

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 23, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 23, 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, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Amy Taylor

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill, please call the roll.

Ms. Caudill: Chairman Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Vice Chairman Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: Present.

Ms. Caudill: Chairman Caudill, present. Chairman Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Commissioner Barnes.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Barnes, sorry. Commissioner Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Bratton.

Mr. Bratton: Present.

Ms. Caudill: And Commissioner Evans.

Ms. Evans: Present.

Ms. Caudill: Chairman, everyone is present; we have a quorum.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Caudill. Are there any declarations of disqualification? All right, are there any changes to the agenda?

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

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Okay, 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 items up for a public hearing 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 1 minute left. And red means your time is up. So if anyone would like to speak now, please come forward.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. I appreciate all your dedicated work to Stafford. CIPs, including Attain, contains Article 3, Section 28-35 and 28-39U. So this is typically for zoning. It is stated that it appears to be a misinterpretation of the US Constitution. It deals with inferior courts and also related conditional use permits with sub-districts. This might be a reason why the Library of Congress will not recognize some addresses in Stafford because of the process, the due process. The people are asking for transparency and to slow down so the budget isn't as bulky as it has been. This article is related to special regulations. Page 31 of 388 pages in the packet today, April 23 2025. This deals with the give and take between federal, state, and district. Federal state grants are questionable in release and are controlling more than the trust bond scope. As one, one board member had mentioned, it was disappointing and disgusting. Also included for CIP and the Attain study that we have today is Article X, Section 28-161, which contains conditional zoning, which was adopted Ordinance 11-18, June 22, 2011. This proposed amendments would delete the existing county, country code language that relates to Virginia Code 15.2-2298, or updates that reference it. The Board of Supervisors are wondering why the bids are returning one sole bid and not challenging others to the CIP cases. It has it has turned into a local monopoly. Food for thought – the zoning maps amendments should also attempt to strike a balance between the needs of the community and the rights of the property owner while the goal is to promote public welfare. Amendments must also respect the legitimate right of property owners in order to maintain property sole interest and the interest of the public to pay property tax and follow our constitutional rights. Property owners take offense on the use of the cut, of the country's acronym, Urban Service Area as used, page 33 of 388 of today's package. This cannot be two boundary specifications of USA, for it will muddy our Constitution, using our county boundaries as ownership of inferior sub...

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, your times up. Thank you very much.

Ms. Maxson: Thank you soo much. I appreciate it...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Maxson: ... again.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else?

Mrs. Stencavage: Good evening. Darla Stencavage, Garrisonville. James Clear, the author of Atomic Habits, has said, "Every action you take is a vote for the type of person you wish to become. No single instance will transform your beliefs, but as the votes build up, so does the evidence of your new identity." I think this quote can also apply to Stafford County officials for the development of Stafford. Let me say it this way – every action you approve is a vote for the type of county you wish Stafford County to become. It is possible that no single instance will transform the county, but as the votes build up, so does the evidence of the new identity you want for Stafford County. So what is the identity Stafford County officials want for Stafford County? Is the identity simply that we are open for business, any business? If that were the case, then how would we ever be able to attract high end businesses? Do we really think that we are going to get nice restaurants and higher end shopping in an area full of data

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

centers, warehouses, and distribution centers? I can't imagine someone planning a nice evening of dining and entertainment in the middle of an industrial park or road... or a roadside gas station. Now I know that isn't, that it isn't the job of the Planning Commission to attract businesses. That is the job of our horrible Economic Development band, and they obviously have some improvement to make. But it is the job of the Planning Commission to make thoughtful decisions that are meaningful, that will be important in developing Stafford's identity. The rest of the quote from James Clear reads this way, "Small habits can make a meaningful difference by providing evidence of a new identity. And if a change is meaningful, it is actually big." So I call on the Planning Commission to start making those changes that will create a new identity for Stafford. Let's transform Stafford like was stated in the Stafford vision 2040, and let's say no to Buc-ee's. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Stencavage: Peter Stencavage, Garrisonville District. April 22nd, yesterday. But I am referring to April 22, 1970. Some of you might remember that as the first Earth Day. It made quite an impact on my family, especially my older brothers. It didn't really affect me until a few days later, when we stopped going to the town dump and started going to the regional recycling center that had recently opened. To this day, my brothers and I are ecologically mindful, and our choices reflect that. And that's why it's concerning to me that Stafford County is even considering a 120 gas pump business like Buc-ee's. The environmental issues, traffic, and safety concerns make no sense. Another concerning issue is that no business lasts forever. You all, most of you, remember Sears and K-Mart. At least they can be repurposed into new businesses. What does Stafford County eventually do with a 120 gas pump station? Maybe in 20 years or 30 years once it becomes obsolete? We already have a few of these abandoned gas stations, for example, east of 95 on Highway 17 on the north side. You probably know of more other... many more others. They are hard to clean up and repurpose. How much more difficult will it be to repurpose 120 gas pumps at a gas station? In conclusion, we are parents to our future selves. I read this in a book. I'm not sure, I believe it was titled "The Point Is." And as I look back at my life, can I truly say that I did the best I could for my future self, and by extension, the best for my community? Members of the Planning Commission, as representatives of the community, can *you* say you are doing the best for your community if you accept Buc-ee's into your... our community? Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Any other speakers? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public presentation portion of the meeting and move on to the first agenda item, which is a Reclassification of Attain at Stafford. Mr. Zuraf.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC22154616; Zoning Reclassification – Attain at Stafford – A proposed zoning reclassification with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the UD-4, Urban Development Mixed Use Village Center Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-8, 39-8B, 39-16C, 39-16F, and 39-16G, consisting of approximately 24.273 acres ("Property"), to allow a mixed-use development with commercial, office, and residential uses, with up to 300 multi-family dwelling units. In general, the proposed proffers include, but are not limited to, provisions that would: require the Property to be developed in general conformance with the master plan; limit development to no more than 300 units and permitted commercial uses; prohibit specified uses; establish architectural design standards for all buildings; require monetary contributions toward schools, public safety and certain road and sidewalk improvements; require specified transportation improvements, including dedication of certain right-of-way; limit maximum trip generation on the Property, based on all combined uses; require construction of certain amenities;

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

and require specified notice regarding proximity to data centers. The Property is located on the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 125 feet south of Hospital Center Boulevard, and along the west side of Old Potomac Church Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: August 1, 2025)**

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, please recognize Amy Taylor for the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Hi Ms. Taylor.

Ms. Taylor: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I am Amy Taylor, and I am here this evening to present item number 1 on tonight's agenda. As noted, this is a zoning reclassification request for Attain at Stafford. This is a request for a reclassification to rezone 24.273 acres from A-1, Agricultural to the UD-4, Urban Development Mixed-Use Village Center to allow specifically a mixed-use development with commercial and office uses, and up to 300 multi-family dwelling units. This will affect Tax Map Parcel Nos. 39-8, 8B, 16, excuse me, 39-16C, 39-16F, and 39-16G. These are all located in the Falmouth Election District. The applicant is BRG Stafford LLC, and Charlie Payne with Hirschler is representing the applicant. As shown here in red, the subject parcel is located along the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 125 feet south of Hospital Center Boulevard, and is generally located along the west side of Old Potomac Church Road. The site is located west of Tax Map Parcel 39-71A which is currently under development for use as a data center. And that project is located here and is known as the Old Potomac Church Data Center. The property is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural, and is shown here in the light green. And surrounding zoning districts include a mix of A-1, Agricultural; B-2, Urban Commercial; B-3, Office; and UD, Urban Development zoned properties. The property has been zoned A-1 since 1978 and there are no proffers in existence for any of the subject parcels. These are existing conditions. And as shown, the majority of the site is currently vacant and undeveloped, with the exception to one single-family dwelling and an outbuilding which is located in the southern portion of the property. And I will show that here, just in case everybody cannot see that. There's also a short section of sidewalk that currently does exist along the northern portion of the site's frontage on Richmond Highway, and that is located in the public right-of-way. My outline here for the property kind of hides that, but that section of sidewalk is generally located about there. As noted, the site is densely wooded, and site topography consists of rolling terrain throughout much of the property, which does slope significantly to the south and towards the center of the site. And most of the southwest portion of the site is encumbered with a Critical Resource Protection Area. Oh, excuse me. The property is generally bounded by Richmond Highway to the west and Old Potomac Church Road to the east, and does abut several undeveloped commercial properties to the south and north. General surrounding uses include a restaurant and a roller skating facility, which are located to the west, and that property also abuts the site on three sides. Other uses in the vicinity include multi-family residential which is the Abberly Waterstone development, and the Residences at Potomac Crest, which are slightly further south on Old Potomac Church Road, including various commercial uses located to the south. And there are also several single-family homes and a data center located to the east. There is the hospital located to the north, and other various commercial uses located to the west. These are a few of the street views for the site. This one showing a northeast view of the property as seen from Richmond Highway, just north of South Campus Boulevard. The this is a southwest view of the property, also from Richmond Highway, this time located near Hospital Center Boulevard. This is a western view of the property from Old Potomac Church Road. And this is the Master Plan. As noted in the staff report, the UD, Urban Development district does require submittal of a Master Plan, as opposed to a GDP, which depicts the elements such as pedestrian sheds, street network hierarchy, and building elevations. The Master Plan does depict the site layout for the proposed mixed use development, which will include up to 300 multi-family units and approximately 57,000 square feet of office and/or commercial space. As shown, the

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

proposed layout will consist of two 4-story residential buildings with approximately 365,000 square feet of floor area, and will include a mix of one- and two-bedroom dwelling units. The total two-bedroom units will not exceed 204 and no three-bedroom units...

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Taylor, Ms. Barnes has a question.

Ms. Barnes: I may be too soon, but that, that section of the property on the right here I think it's actually southwest; that, that right triangle looking... is that part of the parcel?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. The parcel that I just marked with an X?

Ms. Barnes: Yes, exactly.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, it is.

Ms. Barnes: And nothing is... is that the CRPA?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. Most of that property is encumbered with a Critical Resource Protection Area...

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Taylor: ... and there is no development proposed on that portion of the site.

Ms. Barnes: The proffers that are going to apply to this project, will they also apply to that portion of the property as well?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I'm gonna ask you a question as well. The building in the middle, where you have the X, and the property itself, where the... that's the skating rink?

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Taylor: This property here is the Cavalier Skating, Family Skating Center.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Let's see – total number of two-bedroom units proposed will not exceed 204 and no three-bedroom units are proposed with this development. The buildings are adjacent to each other, and sidewalks are depicted around the perimeter of each building and along all street frontages. Residential buildings are generally located in the northeastern portion of the site, with commercial buildings located in the western portion, with frontage along Richmond Highway. An 8,000 square-foot clubhouse is proposed, which will be integrated into multi-family building number 2. And to clarify, that clubhouse is located in this corner of this building, and will include a fitness center and an outdoor swimming pool as depicted in the courtyard. Additional amenities shown include a dog park, two pickleball courts, and

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

two eight-unit garages. The proposed layout will provide approximately 25% open space, which exceeds the 5% minimum required within the UD-4 district, and open space areas will be equally dispersed throughout the development. The southwestern portion of the property is encumbered by that Critical Resource Protection Area, and there is no development proposed on that portion of the site which will be retained as open space. Access to the property will be provided via a limited access entrance on Richmond Highway, and that entrance will be a right in/right out, as shown here. Let's see, and they will have a network of streets proposed throughout the site, including an inter-parcel connection to abutting properties to the south, which will provide secondary access to South Campus Boulevard, which will take them out through the adjacent Arbors at Stafford project. Multiple private streets will serve as primary and...

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans, do you have a question?

Ms. Evans: I do. When you... I'm sorry... when you were talking about they are able to come out and you have the arrow, is that Peake Lane? That's Peake Lane?

Ms. Amy: Yes. The access, Commissioner Evans, the access there that you see on South Campus Boulevard is the existing Peake Lane that we see in aerial imagery now, which is essentially no more than a private driveway serving that one single-family home.

Ms. Evans: Okay, that's I was gonna say, so that's, that will be your, I mean, that will be the the applicant's property, so that home is gone or?

Ms. Taylor: It will be eliminated with development of this site.

Ms. Evans: Okay.

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

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: In the middle of the the plan here, it looks like there's a kind of a triangular park – everything with triangles tonight, I don't know why – but that's actually a stormwater management pond. That's not a park, is it?

Ms. Taylor: No.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Taylor: There is generally landscaping and buffering around that pond that would be provided for the development as a whole, but that is proposed as a stormwater management facility.

Ms. Barnes: Will that have water in it continuously, do you know?

Ms. Taylor: I would have to defer to the applicant.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, all right. Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Multiple private streets will serve as primary and side streets throughout and around the site, and which will also promote the recommended grid network in this area. On-street parallel parking is proposed along primary streets, with angled parking being provided along side streets. And all buildings are located within the applicable setbacks and build-2 zones as required within the UD district. Additional designated parking areas are also provided throughout the site. Sidewalk will also be extended along the site's frontage along Richmond Highway, with exception to the undeveloped portion to the south. And no direct access or pedestrian accommodations are currently proposed along Old Potomac Church Road due to steep slopes along the eastern side of the site. Landscape buffers are proposed along Richmond Highway, Old Potomac Church Road, and along the southern property line, where adjacent to proposed age-restricted housing. This is the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use map, which identifies the site as being within the Courthouse Targeted Development Area. And the more detailed land use concept for the Courthouse Targeted Development Area designates this property for mixed use, for commercial and residential, as shown in purple. The Comp Plan does state that Targeted Development Areas are the areas of the County where significant amount of development or redevelopment is expected to occur, and specifically emphasizes where development will be targeted and where concentrated urban or higher density development is most appropriate. The plan also establishes a goal of established, excuse me, accommodating 50% of projected population growth within TDAs which recommends a total of 3,190 additional multi-family units and up to 5.5 million square feet of commercial development. Multi-family residential dwelling units are recommended at a density of 11 to 14 units per acre. However, the proposed gross density of 14.97 units per acre for this project does slightly exceed the recommendations within TDAs. The Courthouse Small Area Plan further defines where commercial land, excuse me, commercial and residential uses are specifically recommended, and as shown, this site is within an area recommended for a variety of uses, including highway commercial, office, existing and proposed mixed-use, civic uses, and high density residential. The staff report evaluates public facility impacts and other factors associated with this project. In that regard, a Transportation Impact Analysis was submitted with this application which evaluated several intersections and overall impacts to the transportation network. The study was based on a total of 300 multi-family units, 38,400 square feet of general office space, and 19,200 square feet of commercial and retail uses, which are expected to generate approximately 2,935 vehicles a day. Existing operational deficiencies were noted...

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill? Sorry.

Ms. Caudill: Hi. Quick question – when was that transportation analysis done?

Ms. Taylor: That TIA was done, I believe, in April of 2024.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm. Existing operational deficiencies were noted at some intersections and specific turn movements with increased delays and queue lengths under both 2027 no-build and build conditions. However, the study did conclude that the additional impact noted under the 2027 build conditions were negligible and does not further degrade the Level of Service of the overall transportation network. This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policy for impacted intersections and road segments where achieving a Level of Service C is not practical giving existing transportation deficiencies. And VDOT also reviewed the TIA and concurred with the findings. However, while the applicant is... while the project is not negatively impacting the overall transportation network, the applicant is proffering multiple transportation improvements as recommended by the TIA, including construction of that channelized right-in/right-out entrance along Richmond Highway, a raised concrete median to separate northbound

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

and southbound travel lanes, raised concrete median to separate the northbound left turn lane from through lanes, and a westbound right-turn lane along South Campus Boulevard at the site entrance. In regard to utilities, no impacts were noted, and the applicant will be responsible for any necessary water and sewer connections or upgrades necessary to serve the site. Schools will be impacted with 300 additional homes, which will generate approximately 48 school-age children. This table summarizes the attendance zones and capacities for those schools located in this area. And as shown, both Stafford Elementary and Brooke Point High School currently exceed 90% capacity, which is the basis for determining whether deficits exist. Since both schools have no available capacity, any additional students generated by this development would exacerbate the existing deficits at the elementary and high school levels.

Mr. Shelton: I have a question. Will the elementary school 19, as it comes online, impact this?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Shelton, I would have to defer to schools. I do not recall specifically where Elementary School 19 is...

Mr. Shelton: It's at Brooke Point.

Ms. Taylor: ... being constructed.

Mr. Shelton: It's at Brooke Point campus; middle school, elementary school and high school.

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Shelton, I would still have to defer to schools. They did not provide any specific information indicating that students from this project may attend that new elementary school, so I would not be able to answer that, that question with any amount of certainty.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you very much.

Ms. Taylor: You're welcome. As shown, the proposed development would generate approximately 48 students based on the reduced student generation factors provided by the applicant, and those factors were based on five year historical averages for comparable developments owned by the applicant. Staff does note that those generation factors utilized are lower than those recommended by Stafford County Schools.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: Sorry, I have a question for you. When you state the, that the applicant said 48 school age children, and they used the standard student general generation factor. The historical data, was that use... the historical data that they used, is that the same data that Stafford County Public Schools used to do their standard student generation factor?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Evans, no. I'm actually getting to that part of my clarification now regarding the generation factors provided by the applicant versus what the schools recommend.

Ms. Evans: All right, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm. As noted, those factors utilized by the applicant are lower than those recommended by the schools for multi-family dwellings, and this table does show the comparison between the standard generation factors for multi-family vers... provided by the County versus those

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

reduced generation factors provided by the applicant. As you can see, looking at the chart, based on the same number of units proposed by the applicant under the standard student generation rate for the schools, the schools anticipate that this project would generate approximately 105 students, whereas the historical data from the applicant, they believe that, based on their, you know, similar projects that they have in Virginia and their five year historical averages, they are estimating that they believe that their project, with the same 300 units, will generate only 48 students roughly. They have indicated that... the applicant has suggested that the standard student generation rates utilized by the schools are too, too high for multi-family developments for, excuse me, modern multi-family developments, and they believe that their student generation factors are both adequate and consistent with actual student generation from the nearby Abberly Waterstone multi-family apartment community. School... staff did reach out to schools to confirm the generation, the actual student generation coming out of the Abberly facility, and that chart is shown here at the bottom of the screen, which shows a comparison between what the applicant is proposing for their student generation for their facility versus the actual student generation for the adjacent Abberly Waterstone multi-family development. And as you can see, those... they are actually proposing more students than what is actually being generated by the Abberly development.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: So being that the County is so completely off-base with their student generation numbers, is the County going to be redoing that, or are we going to hold steady to our calculations?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Barnes, staff did reach out to the Coun... to schools, and they have indicated that their analysis and that their student generation rates are based on an average of all multi-family units within the county. Their methodology is based on the number of students coming out of these multi-family developments versus how many... excuse me, I would have to defer to my notes that they provided me... it's a combination of everything. They are calculating all multi-family developments in the county and how many students I believe are coming out of those facilities as a whole, and they're averaging them altogether to arrive at their generation rates. Whereas, the applicant feels that for newer, modern facilities, they are not generating as many as the older facilities may.

Ms. Barnes: And do we have any other instances in the county where we have taken the applicant's calculations over our own planners and what's in the Comprehensive Plan?

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Barnes, I am not aware of any others in recent history. The most recent multi-family developments that have been done have utilized the standard student generation rates provided by the county. I am unaware of any others, unless Mr. Zuraf may be aware of some older ones that may have used their own rates.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I recall several years ago the Celebrate Virginia apartments off of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, they did provide their own kind of similar lower projection based on their type of product that they built there. And so, yeah, that, that went into... that, that factored into the corresponding proffers that, that were on that project.

Ms. Barnes: But specifically, we're only talking about student generation, not necessarily other calculations, such as traffic impact or public safety or libraries or general government services. Those are all usually done by the calculation of the County, and that's usually what we base our proffers on.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Zuraf: Correct. Yeah, this lower rate really has been focused on students and otherwise for transportation, for example, we use the standard ITE factors, and that is not something where I ever recall us accepting a lower rate for this type of situation.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So you mentioned the project off of Celebrate Virginia. Do we know what the actual student numbers are now?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, I can provide that information. I also reached out to schools regarding actual student generation for other multi-family developments that exist in the county already. Would you like that information now?

Mr. Apicella: Yes, please. That would be helpful. And well done. Ms. Taylor is up to the task.

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, the numbers currently generated for the 2024-2025 school year coming out of the Silver Collection apartments, they have a total of 278 units, and their total student generation coming out of that facility is 17 students for this year.

Mr. Apicella: Do we... I mean, I'm just kind of, I'm having a hard time wrapping my head around this, why there's such a disparity between the I'll call them legacy apartments and new apartments, newer apartments, why the delta is so huge between the older and newer complexes. We don't... do we have a sense of why that's happening? Is it location? Is it, is it the rental fees? What's, what's causing the I don't want to say drop, but limited number of students?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, I will ultimately defer to the applicant, but they have provided information which suggests that the newer communities don't provide as many child oriented amenities. A lot of them don't provide as many three-bedroom units, which is where they seem to find most of their families locating. But otherwise, I would have to defer for regarding other other logic behind the lower student generation. But in evaluating the existing student generation coming out of some of our other facilities, there may be some correlation regarding the newer facilities and the number of three-bedroom units at those locations.

Mr. Apicella: And so this, the Stafford schools methodology doesn't account for, doesn't make an adjustment for the lack of three-bedroom apartments; it's just a static approach.

Ms. Taylor: That is correct. Reading from the school's email, their specific statement to me regarding their methodology was student... countywide, student generation factors involved dividing the total number of students residing in a specific type of housing, such as multi-family, by the total number of those housing units. So they are taking the total number of students that they, they, they already recognize as residing in those facilities, and dividing it by the total number of housing units within the county to arrive at their countywide average generation factor.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Any other questions about student generation numbers? Nope. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Ms. Taylor: Resuming, in consideration of that information provided and the comparison of actual student generation for the Abberly Waterstone apartments for the 2024-2025 school year, staff does believe that the reduced student generation factors may be acceptable. Based on the proposed lower student generation factor, staff does believe that impacts to county schools would be mitigated with proffered monetary contributions towards new school facilities, and that the applicant is proposing a reasonable contribution in the amount of \$2,627,599, with 1 million paid prior to the issuance of the first occupancy permit for the first multi-family unit and the remaining \$1,627,598 to be paid in the amount of \$5,425 per multi-family unit. In regards to impacts to Parks and Recreation, staff utilizes the County Parks Utilization Plan to identify needs for park facilities in a given area. The Plan does not currently identify this area as a priority in need of more parks, and the applicant is also providing several recreational amenities as part of their development. Public safety impacts would be mitigated with per unit monetary contributions that can be used towards a new fire and rescue facility. And illustrative elevations depicting the proposed design of the building were also provided with the application, and the applicant is proffering, or excuse me, they were previously proffering the general design and character of the building, including the use of building materials that conform to the NDS Plan. However, the applicant has provided some modified proffers, and I believe those were emailed out to the Commission yesterday and were handed out at the beginning of this evening's meeting. I believe that the modified proffers do eliminate the previous building elevation and the use of specific building materials, so I will defer to the applicant regarding the extent of that modified proffer language.

Mr. Apicella: Before you go any further. So is this project based on the language in the amended proffers? Is this project similar to the Attain facility or complex in Spotsylvania, or is it different from that one?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, from what staff has seen based on the tour of the facility that we took several months ago and what we are seeing on the Master Plan, this project is very similar to what is, has been constructed at Spotsylvania Towne Center.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Several of the proposed proffers were noted earlier in my presentation, but this is an overall summary of the proffers as currently proposed by the applicant, which would – let's see, back up one – which would require the property to be developed in general accordance with the Master Plan; would limit development to no more than 300 multi-family units and commercial uses as permitted within the UD-4 District; prohibit development of multiple uses that would otherwise be permitted by-right within the UD-4 District...

Ms. Barnes: Which is what? That's my question, I'm sorry, I just jumped right in. What's the max allowed for UD-40? UD-4, excuse me. WD-40.

Mr. Apicella: UB-40, it's a band.

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Barnes, could you repeat the question, please?

Ms. Barnes: Okay. What is the max density allowed by-right in a UD-4?

Ms. Taylor: Forty units per acre.

Ms. Barnes: And there's 24, 25 acres?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Ms. Taylor: There is roughly 24 acres. And UD density is based on gross acreage of the site, and under the UD-4 district, they would be permitted up to 40 multi-family units per acre.

Ms. Barnes: And so, I'm not going to do the math, but it seems like it's going to be more than 300.

Ms. Taylor: Right...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, so it's 14 that they're actually doing.

Ms. Taylor: ... 14.97 is their proposal. At the 40 units per acre, I do believe it would be roughly 800 units... *inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So with this proffer, with the 300 units, in perpetuity, even if anything else changes, only 300 are going to go on this particular, on these five, which will I guess be then condensed into one particular parcel.

Ms. Taylor: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Let's see... The next proffer would be requiring architectural design features to the units that would be in substantial accordance with the applicant's development known as Attain at Town Center, including the use of a variety of different colors, materials, and features. They would also be required for the commercial buildings and the garages to be constructed with materials and features that are complementary to the units. They would be required to contrib... have monetary contributions of \$1 million prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit, and \$5,425 per multi-family unit, for a total of \$1,627,598 for schools; total contribution being \$2,627,598. They would also have monetary contributions of \$1,694 per multi-family unit, in the total amount of \$508,368 towards public safety. They would also require the following transportation improvements, which would provide primary and secondary site access in the approximate locations, as depicted on the Master Plan: construct the off-site entrance along South Campus Boulevard, including that westbound right turn lane, prior to issuance of their first occupancy permit; dedication of additional right-of-way along Richmond Highway, which would provide approximately 60 feet of right-of-way along the center line for Richmond Highway; and an additional right-of-way along Potomac Church Road, which would provide approximately 32 feet from existing center line. They would also be required to construct those two concrete medians along Richmond Highway. They are also proffering to limit maximum vehicular trip generation to no more than 2,935 trips per day, which was the basis of the Transportation Impact Analysis. They will be constructing amenities for the clubhouse, swimming pool, fitness center, and the two pickleball courts prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the 150th multi-family unit. They are also required to provide monetary contributions of \$29,225 towards construction of sidewalk along the property's undeveloped frontage along Richmond Highway; an additional monetary contribution of \$50,000 towards transportation improvements along Old Potomac Church Road or other general improvements in the immediate surrounding area. They will also be providing a disclosure regarding the site's proximity to a data center campus; And they will be limiting the mix of dwelling units to only one- and two-bedroom units; no three-bedroom units will be provided.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes has a question.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so as far as the phasing of the residential versus the commercial, I noticed that there's nothing in there about when that commercial is going to be built. We've had experiences before, such as Aquia Town Center, where we had commercial that was planned and it just never got done because it wasn't phased in in the proffer. So is there an explanation for why? That obviously is going to be a question for the applicant, but there is no mention of phasing whatsoever between residential and commercial.

Ms. Taylor: That is correct, Commissioner Barnes. There has been no discussion nor mention regarding phasing of the commercial development. So I would have to defer to the applicant. I do not believe it came up during the evaluation. So that would just be something we would need to defer to the applicant as to whether or not they would be willing to agree to.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And then you said it was, what, it was, is it \$29,000 towards the to build a sidewalk? Is that what it was? It was \$50,000 and then \$29,000?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. The applicant is not proposing to construct any sidewalk along that undeveloped portion of the site; that triangular piece, that is not being developed. So they are proposing a monetary contribution of \$29,000 roughly towards construction of sidewalk in that location. The additional monetary contribution of \$50,000 could be used for Old Potomac Church Road or, as written, other general transportation improvements in the area which could also go towards that sidewalk as well.

Ms. Barnes: Any idea how much sidewalk \$80,000 is going to buy us? Thirty-two feet.

Ms. Taylor: Staff did reach out to Capital Improvements regarding that. We did not get a clear answer regarding exactly what \$29,000 would get us, but they did allude to that roughly 1,000 feet of sidewalk, including all site improvements and prep necessary to achieve that would cost roughly, I believe, the answer yesterday was 2.5 million.

Mr. Apicella: So that's \$2,500 a linear square foot.

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So, you do the math. Twenty-nine thousand divided by 2,500...

Ms. Barnes: Inaudible... several people talking at once.

Mr. Apicella: Not a lot.

Ms. Taylor: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Sticking with transportation, is there any discussion of doing a study in this area of Route 1 at any, because we have the project here in Stafford that's been in existence for a long time now for the improvements along Courthouse Road that should be started here soon. Is there any discussion to move it south into the hospital area?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Ms. Taylor: Commissioner Sellers, there was no discussion from Capital Improvements regarding any existing transportation projects in the area and shifting the location of those improvements, or even timing on those improvements at this time.

Ms. Sellers: Well, and then we should throw it out there, maybe instead of putting \$29,000 towards the sidewalk, and it may not pay for much, but if they're going to proffer right-of-way and some of the other stuff, that does take some of the costs down, because that's a significant portion of the cost. But if it could go to a study, then there are, there is potential there, because that would be the next phase because Stafford has the project going up to the courthouse. And then the next phase down Route 1 would be this area of Route 1, because Enon Road's already got a project that should be starting here soon as well. So this is kind of the gap area. So if we can maybe talk about, instead of it just being towards transportation improvements, maybe towards a study, like a STAR study, or the pipeline study that VDOT does.

Ms. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Quick question for you. So on the bottom of the transportation, I think it's the red line proffers, it says the average daily vehicle trips for the project may not exceed 2,935 for all combined uses on the property. Who's enforcing that?

Ms. Taylor: When they come... Commissioner Caudill, when the applicant comes in with their site plan to develop the property, they would be required to account for the square footage, how many units they're proposing, what's the square footage of the commercial buildings. And they would be required to provide their traffic counts at that time. If at any point they proposed a use or a total square footage that would exceed that amount of traffic, they would be, they would receive a comment indicating that they would need to reduce the number of units, or they would need to reduce the square footage of that proposed building in order to achieve or not exceed the maximum trip generation that they have proffered.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor: Mm-hmm. Let's see. Oh, sorry, I did not move on to those slides. Moving on to staff findings and the evaluation, there are several positive aspects to the application, such as that the proposed commercial and residential land uses are generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed uses are consistent with the commercial and residential pattern of development in the surrounding area. The development is in conformance with the transportation plan policies and provides multiple transportation improvements along Richmond Highway and South Campus Boulevard; additional right-of-way dedication and proffered monetary contributions towards construction of sidewalk along Richmond Highway and other other general transportation improvements in the immediate area; and proffers ensure that development will be consistent with what is envisioned in this application, and that the recreational amenities will be provided. Additional positives include that the monetary contributions would mitigate school and public safety impacts, and that the building design is consistent with the NDS Plan for architectural design guideline recommendations. However, staff does find that negative impacts associated with the application are that the proposed density does exceed Comp Plan recommendations for this location; the proposal does not provide adequate pedestrian accessibility along abutting roadways; and the proposed student generation ratio is less than that recommended by Stafford County Public Schools for multi-family residential dwellings. While the proposal is not fully consistent with the Comprehensive Plan use recommendations as it pertains to

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

density for multi-family dwelling units, and the proposed uses, or the proposed uses are compatible with the existing residential development in the surrounding area, as well as the total number of multi-family units and desired square footage of the commercial development within the Courthouse TDA. Staff also feels that the reduced generation, student generation factors may be acceptable in this case, and that the proffered monetary contributions will adequately mitigate the proposed impacts to schools. Based on this information, staff is generally supportive of the project and recommends approval of the application, with proffers, pursuant to ordinance O25-11. Sorry, and I skipped those slides again.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Other questions?

Ms. Taylor: That concludes my presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so when we discussed the proffers, it was Fire and Rescue. As far as public safety goes, in general, were those proffers just for Fire and Rescue, or did they include law enforcement proffers?

Ms. Taylor: They did not specifically include law enforcement. It does just address the public safety component, because that is all we have a project for on our CIP.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so when I look into the Comprehensive Plan, the capital costs for multi-family units are listed at Fire and Rescue for \$2,521 and for law enforcement, \$1,061, for a total of \$3,582. The proffer here is, the applicant is offering is \$1,694, correct?

Ms. Taylor: That is correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And for schools, the proffer per unit is \$5,425?

Ms. Taylor: I believe so, yes, Commissioner Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And the capital cost that's listed in the Comprehensive Plan for this particular kind of multi-family unit is listed as \$10,915. I just wanted to cover that. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Barnes. Other questions? All right, I've got a few. I'm gonna start with this – from staff's perspective, is this a good location for a multi-family apartment complex?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, staff does believe so. It does meet the recommendation to the Comprehensive Plan in conjunction with the surrounding multi-family development that is already in existence in the area.

Mr. Apicella: You mentioned during your presentation that the Comp Plan recommends 3,200 multi-family units in the Courthouse TDA. So how many units have been approved or built thus far?

Ms. Taylor: I would have to refer to the staff report. I do believe it mentions that.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, I can go ahead and... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, please go ahead.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. So you have the Abberly Waterstone apartments with 288 units, and the Potomac Crest apartments with 144 units. Also, not mentioned here, is the JPI project at the corner of Route 1 and Courthouse that has approximately 300 units.

Mr. Apicella: So about 800 total, roughly?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Three hundred, 300, 122, I think that's closer to 800. My math could be a little off though, it's not my favorite subject. So anyhow, it's less than a thousand, right? So again, bottom line is, we're still about a couple thousand away from the projection in the Comp Plan currently.

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, that is correct, including the additional 170 units for the proposed age-restricted multi-family on the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Do we have a rough idea of how much in property taxes the commercial buildings will provide once completed?

Ms. Taylor: Yes. Commissioner... Chairman Apicella. Staff did reach out to the Commissioner of the Revenue yesterday, and they did provide that information. I do apologize for not being able to get that to you earlier. The Commissioner of the Revenue did indicate that, let's see, they provided two different numbers. As an undeveloped parcel... let's see... based on current commercial land values as an undeveloped parcel, those two pad sites in the front of the property, they are estimating a land value of \$1.8 to \$2 million and they are estimating that annual taxes would be roughly \$16, almost \$17,000 to almost \$19,000 as an undeveloped property. Based on full development at 57,600 square feet of office and retail, they are estimating a value of approximately 200 to 225 per square foot, and at that total square footage, they are estimating a value in a range of \$11.5 million to \$12.9 million, with an annual taxes being roughly \$100- to \$121,000 a year.

Mr. Apicella: So that's the foregone revenue, unless and until the commercial comes to fruition.

Ms. Taylor: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Was there any commercial associated with Abberly?

Ms. Taylor: There was no commercial development associated with the Abberly project. That project rezoned that parcel to UD-4, which was associated with only the multi-family buildings. The commercial buildings we see at the corner of Old Potomac Church Road and South Campus are currently zoned B-3 and they are a remnant of the prior comprehensive rezoning for the Stafford Redevelopment Area, the Courthouse Redevelopment Area, so those properties were unaffiliated with the Abberly development.

Mr. Apicella: So, so one of the unique aspects of a UD-4 development is it does require some commercial to help offset the residential component, is that correct?

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, does not necessarily require it, but it does recommend it under the UD-4 district. Because it is proposed as a mixed use, it does not require it, though, but staff did work with the applicant to ensure we were getting a commercial component with the UD district.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: We just don't know when. Okay. On the sidewalks, I don't know if you can tell this from the slide deck that you have, where, where are the sidewalks going to be? Or at least in terms of Route 1.

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, are you inquiring about sidewalks along roadways or internal sidewalks for the project?

Mr. Apicella: Along roadways. So there's a proffer of \$29,000, again, not a lot, but where would it start, where would it end?

Ms. Taylor: As far as what the applicant is constructing, or where the sidewalk with the proffered monetary contribution...?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, is the applicant constructing any sidewalk?

Ms. Taylor: They are constructing sidewalk. They are going to be redoing, reconstructing the sidewalk along that northern portion of the site. So there is an existing portion of sidewalk here. The applicant will be realigning that sidewalk and constructing along their frontage, their entire frontage there across the front of the site. If you see, it does come right here and up into the project, and it does come out of the project and along the remaining frontage, they skip over the Cavalier Family Skating Center, and then there is no sidewalk along that vacant portion of the site that they are not developing. So the developed portion of the site will receive sidewalk along Route 1.

Mr. Apicella: And they're constructing it.

Ms. Taylor: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: So the \$29,000 is over and above what...

Ms. Taylor: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: So what is the \$29,000 for?

Ms. Taylor: The \$29,000 was for the intent of constructing sidewalk along – Stacie, can you get rid of that pop up? Thank you – constructing that sidewalk along the vacant, the vacant portion of the site. That triangular piece on the southern portion of Route 1, where no sidewalk will be constructed at this time, the 29,000 was intended in conjunction with the right-of-way dedication along Route 1 to achieve sidewalk in that location at a later date.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, again, math not being my forte, based on the cost estimate we're talking about somewhere between 12 and 15 feet of sidewalk.

Ms. Taylor: Essentially, yes, based on information we've received from Capital Improvements.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Was there any consideration by the applicant to support sidewalks along Hospital Boulevard?

Ms. Taylor: The applicant did indicate comments were provided to the applicant regarding a request by Supervisor Bohmke regarding sidewalks along Hospital Center Boulevard. They did indicate that they

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

reached out to Medicorp. Obviously, they do not own that piece of property along Hospital Center, and they indicated that additional right-of-way would be necessary in order to achieve or construct sidewalk in that location. They did reach out to Medicorp, but apparently did not get any response indicating that they were agreeable to allowing them to acquire the additional right-of-way. I would have to defer to the applicant regarding any further correspondence or communication with the hospital.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And again, just focusing on sidewalks, Potomac Church, where, where would, where would that be if they were providing \$50,000 for sidewalks? Where would that start? Where would that end? In theory.

Ms. Taylor: Chairman Apicella, again, staff did make a request for them to provide sidewalk along Old Potomac Church Road. The \$50,000 that they are proffering, we don't know how much that may achieve. It's intended to go towards sidewalk in that location or any other improvement. The intent was that they would potentially provide sidewalk along their frontage. The applicant did indicate at one point, though, during the review process that they were not providing an access point to Old Potomac Church. Therefore they didn't feel that, you know, sidewalk was absolutely necessary in that location in conjunction with the steep slopes in that location as well, so.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that's it for me, for now. Any other questions for staff? Thank you very much. Would the applicant lot to come forward.

Mr. Payne: Lots of paper shuffling. My apologies. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission. My name is Charlie Payne. I represent the applicant. It's always a pleasure to be in Stafford County, and I appreciate your time this evening. And thank you. Amy did an excellent job describing the project, and I will add some additional information, hopefully answer some questions that the Planning Commission has already asked or you may ask me. So I appreciate that. I'm just sort of kicking this off before we jump into the slides and I heard some, some conversation about some of the multi-family projects that are in Stafford County, legacy and the newer projects. I think it's important to note, in the past 20 years there has been four, four market rate, not age-restricted, but four market rate apartment complexes that have been approved by the county. The late, the last one was Mainline off of Warrenton Road, which was done in 2022. And of the legacy projects, many of them are three- and some four-bedroom. When the legacy projects were built, they were built obviously to serve many of the military families that lived in Stafford County, that had family members or they couldn't afford to live into a single-family home, or there wasn't a single-family home available. So multi-family was, you know, back in those days, was certainly something that did serve families. The more modern projects do not, and we'll get into a little more detail about that and why. So just real quick about the applicant, Bonaventure Development. They are a renowned developer of multi-family projects. They're not the commercial developer of this component of the UD-4 zoning, but I'll get into that a little bit as well. They have projects in the area, including in Spotsylvania County. And of course, we are proffering that the project will be in substantial accordance with the Attain at Spotsy Town Center. I know that Mr. Shelton had an opportunity to visit the site, and Mr. Apicella couldn't make it. I think he got injured when we invited him, so that he got out of it. I know staff had been there as well. It's a very nice quality site. If you think about the mall where the old Sears used to be, they tore the Sears down and rebuilt roughly 300 units? Is that what's there as well? So it's very similar. And the amenities are very similar as well. So just real quick, as you can see, of all their 22 total projects, 25 year track record, and again, they do have a strong local presence, excuse me, of over 4,447 units total built over a billion dollar development cost investment, and they are teaming with the property owner Powell and Associates, who owns the commercial component of this project, and it was noted earlier, I don't know if it was Mr. Apicella or someone else, that, you know, the unique opportunity about UD-4, even though it's not

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

required, is you do get a commercial mix. Given that Stafford is looking at the courthouse area as the sort of new center, if you will, of Stafford County, having that mix is going to be really important to, I think, the future of what the sort of Stafford Downtown looks like, and we want that to happen here for sure. So staff had noted the project does consist of roughly 24 acres in total. It's five parcels. It, they are all zoned A-1. It is located, as staff had noted, as you can see here in this aerial along Richmond Highway to its west and Old Potomac Church Road to its east and Hospital Center Boulevard to its north and South Campus Boulevard to its south. And as staff had noted, also, there are several variety of uses, compatible uses in the, in the immediate area, including the Abberly multi-family project, which is just to the immediate south of this location. The project is also located within the County's Highway Corridor Overlay District and is within your Courthouse Small Area Plan, which encourages high density mix of residential development and commercial uses. As I noted earlier in my, in the beginning of my presentation, there, there's not a whole lot of market rate inventory. There is the most recent approved project at JPI Fountain, which I think was roughly 200 units. Abberly was built in 2013 or approved in 2013, I think finished in 2015 Michael, does that sound right? And it has 288 units. Of that, six of the units are three-bedroom. So if you think about what they're generating from a school- age perspective, and this was built close to 10 years ago, they're only generating 26 kids, and they have six three-bedroom units, and we have zero. We have all one- and two-bedroom units. I think that, I think that tells a story that supports our position, based on our history, that these projects don't generate a lot of school-age kids. The project will also have commercial out-parcels. We have a minimum of roughly 20,000 square feet, and we can go up to 50,000 square feet, and all that's been included, Ms. Caudill, in our traffic study as well, which we've capped, obviously, on the number of trips. The minimum open space of 25% we've also proffered, it likely is going to be more. I know Ms. Barnes likes more open space, and she likes, likes the landscaping, so we're going to make sure we satisfy her the best we can. And we also proffered some amenities, and I'll get into that, but you're basically looking at pickleball courts, which everyone loves, outdoor pool, an 8,000 square foot clubhouse. I mean, this is a mega clubhouse with a fitness center, dog park. You'll also note, and you'll see in our concept plan that I'll show you, there's lots of internal sidewalks, lots of pedestrian access internally. We do want people to go externally, but we want them to go north. There's nowhere to go south right now. So we'll get into a little bit about that in regards to sidewalks and pedestrian access and other issues.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Does your property in Spotsylvania, does it have three-bedroom apartments?

Mr. Payne: I think it does.

Ms. Sellers: And the one in Richmond, there's one, I don't know if it's called Broad Street, I think it's you guys on Broad Street. Does it have three-bedroom apartments?

Mr. Payne: Most of the projects do, but this one doesn't.

Ms. Sellers: And so is it Stafford that seems to not want three-bedroom apartments?

Mr. Payne: Well, I think it's where the market's been trending for a very long time. I mean, three bedrooms, it's not that we're trying to discourage all kids, but you're creating an environment that's not kid friendly. I mean, you know, you don't have tot lots, and you don't have, you know, it's a very adult, young adult oriented resort fueled facility.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Ms. Sellers: Yeah. It's just, just very interesting. I mean, even when I was a Supervisor, it was always we don't want kids, we don't want kids, we don't want kids. And, you know, we're still saying that, and it's just very hard for me to hear that, that this county, we are not a kid, we are not a family friendly county, and I hear young adults. I was a young adult here, and there's nothing for young adults to do here, either. So it's just a very interesting...

Mr. Payne: There's nowhere for them to live, either. That's the other issue. So, you know, you're trying to attract young school teachers here. If you're a school system, you want a variety of housing inventory that where they, young school teachers can live, or young professionals can live, and they don't have children typically, right? And they team up with another school teacher. But you got a lot of kids in Stafford County, let's not get that wrong. You got single-family homes people live in, and townhomes where you got a lot of single, where you have a lot of kids. And if you just look at, and Ms. Barnes made a point, and not that I want to correct her, but we do, we do pay more than \$5,600 plus per unit. You got to remember, we're paying a million up front with the first CO, so, and then the remainder is five plus. So we're well over \$8,000 per unit for school-aged kids. And we're all in with, with the public safety. We're well over 10 grand. That's the highest, I can't tell you the last time I had a single-family detached project in Stafford County, what was over 10 grand. What's driving it is the school cost. So when we trip the capacity on an elementary school or a high school, we've got to take into account the average school cost per pupil. So your school cost went skyrocketed during high inflation period. Your new high school cost about \$184 thou... \$184 million, okay. Your new elementary school is trending at \$68 million, if my memory serves me, round or about. That's a big number, right? So we got to apply that number to what our impact is, and that's what, that's what's picking up the number. The school system, I get why they're using legacy numbers. Better to fall on the side of high versus low. I get it, but that's not what we're generating. And I think we've proven to staff, and hopefully we'll prove to you that that's not what we're going to generate here. Just across the street is 20, we're 20 units over what's across the street, and we have no three-bedrooms. So just think about that.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, and it's not, I'm not putting this on you guys, I think it's more of just sitting here for a little while now and hearing it, and the realization of, you know, we really are putting out there that we are not family friendly. And especially if you need to live in a multi-family or you choose to live in a multi-family situation, Stafford is not open to you, and that's a really harsh reality. So it's not you guys. I think it's more of the message that Stafford County is putting out and has been putting out for at least 15 years now, so. Not to you guys and not to staff, but definitely something that leadership here in Stafford County, elected leadership need to maybe think about. So that's just my perspective.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Ms. Sellers.

Mr. Payne: Yep, the market's telling us something different. The market is telling us that young, young teachers, young first responders, young government employees, young professionals, need somewhere to live in Stafford, and you're growing in that regard, which is good, because you have a diverse population. Here is the the concept plan, which I noted earlier. You can see lots of landscaping, Ms. Barnes. I want to make sure we got that covered. And you're right. The open space area for the stormwater management, it will have water, I guess, for the most part, but at times it won't have water obviously. You'll see, as staff noted, we will improve the sidewalks to the north of our site, going south from the skating rink to – I have to, have to admit, I have been to the skating rink when they had 80s night with my kids, and I did not do very well like I did in high school, so don't try it. It was, it was a failed exercise, so don't do it.

Ms. Sellers: Was it open when you were a kid?

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Payne: But... no, it wasn't open when I was a kid, but I took my kids and I made a huge mistake. I paid for it for for a week. But anyways, so sidewalks will be improved on the, you know, on the northeast side, going. We did, we did look at potentially doing sidewalks to the south. The issues there are, as you all know, Route 1 is going to be expanded. There's also a bunch of utilities in that area that have to be relocated, not just where we are, but all the way further south. So when they expand that area, plus we have no use for that particular area. We have no residents coming from there, and I'm not sure why, who's going to be walking on Route 1 anyways to come that way or south. So, that's right. So we don't think it was a good idea to do it. So we did proffer some money, and the money took, you know, when we look at it, we look at what's the hard cost for the sidewalk itself. Plus we did, thank you, Ms. Sellers, we did dedicate right-of-way as well, along Route 1.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Payne, Mr. Bratton has a question.

Mr. Payne: I'm sorry, Mr. Bratton.

Mr. Bratton: Question. So if I'm driving south on Richmond Highway...

Mr. Payne: Yep.

Mr. Bratton: ... how can I turn left into the complex?

Mr. Payne: You just take...

Mr. Bratton: *Inaudible*... a U-turn or something. How would I do?

Mr. Payne: Oh, there's a, there's a left turn going on South Campus if you're going south, just like you're going to Abberly. And then you take, you would take a left into the site off South Campus.

Mr. Bratton: So the main entrance to get there is on South Campus Road that's not built yet.

Mr. Payne: South Campus is an entrance, and also off Route 1. So if you're going north off Route 1, you can take a right into the entrance.

Mr. Bratton: I'm talking about, I'm coming south.

Mr. Payne: You're coming south.

Mr. Bratton: There's essentially no way to get there from Route 1 going south.

Mr. Payne: I don't show the access, but you go down to South Campus...

Unknown speaker, inaudible, microphone not on.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, South Campus is open. You take a left into South Campus.

Ms. Barnes: You can get there from Hospital Center Boulevard, too.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, you can come off Old Potomac Church Road as well.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Bratton: All right.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, that left turn lane is there right now. So two main buildings. There's 300 total units. Well, also you can see the commercial pad sites that face Route 1. Like I said, we have internal sidewalks, parallel parking, the concept of UD-4, UD anything is to have sort of a street grid concept, urban concept internally which we have. The Old Potomac Church side of this, there's a, there's a significant steep slope difference between where the right-of-way area is and where our site is. It's like 20 feet grade difference. So it makes zero sense to put a sidewalk on there when our folks can't even access it. So we contributed cash towards improvements to Old Potomac Church Road, Mr. Chairman, not just to the sidewalk, so, and dedicated right-of-way as well for that. And that's the big issue with Old Potomac Church Road, is there isn't adequate right-of-way. So we also dedicated right-of-way there as well. On the Hospital Center Boulevard, and remember, all of our residents, through our internal network system, sidewalk system, can get to the sidewalk on one, to cross over if they need to go towards the hospital or anywhere else. There's a pedestrian crosswalk right there at the intersection of Hospital Center Boulevard and Route 1. And on the Hospital Center Boulevard question, we don't own the property in front of us that adjoins the right-of-way, the road that's owned by the hospital. We have inquired by the hospital to determine whether or not we could get right-of-way to build a sidewalk, and of course, we need to evaluate what that would cost as well, because there are utility lines both underground and above ground that need to be evaluated. So we're, we're in the process of working with them to see if there's an opportunity to do it. In the past, the hospital has been reluctant to dedicate that right-of-way.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton has a question.

Mr. Shelton: The stormwater management area, is that going to be fenced off?

Mr. Payne: John? Yes.

Mr. Shelton: And will it be underground, or will it be above ground storage?

Unknown speaker: It would be above ground.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Above ground, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Apicella: So, so back on the sidewalk issue. Given what you said about the the south parcel...

Mr. Payne: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: ... and the unlikelihood that there's going to be a need for a sidewalk anytime in the near future, I wonder if we could look at that proffer and maybe make it more flexible on how that money could be used. Right now, it's specifically for sidewalk along the frontage of Route 1.

Mr. Payne: You're correct. Yeah, we, we should have built some flexibility in there, or it should be for or other transportation improvements in the immediate area. Happy, happy to make that adjustment.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, okay, great.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Payne: In architectural features, building materials, if you haven't been out to the Attain at Spotsy Town Center, I encourage you go out. In fact, I'm sure my client would be happy to give you a tour. It's going to be substantially similar to this, you know, maybe variations in colors and certain features and things like that. But it, we've proffered this, this exact architectural feature and building materials. Our prior proffer said we had, we had an elevation general depiction, and we wanted to make sure we drilled down, drill that down a little bit, because the intent is to basically build the same thing here. So, just getting into cash proffers for schools and public safety, and Ms. Barnes did raise some good, good points, and I just want to make sure we were clear about what we're doing here. All in we're at \$3,135,000 that's over \$10,717,000 per unit. Schools alone are \$2.6 million plus. We have proffered to pay \$1 million of that \$2.6 million at the first CO, and then to pay the remainder \$1.6 plus million per unit as it's, as it earns a CO. Typically in Stafford, what happens is the building and all the units get a CO at the same time. So you get all those proffers, basically, you know, pretty much up front. So you get them sooner rather than later and have to wait over time like you would for a single-family detached project. Public safety, we proffered over \$508,000, and Ms. Barnes, that's based on the impact analysis to the fire station that is serving us. That's what we're required to look at under State Code, and that's what we evaluated. Sidewalks we just talked about. We're happy to change the proffer on the \$29,000 plus, and then the \$50,000 also to help support Old Potomac Church Road plus the dedication of right-of-way that we have there. And Mr. Apicella had asked like where would these sidewalks be located if they were built, and here's a depiction of that for your review. The blue shaded area is the area that's owned by the hospital along Hospital Boulevard there – Hospital Center Boulevard, sorry. Student generation. And again, we've talked about this already, but our analysis shows we generate about 0.159 students per unit, and that's based on the history, five year history of many similar projects that we have. Again, we've got 22 projects, lots of, lots of history, lots of experience in dealing with residents and children at the, at these facilities. And again, the Waterstone apartments only have 28 school-aged kids. So again, I think that further supports what we're promoting here. And also we have no three-bedrooms, which is, if you can, we're the only, we're probably the only apartment project in Stafford County without three-bedrooms for, for market rate apartments. Proffers, again, no more than 300 residential units permitted on the property. The property will not be developed for certain commercial UD-4 uses. And I'll, just if you haven't had a chance to look at the proffer statement, the excluded uses are under Section 2, and I'd say it's a list of, I'd say close to 20. Assisted Living Facility, we proffered out club, school, parking lot, auction establishment, medical/dental, veterinarian hospital, industrial flex, wholesale trade establishment, motel, and vehicle service. So those things are actually allowed under UD-4 s we've proffered those out. We really want to focus on retail and office. Office is sort of dead, but I think smaller office is actually a little more marketable. And, you know, sit down restaurants, which everybody wants in Stafford. Yes, ma'am?

Ms. Barnes: Is there any particular reason why we didn't phase that in, say that the, what was the, the project is on 610? They can't build a certain number of apartments until a certain square footage of commercial is built. And that way it kind of forces your hand, because we have some experience with residential and commercial, one side getting done and the other not.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, so, I mean, it's a good question. It's a, but it's also, the reality is, the market drives the commercial. And, you know, our thinking is the more concentration of residential we have, you know, including our units, you know, we could have, if you think about it, let's say just two people per unit, that's 600 additional, you know, people in the immediate area, it's going to help drive the commercial in the, you know, in the, in the courthouse area. Remember that when we build the multi-family apartments, we're building all of the infrastructure to support the commercial. So it's not like the commercial won't be pad site ready. It will be ready. It will have all the parking. It will have all the access roads, internal roads, ready to go. So it, with the entitlement and with that in place, it should be very marketable for

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

commercial use. But Ms. Barnes, that is sort of the challenge for any developer, is if the market's not there, they're not going to go there. That's just a reality. Even if we build a shell and no one shows up, it doesn't do anyone any good. A vacant, a vacant property is unmarketable as it can be, especially if it's a new property. Now, if it's something that someone wants to come in and build something the ground up and, you know, to meet their particular need, that is much more marketable. And I think with these apartments being next door, and with now, you're starting to see a concentration, Abberly, and then if the age-restricted project is approved by the Board, and you've got another age-restricted project, and then you've got JPI, now you're getting some concentration I think they'll be attractive. The other thing we're competing with is Burns Corner, you know, when it comes to retail, so, and food. So, but I think people who want to walk and not have to get in their car are going to, are going to demand that, that those commercial uses be in place.

Mr. Apicella: You understand where we're coming from though.

Mr. Payne: I get it.

Mr. Apicella: Which is why I asked the question, how much in taxes will we and that doesn't include meal taxes.

Mr. Payne: Right.

Mr. Apicella: If it ends up being a restaurant, \$100,000 to \$120,000, that's real money.

Mr. Payne: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: So unless and until...

Mr. Payne: Yeah, but remember, the apartments will assess higher from real estate tax perspective than the commercial, right. The commercial has the ability to generate additional taxes with less impacts. We're going to have impacts, right, on county services with the residential but the assessment will be much higher. It's like double what the commercial would be. But the commercial gets to generate personal property tax in addition to real estate tax and sales tax and lodging, I mean, food tax. So that's the difference, and that's where it gets a little more even. But remember, once it's rezoned from A-1 to the UD-4 for commercial use, the real estate tax assessment on that site, even for undeveloped land, goes up, it doesn't go down, right. So you will get a positive return, even just on the rezoning itself. Amenities – everyone loves pickleball courts. They're everywhere. A pool...

Mr. Apicella: Just to put it out there, the pickleball courts, they're not close to the apartments. They're not close to any residency.

Mr. Payne: That's right.

Mr. Apicella: They're kind of a distance away.

Mr. Payne: They're a football field away.

Mr. Apicella: Not going to hear the...

Mr. Payne: That's right.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Payne: Exactly. We don't want to get into it, noise issue of pickleball, right. I mean, the data center can be, it'll have to be quieter than the pickleball. But I digress. We are, speaking of data centers, providing notices to residents regarding the nearby data center use. And again, the project will be restricted to one- and two-bedroom units only. And someone had asked about the Peake property; that's for sale, we're acquiring it. And of course, that access road will be improved into the site.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill? Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Evans.

Ms. Evans: I think you may answer this, since you put this page up, but will these apartments have solar panels like the ones that you're showing?

Mr. Payne: Have you planned to put solar panels on it?

Unknown speaker in audience: To be determined. It's unclear... *inaudible, not at microphone.*

Ms. Evans: Okay.

Mr. Payne: As you can see, though, they, they do, they do provide solar panels on all the other projects. Site access – again, I think Mr. Bratton had asked this question, along Richmond Highway, and then also the second access off of South Campus Boulevard. Transportation improvements will include off of South Campus Boulevard, construct access from the property, provide one inbound right turn taper. It's 100 feet and 100 feet of storage on the westbound approach to South Campus. So coming west on South Campus you'll have a 100-foot taper and a 100-foot storage to turn into it, take a right turn into the site, and then we're dedicating right-of-way along Route 1, and then also on Old Potomac Church Road. And then also we're constructing, and this is important, Ms. Sellers, for future improvements at the intersection of Route 1 and Hospital Center Boulevard. It's the construction of two concrete medians within the Richmond Highway area prior to the issuance of the first CO. So both to block the north and south bound lanes so people aren't crossing over. Hopefully they don't do that, but I think they are at times, so that, that's something that had been planned as part of future improvements in the immediate area. And we did cap the trips based on our traffic analysis at 2,935 trips, vehicle trips per day. And fiscal, I talked a little bit about it on the assessed value for the apartments. But at the end of the day, we're looking to generate a positive \$519,770 at full buildout. The tax revenue expected to be over \$1.2 million each year. And here's the real and personal property breakdown. And again, during construction, you'll have positive jobs as well. And we got support from the hospital. I know that they've been encouraging multi-family uses in a particular near the hospital so their employees can live there and easily walk to and from work. And people visiting family members who are at the hospital as well, who may have relatives who live at the, at the multi-family facility. But thought I'd share that with you, and I'm happy to answer any questions, and if I didn't answer questions you had before, I'm sorry. I'll answer them if you repeat them.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Questions for the applicant?

Mr. Payne: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Seeing no questions, I'll now open the public hearing on this matter. It's an opportunity to put the public to comment on this particular item. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So anyone would like to speak on this item, please come forward now.

Ms. Callander: Excuse me. Elaine Callander. Oh, let's see, do you need my address or just my district? Falmouth District. First I want to say that I tried to access information about this hearing on the website, and every time I opened the background report, a little thing popped up said, reload. That happened to me several times over the past two days. I never really read the report online. I do thank you for the thorough presentation tonight, and you asked a number of pertinent questions. I'm having to talk off the top of my head because I couldn't prepare in advance. We've been waiting for a Downtown Stafford. And in fact, I go back to about 1990 when Charter Communities talked about a Downtown Stafford. That never happened. So I'm always glad to have these kind of projects come up. I think this is well thought out from what I've been able to determine. I think apartments at that location are appropriate. It can service hospital workers, teachers, government workers, our local government workers. So I like the idea. I think that when I hear talk about open space and landscaping, that's important to me. I go back to the first Earth Day, as well as this gentleman earlier mentioned. So considering the environmental impacts is very important. I would like to see a bus stop there and expanded sidewalks. I caught a news item this morning, a survey done of Gen Z, and it said that one in five feel a part of a community. So we need to build a community that can serve younger folks as well as families and seniors. So I think this is a good project for Mike from what I can tell, and so I am in favor of this going forward. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? Welcome back, Ms. Brown.

Ms. Brown: Well, thank you. Dana Brown. I am no longer a Stafford resident, but I'm actually here...

Mr. Apicella: Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. Brown: ... to pay Stafford taxes tomorrow. I'm still in the loop here on that. So is it appropriate for me to speak on this?

Mr. Apicella: That's fine.

Ms. Brown: Okay. First of all, I think Stafford needs more housing. That particular parcel, I don't know what A-1 use would be appropriate for that. That's kind of a not a good zone there for that. I spoke with Abberly today. I have a daughter that still lives here. Abberly is currently at 96% capacity. They have one two-bedroom coming up in the next six weeks. So there's not a lot of availability there. I do disagree a little bit on the three-bedroom, two-bedroom bringing the kids thing. I believe the two-bedrooms are going to be bringing kids and families. And I think we should go on the 300 you know, apartment units, I don't think two-thirds should be two-bedrooms. We need more one-bedrooms and maybe even some studios. Then you might get two-year teacher housing, because right now, this is luxury housing. I looked at the Attain website and I spoke with them down in Spotsylvania, and they aren't advertised as luxury apartments. The two-bedrooms start, and I mean, the minimum price of the two-bedrooms is \$2,180 a month. On top of that, there's a mandatory facility fee, internet fee, and trash fee of \$135 bringing the total minimum to \$2,315 for the bare minimum two-bedroom. Again... also, before I forget, too, the commercial. I have been living here for a long time, and I do know of the dead zones of these empty commercial pads. I would ask them to start the commercial, but I would not want to see a bunch of empty pads, because that's going to look like a dead zone and look like we, you know, can't get our

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

stuff together there. Hopefully the applicant would be willing to make some changes. Again, step down on some of the two-bedrooms, put in some studios, some one-bedrooms. And, uh, let's see – I think that's pretty much it. But we do need some affordable housing, and luxury apartments is not it. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Brown. Other comments?

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. I'm right across from South Campus Boulevard. I can verify that the reload error of not being able to open the Attain agenda was occurring for the public when I tried to access it. This is the fault of the dependency with Stafford and the public on make, on online access. The Attain GIS address is 1924 Richmond Highway. However, this address is not listed for history reference in this study. The Exhibit A through E is spotty and cannot be followed by alfa exhibit search. So the reference is difficult to follow. As example, fiscal analysis dated July 25, 2024, is dedicated to the Stafford Hospital and not to Attain project. There is much confusion to this project. As example, LLC, reference change to Inc. in ownership, but not updated in the current Stafford parcel database. Traceability is for the Inc. is not recorded with the tax map report. Traffic, April 2024, demo project number 22627 is for the Hospital Center Boulevard, multiple family and not labeled as Attain project. Is the two studies the same? The application contained in the agenda has no project name, project number, or tax map number, with the signatures following and a notary stamp contained. This is odd. Page 339 of 388. Proffer analysis is for the Stafford Hospital residential development, and does not include the Attain name. And I believe that's February 22, 2024. Also see Utilities B under the impact analysis. Here it is stated, please see sheet six of the master plan. There... this is an error. There are so many versions of the Attain master project. One has four pages, one has seven pages, and the agenda contains nine pages. The page... the one in the agenda can't be found on the web study. Which master plan will be the main project study received by this search routine? All have the same date assignment. Sewer gravity project will connect to the sanitary sewer line T in the intersection of Jumping Branch Road and Route 1. That is part of the Accokeek regional pump station infrastructure. Onsite easement will be replaced by applicant and/or by owner. This is... there's no reference to who that owner or applicant is. And I'm...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much.

Ms. Maxson: ... out of time. I want to thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Is there anyone else who'd like to offer public comments on this item? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing, bring it back to the Commission. I'm sorry. I need to give Mr. Payne an opportunity to respond first.

Mr. Payne: I just got to say, I think I really don't need a vote from anyone tonight, because Alaine supports my project. It's the greatest goal! I can't believe it!

Mr. Apicella: Put that one down for the history books, right.

Mr. Payne: I'm just kidding. But your question about the proffer actually is in the proffer, I missed it. If you look at 6(c)iii, it says, Notwithstanding the foregoing provision of this proffer, of this proffer 6(c)(i) -(ii), the County may apply these funds towards other transportation capital improvement projects in the immediate area if not otherwise applied to the aforesaid transportation improvements. So there's a third prong that says you can apply it to whatever you want to apply to.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Can I ask you a quick question?

Mr. Payne: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Where's the nearest Fred bus stop?

Mr. Payne: The hospital maybe?

Mr. Apicella: So it's close.

Mr. Payne: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Payne: We talked to Fred. They did not want... they were not interested in locating a site because they didn't want to meander through our...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, you can walk. One other quick question. So you've capped the number of two-bedroom units, but you really haven't decided what your allocation of one- or two-bedroom units, so you could have more than a hundred one-bedroom units.

Mr. Payne: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: Does that also preclude you from doing studio apartments?

Mr. Payne: No.

Mr. Apicella: No. So, so you could have a mix...

Mr. Payne: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: ... but not three-bedroom apartments.

Mr. Payne: We just see the market, we just want some flexibility, because we think the market is attractive to single people who work... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: No, I understand. I'm just saying that studio apartments and more one-bedroom apartments can happen...

Mr. Payne: That's right.

Mr. Apicella: ... irrespective of the... *inaudible*.

Mr. Payne: Absolutely, yeah.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, I'm gonna bring this back to the Commission, and I'm gonna pass the baton to Mr. Shelton since this is in the Falmouth District.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you, Mr. Apicella. Since this is in your district, where would you like to proceed?

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. I would like to make a motion recommending approval of the reclassification from A-1 to the UD-4 district for the project called Attain at Stafford.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Shelton: I have a motion and a second. Discussion?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton, I'd like to offer the following comments. So I'm supporting this project for the following reasons. Stafford's Comprehensive Plan recommends over 3,000 multi-family apartments in the Courthouse UDA. So far, only a limited number of apartments have been approved and constructed thus far, well below the 3,000. So at the current pace, we really need to step up in terms of apartments in this area to accommodate the additional population growth over the next decade. The project is in a good location. It will bring the County 10% closer to the Comp Plan projections. It's based largely on a similar project in Spotsy and appears to me to be a very high quality complex with lots of popular amenities for its residents. While I am concerned about the number of students and the significant delta and projected numbers between the applicant and the school system, the applicant has proffered that there will be no three-bedroom units. I believe this limitation will mitigate the number of residential students generated from this project. I do hope that we'll get the 57,000 square feet of commercial sooner rather than later, which I think is an important component of the UD-4 district. And while the application makes its way forward, I hope the applicant will work with the Board and the hospital on potential additional sidewalk improvements in the area. And I'm also going to add that since Ms. Elaine Callander is in support, it's all the more reason for me to support this project.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I'm going to support it as well. I think it's a good project in North Stafford. We need, we do need more affordable housing, attainable housing. I don't know what the terminology is, but we need more, we need more housing. I don't really like the argument of we need to limit children and families. I've heard it for a long time and saying that kids are expensive. And I've said it when I was on the Board, it's just as expensive to close schools as it is to open schools. And so using that argument has never sat well with me. We need to build a community. We need to welcome people. And, you know, I would have been just as happy seeing more three-bedroom apartments in here because we do need them, and this area is growing. I also see it as when you look at the opportunities for state funding for grants from Economic Development perspective, they look at projects like this. So it may seem like you're going to lose money on the, on the project from the County perspective, but it does set us up to go after grants that we see Spotsylvania get every year. And it's because they have these UD type projects throughout their county. And it saddens me that we're comparing ourselves to Spotsylvania County, but it is what it is. So I will be supporting it. I think it's a good project. I'm happy to see the courthouse area finally starting to take off, so it's a good project. Thanks.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Shelton: Thank you, Ms. Sellers. Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: I actually don't have a comment. I will support it, especially since I live in Falmouth. But I think that I can agree with Ms. Sellers. We should not be saying, you know, like kids aren't welcomed here. So with that, I will say I do support it, though.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: I don't have any, any comments. I, I do but I don't so I'm just gonna, I'm just gonna pass it on.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Well I always have something to say so. This is, when I look at this, this is a decent project, and there's always going to be upsides and downsides to any project. And one of the things that really grabbed my attention is when I look at the Comprehensive Plan, one of the chapters, and I'll quote it, it says, Exploding housing growth creating an imbalance of residential to commercial development can have the effect of decreasing acceptable levels of public services and increasing county debt. So when I look at a project like that, this is what comes to mind. Stafford County has a, a huge deficit in commercial bases for taxes. I think that's about to change. I think that we've got a new chapter coming up, we've got some big projects coming up with hopefully some great revenue streams. But until that happens, I'm afraid that although these projects, oftentimes they're good projects, and we may want them and we may need them, but unfortunately we can't afford them. And when I take a look at the Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, very specifically, lists how much in capital cost different kinds of projects cost us. And when you look under multi-family, it says \$77,351 per unit. Now, even if we took the education or the schools out of that, you could subtract \$10,915 and that gets you to \$66,436 per unit times 300 units, and it comes to about \$19,930,000, \$20 million. Now I know that that's not, that's not a reasonable request from the County, but it does go to show that we're in a bad way when it comes to our infrastructure in Stafford County right now. And I am very hopeful that that's going to change very soon, but it hasn't changed. And, like I said, we may want, we may need, but unfortunately, in my opinion, we just can't afford these right now. I look forward to a time when we can. I agree with some of the speakers that I would like to see, oddly enough, these look like some luxury apartments, I would like to see some more one-bedrooms, even some studios. I have a neighbor that just moved from my hometown, San Diego, and when they moved here they had to wait a while. And they've got a couple of kids and what did they do? They rented an apartment, and that is becoming more and more common. So I, you know, just obviously this is just my experience, I think we might be seeing an uptick in apartments that have kids in them because there's, there's an inventory issue with single-family dwellings which a lot of families are looking for so. I see two-bedrooms as having a distinct possibility of having children in them; three-bedrooms of course more. And it's not that we don't want children. I mean, that's not that we don't want, it's just that, right now, I'm not really sure that we can handle them, not that we could ever really handle kids in general on an individual basis. But, you know, they've even said, and if you listen to the School Board, when those, when those two new elementary school 18 and 19 open up, and high school number 6 open up, it's estimated that those, that those schools will be full. And, you know, with a project that, that's going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money in infrastructure and with things like schools and fire rescue and transportation and law enforcement and government services, we still don't have a new courthouse. I think they're doing cases in here now. So not to repeat myself, it's a good project. If it does go forward and it gets built, I think it'll be a decent addition. And if Ms. Callander is, is voting up, boy, that turned my head. I got to tell

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

you that's that's one for history right there. But unfortunately, because of those things, I won't be supporting the project. Thank you.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you. Carlos?

Mr. Bratton: Yes, I do have a couple comments. There's, me working at Quantico, there's nowhere for marine officers to really stay at. So I think this is a good opportunity for Marine Officers that go to TBS, or just anybody that goes to marine schools that are here for TBA for six months at a time, to have somewhere to stay at. I think that's what will help that, help the Marines have somewhere to stay. I do like the idea, like, there's no apartments in Stafford, but I just don't like the idea y'all cutting corners with the sidewalks. Like that's supposed to be like downtown. We say it's going to happen, it's going to happen, and then we wait 10 years from now, it's going to be 2.5 now, 10 years now, it's going to be double the cost, and every way, it's going to be double the cost. So I'm for the project, I'm for it. I just kind of hope y'all put the sidewalks in. How you can have a luxury apartments with no sidewalks, it's kind of contradiction. And then, um, you have to re-evaluate the left, that turn onto Route 1, Richmond Highway, because they have the same similar type turnway on 7-Eleven and everybody's doing U-turns to get in there. They don't go to the light and turn and do that whole go all the way up to Sheetz and come back down to 7-Eleven; they just bust that illegal turn right there in getting there. So this, those are things y'all need to look at, but I'm still for it.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you. I'd like to comment on the fact that I had the pleasure of going with Ms. Taylor and Mr. Zuraf to look at the Attain at Spotsylvania. And as a person who deals with fire protection engineering for about 45 years, I was thoroughly impressed with the life safety amenities; fully sprinkled, standpipe, smoke detectors, elevator access, exits were well illuminated. Construction, a type five construction is, is well attuned to that type of structure, so I'm going to be fully supportive also. Any additional questions? Let's call for the question. All in favor. All opposed. Make your marks. Tally. Looks like we have a 5 to 2 (*Ms. Caudill and Ms. Barnes opposed*), so it passes. Mr. Chair, you got your gavel back.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. Congratulations to the applicant. Moving forward, there's no Unfinished Business, and there's no New Business. Planning Director's Report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

2. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, Mr. Chairman, all I have this evening is you did receive the Project Pipeline Report which identifies some of the upcoming public hearings that we that we know of at this point. And that's all I have for my report tonight.

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: I have no report at this time. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you. Subcommittee Reports - Tobacco and Vape Shop Ordinance. Ms. Sellers.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

4. Tobacco and Vape Shops Ordinance Subcommittee
Next Meeting: Monday, April 21, 2025 @ 4:00 PM; Conference Room A, First Floor

Ms. Sellers: Yes, sir. We met Monday afternoon, and you have a draft ordinance here. We kept it pretty simple, just because it's to get something in there, and it's pretty much adopts what's in the State Code, with the exception of where it can go. So you'll see on the back of the page, we are recommending pretty much what staff recommended; in the uses to put it as a conditional use in B-1 with a conditional use permit, excuse me. And then by-right in the B-2 so. Everything else is pretty much straight from State Code.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Thank you, Ms. Sellers. So my understanding is this needs to go back to the Board before it gets referred to us. We just got it tonight. Do you folks want to wait until the next meeting to take a look at it? Or do you want to go ahead and send it forward now?

Ms. Sellers: They can send it forward because they'll have to take a crack at it and then send it back.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, yeah, basically the decision for the Commission is whether you want to take a little time to, to digest the ordinance and bring it back to as Unfinished Business, or just send it on. If we send, if you, if the Commission sent it on to the to the Board, it would basically go back to the Board, and they would be, they would look at this ordinance and decide whether they're good with it, and they would vote to send it back to the Commission for a public hearing. So you'll see it again. It's a little bit of ping pong.

Mr. Apicella: So again, on this side, what's the preference? Hold on to it for two weeks, or go ahead and send it forward?

Mr. Shelton: Oh, I recommend we send it forward.

Ms. Barnes: Digested and approved.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Can I ask in sending it forward that the Board possibly gives us a chance to make additional changes once it comes back to us just in case?

Mr. Zuraf: We can put that request in.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So, I'm just gonna, I think we've got pretty much unanimous consent to send it on. All right.

Mr. Zuraf: Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: I don't have a Chairman's Report. There's no Other Business. Looks like the last item on the agenda is approval of the April 9, 2025, minutes.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

5. New TRC Submissions

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

6. April 9, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Ms. Sellers: Approval.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? That motion carries. With no other business, we are hereby adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:49 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the April 23, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.