 of 623. And, of course, the agenda grew a hundred pages, so there was over 700 pages because the public didn't have a chance to read it. The address was not recognized for the Arbors, which much went unattended, and please make a note of it. And I wanna thank everybody here for all your hard work. You definitely deserve some time off coming after the budget.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who'd like to offer some comments during the public presentation portion of tonight's meeting? If not, I'm going to close that portion of the meeting and move on to the first agenda item. Mr. Zuraf.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC24155575; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Creek Industrial Park Lot 4 – A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 38-24F, consisting of approximately 1.4757 acres (Property). In general, the proposed proffers would: prohibit specified uses otherwise permitted within the B-2 Zoning District, limit maximum trip generation on the Property to 1,000 vehicles per day, based on all combined uses; limit access to Potomac Creek Drive to one (1) entrance; and require dedication of certain right-of-way. The Property is located on the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 200-feet south of Potomac Creek Drive, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: July 18, 2025)**

Mr. Zuraf: Please recognize Ramin Sadiq for the staff presentation.

Mr. Sadiq: Good evening, everyone. Okay, so we have a rezoning reclassification for Potomac Creek Industrial Park Lot 4. And so coming to the background of the project, this is a rezoning project for a lot. That area is 1.47 acres, and the request is to rezone from M-1, Light Industrial zoning district to the B-2, Urban Commercial zoning district, with a proffer. The tax map that is affecting this project is number 38-24F, and is located in Falmouth District. And the applicant and owner is Mr. Ronald Ramsey from Jerr-Ron LLC, who couldn't make it tonight to participate, part of any personal matter. And I believe we have members from the church team available. I'm not sure. Are they here? Yep. Okay. And they would address any question related to church or child care services, part of this project. So, coming to the location and zoning of the project, this reclassification request affect only one parcel, shown here in the red, which is located along the east side of Richmond Highway, just south of Potomac Creek Drive. The parcel is in the Falmouth Election District and is located entirely within the Urban Service Area. The parcel is currently zoned M-1, Light Industrial, and zoning for surrounding properties include a mix of B-2 to the south, M-1 to the north and east, and B-2, B-1, and M-1 to the west side of Richmond Highway. The property is within the Highway Corridor Overlay District and also within the urban impact... the Airport Impact Overlay District. Coming to the zoning history of this parcel, this property is part of a former parent parcel, 38-24, which was originally rezoned from A-1, Agricultural, to M-1, Light Industrial, back in June 1975 with no associated proffers. Later on 2024 June, a major site plan for this property was approved for development of office and light industrial uses, and the existing building was completed in 2005 with a total gross area of 16,500 square feet. A conditional use permit was later approved on October 2007 that allows a place of worship, mainly church with the M-1 zoning district pursuant to Resolution R07-384. And now the applicant is seeking a rezoning to the B-2 district to allow child care services for the existing church located at this location, as well as greater flexibility for more retail and commercial businesses. This is existing conditions of the site. As shown, the property has been fully developed with an existing flex warehouse with a narrow, with a narrow landscape buffer along the southern portion of the property, and a landscape buffer along the eastern side of Richmond Highway. The site have the main access from Potomac Creek Drive on the north, and there is no RPAs or any environmental sensitive areas on the property. Abutting properties include general offices, warehouse to the north, undeveloped planned office to the south, auto repair to the east, and Richmond Highway to the west. Site topography is predominantly level and gently slopes toward east, west, and south. Multiple utility easement and manholes are located around and through the site.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Sadiq, before... can you go back?

Mr. Sadiq: Yep.

Mr. Apicella: Where do people park?

Mr. Sadiq: The parking is on the southern side of the building right now, in this portion.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And do we know how many parking spaces there are?

Mr. Sadiq: There's 59.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And so changing from M-1 to B-2, going to be any issues with... they'll have sufficient parking for the number of vehicle trips per day?

Mr. Sadiq: Yes, because mostly in terms of the uses, there will not be a big impact, because they are not changing the building layout at all. They're not touching the building. So in that sense, it would be enough.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Sadiq: These are a few street view of the site. This one showing a northeast view of the property from Richmond Highway. And this one shows the property from the Potomac Creek Drive. And here is the main access to the site. Now it's not working. Thank you. The applicant does not intend to expand or modify the site or any portion of the existing building, part of this rezoning application, and in that sense, he requested a waiver for the Generalized Development Plan that we call GDP. However, the applicant submitted a copy of the approved major site plan of 2024 which shows in this slide, in lieu of the GDP, which depicts the layout of the site, as well as the location of the existing building and all other existing features. Coming back to the future land use in the Comp Plan, the Comp Plan identified the future land use of the site as being within the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area, and the more detailed land use concept within the Central Stafford TDA specifically designate this site as Business and Industry as shown here in red. The Comp Plan states that the Targeted Development Areas are areas of the County where a significant amount of development or redevelopment is expected to occur. The Business and Industry areas is recommended to serve as one of the employment centers in the County, as a location that could accommodate a wide range of commercial activities, serving small business entities to larger corporations. The proposed low and medium density... medium intensity commercial uses, including child care services, are consistent with the Business and Industry land use recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use is consistent and compatible with the established and developing land uses along the Richmond Highway. The proposed proffers would limit potential impact of this rezoning application; that will be detailed out in the next slide, part of the proffer. So these are the proffers that proposed by the applicant. It's a summary of them, that which would prohibit specific uses on the property that would otherwise be permitted by-right or by CUP within the B-2 zoning district; limit maximum trip generation to no more than 1,000 average vehicle trip per day based on all combined uses; limit access to the site to no more than one entrance along Potomac Creek Drive in the general location, as shown on the existing site plan and boundary survey; required dedication of additional right-of-way along Richmond Highway within 12 months following approval of this zoning reclassification, and to the maximum extent practical.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Yep, please go ahead.

Mr. Shelton: Was there a Traffic Impact Analysis conducted or are you based on less than 1,000?

Mr. Sadiq: As the project was smaller in, in the overall scale, in that sense there was no need for a Traffic Impact Analysis, and that's why we got agreed with the owner to limit the 1,000... to limit the trips to 1,000 vehicle per day.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. Second question, is the child center going to be a Monday through Friday operation, or just on the day of worship?

Mr. Sadiq: That's something I think the church members should... they are saying Monday through Friday.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Sadiq: Coming to the evaluation of this application, the staff findings to the positive side, the proposed low and medium intensity commercial uses, child care services, and other permitted commercial uses are consistent with the Business and Industrial land use recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use is consistent and compatible with the established and developing land uses along Richmond Highway. The proposed proffers prohibit a number of higher intensity and potentially undesirable commercial uses. The proposed proffer limit the maximum vehicle trip generation to 1,000 or less vehicle per day, which is expected to create little to no transportation impact. The proposed proffers require additional right-of-way dedication to be used for future transportation improvements. About the negative, negative impacts, staff didn't find any apparent negative impact part of this application. As a recommendation, staff believes that the proposed B-2 zoning and proposed low and medium intensity commercial uses, child care services, and other retail and commercial uses are appropriate in this location along the Richmond Highway, and generally consistent with the character of surrounding areas. Also the uses are consistent with the Business and Industry land uses recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff is generally supportive of the project and recommends approval of the application, with proffers, pursuant to Ordinance O25-10. That concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer any question that Commission may have at this time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Questions for the applicant? All right, I've got just a couple. So, as I read the staff report, the primary driver for the zoning change is to allow the church user to operate a daycare center. Is that accurate?

Mr. Sadiq: Excuse me, can you repeat your questions?

Mr. Apicella: So, in reading the staff report, what I saw was that the primary reason why the applicant wants to change from M-1 to B-2 is so the church can operate a day care center. Is that correct?

Mr. Sadiq: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Just two other questions. What's the maximum number of vehicles per day that could occur on the site under current M-1 zoning?

Mr. Sadiq: On the current M-1 zoning, there are a few uses that have higher trip generation than 1,000, such as like restaurant with a drive-through that generates 1,789 vehicle trip, vehicle per day, and

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

microbrewery that generates 1,018 vehicle per day, and convenience store that generates around 898 vehicle per day. That all of these are being controlled to the proffer on the proposed zoning reclassification right now.

Mr. Apicella: Were you answering under B-2 zoning or under M-1?

Mr. Sadiq: Under M-1.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Sadiq: Under M-1. If right now the owner wants to build something or want to...

Mr. Apicella: Right, they could use those uses by-right.

Mr. Sadiq: Yeah, they can use it that way.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And even with the 1,000 vehicle per day cap, are there any other B-2 uses that you believe would be incompatible with this area that haven't been proffered out?

Mr. Sadiq: In that part I think we have been discussing multiple time with the owner to make sure we are not missing anything. In general, I think the uses that we already picked and the owner picked, I think they are okay enough to control them, either by the CUP requirement part of the HCOD and the B-2; however, there is only one item, which is the child care or day care, which is a by-right use in the B-2 zone, and it might not be a compatible stand alone use, because right now it is as like ancillary use with the church. If somebody wants to use as a standalone daycare, that might be not a compatible use for that specific area, considering the nature of the industrial surrounding areas and the industrial nature of the area.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Any further questions for the applicant?

Mr. Shelton: I have one question.

Mr. Apicella: I mean, sorry, for staff.

Mr. Shelton: I think you alluded to the fact that the church already has four suites. Are they adding a fifth suite for the child development services, or is it going to be incorporated in the existing four?

Mr. Sadiq: On the existing one?

Speaker from the audience: Actually, it's just the one, the first suite. So it's suite 101, 103, 105, and 107, and we're just using the daycare in 101.

Speaker from the audience: We're not adding suites.

Mr. Apicella: We got a kind of complicated situation here since the applicant's not here. Can you just repeat what they said for the record?

Mr. Sadiq: They are saying those four suites that they're using right now as a church, one of them will be used for the childcare services. They're not adding any more suites on that.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Mr. Shelton: And the enrollment for that would be limited to X number please?

Speaker from the audience: Twenty-five within the membership role of the church itself.

Mr. Apicella: Again, can you repeat that?

Mr. Sadiq: Twenty-five... 25 based on what?

Speaker from the audience: Twenty-five total children at most within the existing membership of the church, all in-house.

Mr. Sadiq: Yes, they're saying 25 based on the current membership of the church.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further questions, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: So just for clarity, so no one from the out... so is it that you have to be a member of the church in order to be accepted into daycare, or is this for anybody? So, like, if I had a child, could my child come to the daycare?

Mr. Apicella: I'll tell you what, I'm gonna, I'm gonna... you're you're done with your presentation.

Mr. Sadiq: Yeah. Should I ask them to come?

Mr. Apicella: Well, I'm going to ask them to come up in lieu of the applicant.

Mr. Sadiq: Please come up.

Ms. Sellers: I have a question while you're there.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, please go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Under B-2 they could have a data center. Could we ask them to proffer that out? No, they can't?

Mr. Apicella: No, only under M-2.

Ms. Sellers: Only under M-2, okay.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Mr. Sadiq. If you guys can just again, give us your name and address.

Mr. Schultz: I am Pastor Curtis Schultz. This is my wife, Pastor Lynn Schultz, and we're... the church is at 28 Potomac Creek Drive here in Stafford.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Ms. Evans, can you repeat your question?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Ms. Evans: Yeah. So my question was, can, is it just church members that are allowed to use the daycare? Or is it going to be open to outside people?

Mr. Schultz: Well, the initial plan, which is what we're going, would like to do up front, is just in-house membership. That's the goal. Not necessarily outside to the public. It's not that we wouldn't like to maybe visit that option in the future. So having that option would be great to have. But the goal is right now, it is only working with a daycare in-house within the membership of the church itself. So it's going to be, it's going to be a ministry to the church itself in-house. That's the main thing.

Ms. Evans: Okay, thank you. And with that, I guess I'm going to piggyback off your question, Steven, as far as then does that change the number of people that should be coming in, in and out, I should say, like the number of cars, vehicles?

Mr. Schultz: No, because it's... it's never going to go over 25 children. Twenty-five children is the max that we're going to handle, and, um, and we're looking to keep everything in-house within the membership of the church itself. And it will not create a large traffic of people. It won't. It is Monday through Friday. It's going to be six to, like from 6 AM to 6 PM. And it's not going to create, with 25 children it won't create a huge amount of additional traffic. So the goal is really just to have a ministry in-house provided to the church itself. That's the goal.

Ms. Evans: Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Schultz: Can I add something to that as well? The, that part of the building itself, that's the amount of occupancy we can have there, so it can be no more than 25 children.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? All right, thank you very much.

Mrs. Schultz: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, I'm going to open the public hearing on this item. It's an opportunity for the public to comment on this particular matter. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if anyone has any comments on this, please come forward now. All right, seeing no one, I close the public hearing, bring it back to the Commission. Ms. ... I'm sorry, go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: I would like to put in the prohibited uses tobacco sales. That's currently a by-right use, I believe, under B-2. And even if, I know we're reviewing that, but even if we do change this with that child care center there, I think we should consider removing that option and saying we don't want tobacco sales to go on this. Because right now, I think that property is subdivided with, so I would like to consider that.

Mr. Apicella: So the issue that we have is the applicant isn't here, and if we make that change, the applicant's going to have to come back to another meeting.

Mr. Zuraf: And if I can add some clarification, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Mr. Zuraf: We do not have tobacco sales yet as a listed, specific listed use in the zoning code.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: It's something we're working on, but it's just not there yet.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. All right, I'm gonna pass the baton to the Vice Chairman, since this is in the Falmouth District.

Mr. Shelton: Good evening, Mr. Apicella. Since this is in your district, comments?

Mr. Apicella: Well, Mr. Vice Chairman, I would like to recommend for approval the reclassification, with proffers, of the Potomac Creek Industrial Park Lot number 4.

Mr. Shelton: Do I have a second?

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Shelton: I have a motion and a second; open for discussion. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: I have no comments.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No comments.

Mr. Shelton: Additional Commissioners? Ms. Sellers? Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: No comments.

Mr. Shelton: Call for the question. Cast your vote. Passes unanimously, 7 to 0. Mr. Apicella, you got the... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. All right, we're going to move on to the next agenda item, which is Unfinished Business associated with the regulations for campground uses. Hi Mr. Geouge.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. An Ordinance to amend and reordain the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms" and Sec. 28-35, "Table of uses and standards" to modify regulations relating to campground uses. **(Time Limit: June 6, 2025) (Referred by the Board of Supervisors on February 18, 2025)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: April 23, 2025)
(Last Potential Public Hearing Date: May 28, 2025)

Mr. Geouge: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. As you stated, this is to initiate a public hearing for an item that the Board initiated. This is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to change campgrounds from a by-right use to a CUP use in the A-1 district, as well as to modify some of the definitions in the Ordinance. The

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Planning Commission did establish a subcommittee for this item, consisting of Chairman Caudill, as well as Commissioners Barnes and Shelton. The subcommittee met March 20th and April 2nd. There were a couple changes that came out of that subcommittee. The main one was that the subcommittee wanted to establish more specific time limits on how long people can stay at a campground. So we did make that change to the definition, which we borrowed some language from State Code on that. It limits the length of stay to no more than 14 nights within a 30-day period. And that was all that came out of the subcommittee, and they did want to move this forward to authorize the hearing.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Geouge. Ms. Caudill, you were chairing this. Did a great job. Anything else you'd like to offer?

Ms. Caudill: So I do have a few things. First of all, I would like to say I have thoroughly enjoyed being a part of the subcommittee. I am pleased about the progress and work that has been done. I am a camper, well, more so gl camper I like to call it, and have been to quite a few campgrounds. So I fully understand that tent camping is a common form of camping. However, tent camping, in my opinion, would be a less than ideal scenario. I also want to clarify that this concern came up after the final committee's meeting. Although during the meeting, the comment did arise about riff-raff with tent camping. This does not, to my knowledge, represent the views of the entire committee, but I do know some adults that like tent camping. But for example, at Travel Trailer Village, they only have six tent camping sites, and you might, you have to be 18 years or older to rent and stay. So could it be possible solution that we have in there for consideration of limitation of tent sites through a CUP? Is that something that could be possible?

Mr. Geouge: Yes, Commissioner Caudill. With a CUP we could impose various sorts of controls, whatever we feel are appropriate to mitigate the impacts of that particular development...

Ms. Caudill: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: ... in that particular area. If there is a concern about tent camping and potentially any associated impacts associated with that, that could be controlled through a CUP condition.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. All right, I would like to add something in.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it's, it's already got a conditional use permit. That's the way this would go forward, right? So if somebody wanted to do a campsite in the future, once, if this gets approved by the Board, it would be under CUP and then the staff would recommend conditions, and we'd have an opportunity as a Commission to also add to that. So if you had concerns about the number of tent sites or anything else, you could bring that up.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, all right. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Is that okay?

Ms. Caudill: Yeah. No, I just, I want to make sure that that's not the place in the definition or any of that that we would need to put that as like a case by case basis or, or whatnot. Just...

Mr. Apicella: Well, since it's a CUP, it basically would be on a case by case basis.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, all right.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Does that work for you?

Ms. Caudill: That's good. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I've got two minor changes. One is... well, three actually. Under the campground definition, it has motor home camp. I think there's a typo there? Is that motor home camper?

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

Mr. Apicella: Right, but it's, it's kind of along the line... it says recreational vehicle or motor home camp.

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

Mr. Apicella: So, well, whatever it is, I just want to make sure we've got it right.

Mr. Geouge: Yes, this, this portion of the definition is referring to the types of camps...

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: ... not the type of actual camping unit or the facility itself.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: So that, that was the intent there, to just kind of cover the bases on all the different campground types.

Mr. Apicella: So we have a, we don't have a definition for every term here. We have a definition for recreational vehicle. We don't have a definition for motor home camp. What is a motor home camp? So is, but yeah, so is recreational vehicle. So we've separated it out; we've got a definition for recreational vehicle. I just don't know if a layman would understand what a motor home camp is in the absence of a definition.

Mr. Geouge: Okay. Yeah. On that note, there are some others that do not specifically have definitions. For instance, the primitive camp, tent camp. Those, those don't have separate...

Mr. Apicella: So if we were to pull out Webster's Dictionary, which is sometimes what people use to figure out what a term means if it's not in the Zoning Ordinance, do we think there's a, somewhere people can look to to understand what a motor home camp is?

Mr. Geouge: I believe so. I mean, motor home is pretty, pretty well-defined I would say.

Mr. Apicella: I got motor home. But I just don't know what a motor home camp is. I've never heard of that before.

Ms. Caudill: I also agree with the motor home camp. I do not know what that means.

Mr. Geouge: Okay.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Ms. Barnes: Let me, let me ask this. Under camping unit, it lists motor home. So there's kind of this circular, yeah, we don't have a definition of a motor home camp, but we do have motor home under camping unit. Is that reverse engineered kind of?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, again, the only reason I bring it up is because recreational vehicle we do have a definition for, we don't have one for motor home camp. To me, it's kind of a stream recreational vehicle or motor home camp, because they're in, you know, commas between commas. So it's kind of like a recreational vehicle, but not quite a recreational vehicle. Maybe I'm making too much of it, but...

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, Mr. Chairman...

Mr. Apicella: I just want to be sure that the public, if somebody wants to set up something like this, they're going to know what it means.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I think the intent there is to capture the kind of terminology. I can see it as one in the same and, and we as staff can just go back and just double check that that really is the intent that, you know, that is... it's all one in the same but just capturing the different terminology for an RV.

Mr. Apicella: So, when this does get to a public hearing, can we maybe get some more... I don't know that I'm asking for a change, but just so we know that there's some general, this is a general term that the public...

Mr. Geouge: Definitions.

Mr. Apicella: ... can find somewhere.

Mr. Geouge: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I do have one other change. I think it's kind of important. So about six or seven lines down, it says periods overnight or longer, comma, and. I would add the word shall and shall not exceed.

Mr. Geouge: Instead of not to exceed...

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Geouge: ... and shall not exceed?

Mr. Apicella: Yes. Is our council good with that?

Ms. McClendon: Commissioner Apicella, that's an appropriate change. Our office will review this Ordinance as well before it goes to the Board. So there's additional opportunity for changes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. That's it for me. Anybody else have any other suggested changes? All right, thank you. Is there a motion to put this to a public hearing, maybe at the May 14th meeting? Can you put your...?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Ms. Caudill: Motion to send to a public hearing.

Ms. Evans: Second.

Mr. Apicella: At the May 14th meeting.

Ms. Caudill: At the May 14th meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Awesome.

Ms. Evans: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: I heard Billy, too. I don't know... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: I'll give that one to Ms. Evans. All right, so any further comments? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No, thank you. I enjoyed this very much.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Ms Evans?

Ms. Evans: No, we just get the definition down so we can have an understanding.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? All right, all in favor of putting this to a public hearing at the May 14th meeting – we can do this by voice vote – please say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Okay, that carries unanimously. All right, gonna move on – New Business, none. Planning Director's Report.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

3. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, all I have for you tonight is just I'll refer you to the Project Pipeline Report that's in your package that lists the upcoming public hearings at future meetings. And we have a few, a few public hearings teed up for the next few meetings. So no, no breaks, sorry.

Mr. Apicella: Bummer.

Mr. Zuraf: And that is, that completes my report this evening.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. County Attorney's Report?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. McClendon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no report at this time, but I am happy to join the Planning Commission this evening.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. McClendon, glad to have you here. So we already got our Committee Report from the Campground Ordinance. Tobacco and Vape Shop Ordinance, where are we?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

4. Campground Ordinance Subcommittee
Subcommittee Report – April 2, 2025
5. Tobacco and Vape Shops Ordinance Subcommittee
Meeting: TBD

Ms. Sellers: We have to get a meeting... *inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Do we think we can get together before the next meeting, hopefully?

Ms. Sellers: I'll have to see. I mean, right now, we're trying to do it after 6:30 and every night there seems to be a meeting here, so, at 6:00, 6:30.

Mr. Apicella: Is it the room that's a problem or the time that's a problem?

Ms. Sellers: It's kind of been both. But we'll, we'll move it up in the day.

Mr. Apicella: We can't get the ABC Room or the Activities room, Mr. Zuraf?

Ms. Sellers: We'll have to look at the...

Mr. Zuraf: We'll, we'll explore all the meeting room potential options.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Chairman's Report. I don't have anything. No TRC meetings. Last item on the agenda is the March 26, 2025, minutes. Is there a motion...?

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

6. New TRC Submissions - *NONE*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. March 26, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve,

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 9, 2025

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right. All in favor of approving the March 26th minutes, please say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? All right, that motion carries unanimously. And we are hereby adjourned with no further business.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6:38 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the April 9, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.