

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

November 12, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, November 12, 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, Kelsey Caudill, Kecia Evans, Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Bratton

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Said Habibi, Ramin Sadiq, Emilie Wolfson, Shaun McLellan

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: Commissioner Caudill, present. Commissioner Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Evans?

Ms. Evans: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Bratton? Chairman, we have a quorum.

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

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that the Commission move item 7 to right before the first public hearing item. Item 7 is related to that first public hearing item.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Is there a motion to make a change to the agenda as requested?

Ms. Sellers: Motion.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right, we'll just do this by voice vote. Everybody in favor say aye.

All Members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. All right, I'll now open the Public Presentation portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to three minutes to comment on any matter except the three public hearing items on tonight's agenda. There'll be a separate opportunity to comment when those items come up. This is not an interactive conversation. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if anyone would like to come forward and speak on any item except the public hearing items, please come forward now. All right.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Maxson: Hello, I'm Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District. I don't think I was late, but one one minute takes precedence. Today's agenda changes at last minute from 76.92 megabytes to 80.70 megabytes, with no time for public to review changes. It is questionable if the public has access to the new document. Motion did change for the agenda just recently, one minute before my speaking. Take note that the Kraken Loop 530 at 7p... 530 to 7pm at Rowser Building is being held at the same time as this meeting. Could this be a conflict of interest, diverting the public? The project includes building a new 70 mile, 600 kilowatts transmission line through five county, counties here with Stafford. New Potomac Creek sewer plumbing station page 298 of 469 today in agenda. And I'm not sure if the agenda matches what we see today, since it was changed, but 16-inch force STC, Stafford Technology Center to Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility. Water and sewer without 3R maintenance projects is \$840 million for the fiscal year, 226 budget, and this is for your FYI, and I am happy to serve the public. States new 11 MGD Centreport portable water pumping station, Centreport page, excuse me, page 307 of 469 today's agenda. And Centreport is located near Stafford's airport. August 27, 2025, Cranes Corner right-of-way acquisition question was defined, page 330 of 469 of today's agenda. Proffers just arrived last minute with no time of staff and public to review, and it was deferred, no answer was given to the public. This is for the project that was claimed to have no conflict on the Stafford public, along with the data center hearings. And I'm out of time. I want to thank every one of you for all your dedication. I know you do a good job.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson.

Mr. French: Good evening. My name is Kevin French. I'm from the George Washington District. I'm addressing comments tonight to item 13 on the agenda, the Utilities Commission Amendments to... or update to the Comprehensive Plan. I want to recognize a significant effort that went into preparing the 2025 Water, Sewer, and Reclaim Water Master Plan. However, as written, the plan exposes Stafford County to some new risks, and it merits careful consideration before approval. First, the plan fundamentally alters our utilities policy from growth neutral to what I believe is growth enabling. For the first time, it allows extensions of water and sewer service outside the, outside the Urban Services Area through privately financed Water Services Agreements, a tool that was never intended to drive development. This change weakens our long standing growth management policy. The utility should follow the Comprehensive Plan and not lead it. Second, the plan relies heavily on Water Services Agreements without establishing public and clear rules, reporting, and enforcement mechanisms for these documents. There's no defined limits, dashboards, or penalties if developers fail to meet

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

commitments. Without these, WSAs can become opaque financing vehicles rather than public interest tools. We urge the county to create formal performance and transparency standards around WSAs, including a public WSA dashboard, board oversight, use penalty provisions to prevent abuse and ensure compliance. Third, the plan's strong emphasis on reclaimed water for data center cooling risks privileging one industry over another. Protect Stafford supports water reuse as a sustainable measure, but not when it creates unfair incentives or diverts attention from community water resilience. We recommend that reclaim water access and pricing policies remain neutral and equitable across all sectors. Fourth, Stafford's potable water security remains a serious concern. Our reservoirs, and by extension the entire system, depend on the Rappahannock River, a drought sensitive source already stressed in recent years. The plan's assumption of sufficient yield through 2060 ignores back to back drought scenarios and competing regional withdrawals from other counties. We urge the addition of a drought resilience and demand management section, preferably before adoption. Finally, the expanded role of the Utilities Commission must include transparency safeguards; annual public reporting on all WSAs, reclaim water allocations, and any pro rata modifications. Additionally, the Utilities Commission meets quarterly. I think they're going to be tasked with doing a lot more things going forward, and I question the advisability of being of a body that meets quarterly to meet the, to meet these new demands of the of WSA oversight. In closing, we support the modernization of our utilities planning, but only if it remains transparent, growth neutral, and drought resistant. Stafford's water policy must serve all citizens fairly.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you sir.

Mr. French: Auto-function is a quiet subsidy to a single industry. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Hurley: Good evening. Can you guys hear me okay? Okay. My name is Brendan Hurley, I am a Professor of Spatial Statistics at George Washington University, and I'm a Fellow at the Harvard Center for Spatial Data Analysis. I wanted to give you guys a bit of a hit list, a rundown of some important statistics that I've compiled over the last day or two, highlighting GWV. I imagine good, hard numbers work better for some people than others. But we decided to start our analysis with a conservative and fair approach, removing from consideration all areas in the county that clearly cannot or should not be developed. These existed, existing structures and their 500-foot protective buffers, all county-owned parks and designated open spaces, the entire Quantico Marine Base, and all mapped wildlife corridors and critical habitat. Only areas in the county that did we evaluate which remained available for potential development. This ensured our findings, which I'll go through in a second, reflected not theoretical open space, but truly undeveloped and ecologically viable landscapes within Stafford County. What our analysis revealed is that the proposed GWV site represents an area of extraordinary ecological and conservation importance within what remains of the landscape. Based on current forest inventories in published paper Della Sala 2022, that single tract contains 5.3% of all remaining old growth forest in the county. In other words, over 1/20 of what little mature forest in Stafford has left will be permanently lost if this project proceeds. Further, if the GWV site is viewed as contiguous forest, chunks of forest that are touching each other, it's actually the fourth largest contiguous old growth forest in Stafford County, and the second largest among all parcels currently under review for data center development behind the Forest Lane proposal. This means the county is being asked to consider the conversion of one of its few remaining large intact forest systems in industrial scale facility. Beyond forest cover, GWV tract also encompasses one of the most substantial wetland complexes in the entire county. Within the project footprint, there are five distinct wetland patches totaling 77.27 hectares of mapped wetland area. The largest of these is 187., 189.7 acres. This wetland area by itself ranks ninth out of 703 wetland areas identified within the county. I want to wrap up by saying the GWV site does exactly what the

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Comprehensive Plan warns against. It removes a major contiguous block of forest and wetland that anchors the county's natural resilience. And in total, the GWV tract supports both forest canopy and wetland hydrology that Stafford's Comprehensive Plan identifies as foundational to the County's long term... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Hurley: Thank you.

Mr. Eastland: Good evening. Jeff Eastland from Rock Hill. I'd like to start by thanking you again for the work you do. I believe it's underrated, but it's not under appreciated. When I look at the Water Master Plan, a document that's supposed to be neutral, but it's not really. It appears to me to be a clever, subtle slight-at-hand intended to open the door for water usage for data centers later. At a recent board meeting, I pointed out that we're at a tipping point in this county. We get to decide what kind of county we want to have. Do we protect the residents? Do we protect our environment? Or do we cater to special interests? At last meetings, last month's meeting on Buc-ee's, I pointed out that we have a region that was once known for an abundance of water, and now because of usage, development, climate change, and drought, which we're starting in right now, as well as data centers, we're looking at a scarcity. The Buc-ee's project, much like some of these data center proposals, is really a train wreck for our county if you look at the comparatively small amount of financial gain when you compare it to the trade off of the exploitation of our county's resources. Money comes and goes. Destruction is permanent and irreversible. So when I look at something like a potable bridge for water to cool data centers with no end game or enforceable end game, it makes me realize that we're going to undermine our conservation. We're not going to protect our residents. And that's important, because you have sustained growth and community trust when you do that. So I would simply ask that in reviewing this, you take a good look at it, preserve the neutrality, do not preordain decision making in favor of a single, single industry, and don't extend the water sewer outside the Urban Services Area for private projects. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Azarro: Hello. Allison Azarro, GW District. I want to start on a personal note and just say that I want to thank you for hearing and acting on the information that was presented at the last joint hearing, specifically with respect to noise, and that I very much appreciate you sending forward that recommended language; that meant a lot to me. So thank you. I want to build on the comments made earlier about the forested areas in Stafford. I fully understand and appreciate that the application for the GWV data center requires more time to review. We have heard a lot from the Board of Supervisors that they want to know where it is appropriate to develop and that they are looking for best practices. Over the past months, we've definitely had some growing pains, and I think we can all sit squarely with the knowledge that there may have been things we would do differently had we known better. GWV is the fourth largest contiguous old growth forest in Stafford County. It is one of only four large mature forested areas that remain in the county. Two are in the north. There's Sherwood Forest in the GW District, and there's GWV. Six months ago, what is now the Stafford Technology Campus on Eskimo Road, was the fifth of five large remaining mature contiguous forested areas in the county, and now we have four. The standards that must be met under the conditional use permits include not changing the character of the area. If GWV is clear cut, it would change not only the character of that area and the properties adjacent to it, but the character of the entire county. The Comprehensive Plan, even in its original form, stresses the protection of mature forested areas and places of cultural significance. There is no plain reading of the GWV proposal that is in any way aligned with the Comprehensive Plan and those goals that are discussed. Of the approximately 2,000 forested fragments left in Stafford, it would

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

take 1,665 of them combined to equal what is in the GWV area. That is not a loss that the county should even consider. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Sanzero: May I ask a clarifying question before I speak?

Mr. Apicella: No, I'm sorry.

Ms. Sanzero: About public hearing speaking?

Mr. Apicella: So, you can speak on the public hearing matters as they come up. You can speak on any other item...

Ms. Sanzero: Right, if I want to speak on GWV specifically.

Mr. Apicella: Now would be the time to do it.

Ms. Sanzero: So I've got to do water and that now.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Sanzero: Okay, that's what I thought. Okay, I'll go quick then. So I want to speak about the Water Master Plan being proposed. I'm concerned first of all that it's not a growth neutral stance, that it is outgoing ahead at being very pro data center in its position in terms of putting that infrastructure in place before we have approvals. I want to focus specifically on the traditional infrastructure planning when we're talking about cooling technologies themselves that are evolving at a break neck speed. So in the interest of succinctness, we've already gone from potable to recycle to closed loop to air cooling and now to synthetic coolants. So we will see a shift even away from water to other forms of cooling, but we will be making water infrastructure changes that presume that those changes won't happen. So I want to encourage us to slow down and look at a plan that is truly growth neutral. And then with the time that I have left, I want to shift to the GWV project. I want to speak specifically to the fact that this applicant who represents both this and the Market at Austin Ridge has violated Zoning Ordinance and proffers on the land that's contested here. And I want to make sure that we're clear on that, that we have someone who has been signaled very clearly that he's not interested in being neighborly and he's not interested in pursuing the rules that the county has in place. I'm happy to share with you all the transcript from that permanent injunction where he and his attorney made multiple deviations or pivot points throughout that argument that sought to assert that what they had done was indeed legal, and then to exploit and subvert loopholes within the county ordinances in order to justify what they did. So I think this is a project that you should not approve, and I hope you will take very seriously what it is to rezone a project like that on top of residents with a developer who has made it clear, not in word but in deed, that he has no intention of doing anything other than what you will legally enforce and how enforceable that all remains. So I'll yield the rest of my time and ask you to think very seriously about both the water plan going forward and the GWV and Market at Austin Ridge projects as it pertains to a developer who's not interested in actually coming alongside the county in a mutually beneficial way. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Robertson: Hello. My name is Kelly Robertson. I live in the Hartwood District, and my family has been a resident of Stafford County from the very beginning. We have seen poor growth devastate our county, devastate our quality of life, and at this point in time, we question whether or not we're moving in a pattern that's going to make it better or that's going to make it worse. We understand the need for commercial growth, and we understand the need for balance, and growth will indefinite, indefinitely happen, but we need to make sure that it's being done in a manner that is respectful to the residents. With the GWV data center and the fact that they have already violated our regulations, that they have already destroyed some of their proffers, I question the fact that whether or not we should move forward with a developer that has already showed disrespect to our government and to our community in that manner. As for the water system master plan, I question some of the projections based off the data centers that are already in process, and we have heard all summer long repeatedly from our citizens that we do not want our water pulled from our rivers. I don't know how long some of you have been here, but we have a large community of watermen, of marinas, of boat repair, of boat sailors, of upholstery. All of those jobs will be devastated if we devastate our water. I'm concerned also with the water plan accepting data centers outside of the USA. What are we going to do with all of the families that are on well and septic if we allow that construction, that mega construction? My family has lost its well and has lost its septic over the years due to the construction that has happened in the Aquia region. It's why I moved to Hartwood. I wanted some semblance of the life that my family has given us here in Stafford for generations. And I beg you to be very thoughtful of the choices that you are making and what it is going to do to shape our county going forward. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. Anyone else? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public presentation portion of the meeting and move on to the first item, which is now the Time Extension for Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Office.

5. Application Time Extension – A request to grant a time limit extension for action for a Conditional Use Permit application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits,” for a project known as Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Office.

Mr. Zura: Please recognize Ramin Sadiq with the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Hi Ramin.

Mr. Sadiq: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. So I'm starting with the time limit extension for the project called Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Clinic, which asks for a CUP conditional use permit. So this application, according to Ordinance O20-13 that established time limit for the pending CUP application, and the Ordinance Section 28-185, has specified that the C, that any CUP application is still pending beyond 12 months limit from the date of submittal of the complete application may only be extended by written request of the applicant, and the subject approval of the body that's currently considering the application, which is Planning Commission for this application. So the applicant, Carrie Accardi, which representing the Riverside Land LLC, submitted the CUP application on September 13 of 2024 for a medical dental clinic at Tax Map Parcel Number 45-37J, in the M-1 zoning district. The application was deemed complete on October 13, 2024. Moving on about the timeline, the first round of review comments were sent to the applicant on May 12, 2025. Later on August 18, 2025, applicant submitted the second review set, and on August 11, applicant requested the time extension until April 30, 2026. And the same application is right now tonight in our agenda for the PC public hearing. So the 12-month time limit application, time limit for this application is October 30, 2025. In general, staff is supporting the adoption of Resolution PCR25-21 to extend the time limit for this application until April 30, 2026. Thank you.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Questions for staff? All right, thank you very much. Ms. Caudill, this is in your district, how would you like to proceed on this one?

Ms. Caudill: I recommend approving PCR25-21, for the conditional use permit time extension.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Sellers/Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Any further comments, Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

Mr. Apicella: Not sure who got it over here. I'm going to give it to Ms. Sellers. Any further comments, Ms. Sellers? All right. Can we do this by voice vote? Okay, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Opposed? Okay, that motion carries unanimously. Moving on to the next item, same project.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP24155932; Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Clinic – A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a medical/dental clinic in the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-37J (Property). The Property consists of 6.775 acres, located along the west side of Riverside Parkway, approximately 2,500 feet south of the intersection with Sanford Drive, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: February 20, 2026)**

Mr. Sadiq: Can I have the presentation please?

Mr. Apicella: Computer, please. We'll get there, I'm sure.

Mr. Sadiq: All right, so as I mentioned, this agenda is about the CUP application for a project named Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Clinic. It's a request for a conditional use permit to allow a medical dental clinic within an existing building located in the M-1 zoning district, Light Industrial. The Tax Map Parcel Number is 45-37J. The site area 6.77 acres. It's located in the George Washington District. And applicant is Ms. Carrie Accardi from Riverside Land LLC. The subject property located on west side of Riverside Parkway, approximately 2,500 feet south of the intersection with Sanford Drive. The property is currently zoned M-1, Light Industrial, and all abutting properties are also zoned M-1. It does also include a few A-1 properties in the vicinity. Parent parcel Tax Map 45-37J was zoned M-1 before 1978 and since then has been subdivided and received various approval between 1981 until today. These are the existing conditions. As you can see, the property is currently developed with an existing office building. The building name is the Jefferson Office Building. The site has frontage along Riverside Parkway, which includes an existing four feet sidewalk, two full access ways to the site are provided through the Riverside Parkway. The existing parking areas are located on the eastern and western side of the existing building with a capacity of 333 spaces. Moving on, the existing condition,

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

these are some pictures of the Google Street View. This is looking to the eastern side of the building from the western parking area. And this picture is showing the western view of the building from Riverside Parkway. This slide shows the approved site plan from 2003 and shows that the applicant does not plan to alter the site or building under this CUP, and has requested a GDP waiver submitting, by submitting this approved site plan, which shows the site layout and existing features. The red line area, the red line rectangle shows the location of this project on the south western corner of the building, which is suite number 103 located on the first floor of this existing building. Coming to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use, according to the Comp Plan, the property is within the Berea Targeted Development Area. And Laurel Beach Stream and its associated wetlands designated as a Resource Protection Area run along western side of the property with 100-foot buffer wide. Additionally, a portion of the site in the northwest corner and areas extending beyond to the adjacent western property are located within 100-year floodplain. The project site is within the boundary of Urban Service Area. Looking at the detailed land use concept of the Berea TDA, this site has been designated the property for commercial retail office use. Within this designation, medical/dental office is considered appropriate and compatible and comfortable use. Coming to the evaluation of staff about public facility impact, there are no anticipated impact to transportation, schools, parks and recreation, and public safety, and the use is expected to have little to no impact on current Level of Service. However, I have to mention the applicant provided a traffic comparison using trip generation rates of ITE's 11th Edition and a Transportation Impact Analysis was not required as the total combined trip for all users in the building are under 1,000 vehicle per day. The proposed medical office is expected to generate 252 vehicle per day, with a peak hour volume of 22 for the AM peak hours, 28 for the PM peak hours, and 21 on Saturdays. Staff proposed conditions to mitigate potential impacts, as summarized below, and included in the Resolution R25-277, Attachment 3. So the conditions highlights the project site area that shall be limited to no more than 7,000 square feet in area. The operational hour shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM and Saturday from 9 AM to 1 PM. And the parking to be limited to on this, onsite parking area located on the property unless provision is made for shared parking with adjacent properties.

Mr. Apicella: Ramin, before you go on, are these the hours that they wanted?

Mr. Sadiq: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Sadiq: Yes. These hours have been provided by the applicant. Staff's evaluation, starting with positive, the proposal align with the Comprehensive Plan's land use recommendations for commercial development in the Berea TDA; the proposed use maintains the existing development pattern along Riverside Parkway and nearby areas; the proposal is limited to a single suite within the building. About the negative, no apparent negative impacts are noted. The staff recommendation is, in general, staff is supportive of the project and recommend approval of the application CUP24155932, with conditions pursuant to Resolution R25-277. Thank you. If there's any question, I'm happy to answer that.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Sadiq. Questions for the staff? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Thank you for that. Appreciate that. So quick question, the staff report states that the total site trip generation will remain under 1,000. Could you elaborate on how peak hour traffic compares to existing conditions, particularly around the AM and PM peaks on Riverside Parkway.

Mr. Sadiq: You mean for the combined users of all in the building?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Mr. Sadiq: Yeah, for the PM... for the AM peak hours, currently it is 103. And this project is going to add another 22 on top of that. So it's going to be 125 vehicle per hour for the AM.

Ms. Caudill: All right, and then, and this might be a question for the applicant, but on the impact statement that was submitted, Attachment 2, it has existing conditions of 813 vehicles per day. So wouldn't we take that number plus the proposed 252? And that would be over 1,000.

Mr. Sadiq: The point is this 7,000 that they are proposing is going to be deducted for the current trips. So in that sense, if you're talking about the total vehicle per day, it's going to be 737 for the existing one, plus 252 for the new addition. So total is going to be 989 vehicle per day.

Ms. Caudill: And then my next question is, are there any ADA accessibility or parking recalculations triggered by changing from general office to clinical use?

Mr. Sadiq: No, no, there was nothing regarding the parking.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you.

Mr. Sadiq: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Why does this require a conditional use permit?

Mr. Sadiq: Because this is in the M-1 in Light Industrial and medical office clinic needs a conditional use permit.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Sadiq: Regularly we, I mean, we receive, or we don't need any conditional use permit for medical clinic, mostly in the B-2 districts. But it's a little bit unique because it's located in the M-1 district.

Ms. Sellers: Right, but it's ... okay, but it's an office building. It's just a little interesting that it's, it's going into an office building that already exists, and they have to come in for a conditional use permit, so. That's all.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: I assume, Ramin, this is just a general medical and dental office. We're not talking about invasive procedures or anything along that line.

Mr. Sadiq: No, it's, it's a regular, yeah, dental clinic.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Sadiq: Not something very serious.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? All right, thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mr. Johnson: Good evening Chair and Commissioners, my name is Fitzhugh Johnson. I'm the leasing agent for 150 Riverside Parkway, and here on behalf of the applicant, Carrie Accardi, this evening. As mentioned previously, we are requesting a conditional use permit to allow what is a pediatric ophthalmology office in an existing multi-tenant office building, as you saw in the pictures earlier, in a building that is existing, stabilized but zoned M-1. This is a very low intensity appointment-only based clinic that fits the character of our building very well. It's a very synergist, synergistic use. You know, we don't anticipate even the current occupants in the building really having any, no change to their daily, you know, use in the building. We don't even anticipate an impact from their from their purview. And, you know, this application, there's no exterior changes to the building, no industrial activity, no added noise. Frankly, the practice will expand local access to pediatric specialty eye care, reducing travel burdens for families in Stafford County. It's going to be a great amenity to have, and also keeping care dollars local. Right now they're traveling outside of Stafford County to receive and have this service. So we're committing to the conditions on hours and all the other conditions that have been set forth; operations, waste handling, signage, just ensure there's no adverse impacts whatsoever to this small, I don't know if you call it a neighborhood, right, but Business Park and, and really the rest of Stafford County. So we believe that the use is compatible with M-1 performance expectations and meets all of the CUP requirements and criteria. And, you know, just going back and talking about the vehicles per day, we really don't anticipate having any burden. You know, we're very mindful to the existing tenants in the building that there is no shortage of parking. That is important to be mindful of that, as we let in new tenants, we don't want to hurt or burden the tenants that are currently there. So we, this is going to be a very, extremely low impact deal and a very small portion of the building. And ultimately, I think it's going to, you know, again, be a service that is important, really, really important. So we thank you for your consideration, and ask that you support this conditional use permit request.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Questions for the applicant? Please Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: What's the hours of operation? I'm a little concerned, just because, if you close at five, wouldn't you want it to be a little later in the evening just in case? Or should you have a provider who comes in and says, hey, I'll have some evening hours maybe once a week.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, that's a good question. I'd have to defer to the applicant. I mean, I think the broader it is, the better, ultimately, but we're willing to do it from 9 AM to 5 PM.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, that's, that's what I would suggest.

Mr. Apicella: So, so can you please state your name?

Ms. Hagerman: I'm sorry. Heather Hagerman, I'm the other leasing agent for the building. I represent Carrie Accardi as well. Pediatric ophthalmology is so specialized and it is not very frequently used. So if there's an emergency, the child predominantly would go to the ER, and then whoever the pediatric ophthalmologist is then gets called into the ER, and then they come back during office hours for a follow-up. That's why it's more standard office hours.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, okay.

Mr. Johnson: You might want to stay up here.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Any, any other questions? All right, well, apparently you did a great job. Thanks so much.

Mr. Johnson: All right. Thank you. Thank you all.

Mr. Apicella: All right, so I'm going to open the public hearing on this item. This is an opportunity for the public to provide their comments. Before you do so, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. And red means your time is up. So if anyone wants to comment on this particular public hearing item, please come forward now.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District. Nice presentation for the project. I had a few comments to say. Riverside Business Park, the medical clinic development plan is not legible to the public under Planning and Zoning application 2024, number one in presentation on the agenda today. So that means the public can't read it. It is unknown what other public documents are legible under this application which is serve, servicing the study. It's not the study. I think the study is great. I think it's the information that's provided to the public. The public can't read it. This might, might not be related to the project, of course, but the application set forth by the Stafford portal is having trouble for legibility. And this is September 9, the day of... September 18, 2024, the presentation given showed information that was not contained in the agenda. So what we saw today was not in our agenda. We saw some information that we didn't have a chance to see and comprehend. This hearing might not be complete to the public's comprehension and Planning and Zoning. So this is Planning and Zoning, and the people need to understand it. And I will give you the rest of the minutes. I want to thank everybody here for all your work, and I am very positive on this project. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson. Anyone else? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Ms. Caudill, this is in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Ms. Caudill: I would like to recommend approval of CUP24155932, proposed Resolution R25-277.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Can you say that again? *[Laughter]* All right, there's been a motion, and it's seconded. Any further comments, Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: I appreciate all the staff and the applicant for all of your hard work and for coming to us. I know it's a little bit of a process, but I appreciate you hanging in there, and I think that this is a good use for the existing site with no notable huge impacts. So thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think Mr. Johnson stated it well, this is a practice that we do not have in the lower part of the county, and it is a much needed process. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All right, can you pull up the screen so we can take a vote? Please cast your vote. Everyone voted? That motion carries 6-0 (*Mr. Bratton absent*). Thank you very much. All right, moving on to the next agenda item.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

2. CUP25156616; Conditional Use Permit – Storck Road Fiber Utility – A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a public facility/utility, specifically a fiber utility hub, in the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 25-33 (Property). The Property consists of 0.57 acres, located along the west side of Storck Road approximately 2,100 feet north of the intersection with Doe Way, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: February 20, 2026)**

Mr. Zuraf: Please recognize Emilie Wolfson for the next staff presentation.

Ms. Wolfson: All right. Good evening Chair and members of the Planning Commission. I am Emilie Wolfson with Stafford County Planning and Zoning, presenting item number 2 on tonight's agenda, the Storck Road Fiber Utility Hub conditional use permit. This stopped working. It's these arrows, right? Oh, there we go. Okay. This is a request for a conditional use permit to allow public facility utilities, specifically a fiber utility hub, which is located in the A-1, Agricultural zoning district on a portion of Tax Map Parcel 25-33. The property consists of .57 acres located along the west side of Storck Road, approximately 2,100 feet north of the intersection with Doe Way, within the Hartwood Election District. The applicant is Network Towers, and the owner is Bernard Bumbrey, and the agent is Charlie Payne from Hirschler. So, since this is a use that many people are not familiar with, I want to explain what a fiber utility hub is before we get into it. So, in case you were not familiar, a fiber utility hub is an outdoor compound that connects underground fiber optic cables and helps distribute broadband service. The facility size really varies depending on local network demands. So the purpose of this project is to support expansion of broadband infrastructure. The parcel has been zoned A-1, Agricultural, since before 1978 and is not subject to proffers. It is divided by Storck Road, and the CUP area only applies to a .57-acre area on the southwestern portion, shown in black on the map. As far as existing conditions, the property, as you can see on this aerial, is mostly undeveloped and heavily wooded, with several residential homes and accessory structures. Images here show some of the existing residential structures on the site; two on the west side of Storck Road, which are addressed as 201 and 203 Storck Road, as well as one residential structure along the east side of Storck Road addressed as 195... 194, sorry, Storck Road. Here's some images of Storck Road from street view. The left image is looking southwest towards the CUP area, and then the right image is looking northwest towards adjacent single-family homes. As far as the general development plan, this shows the existing site layout and identifies the location of the fiber utility compound and all structures and equipment associated with its current operation, as well as the proposed area of expansion. As mentioned, there are several existing residential structures on the site which will not be affected by this application, but the GDP includes existing conditions for the entire parcel as it helps to contextualize the CUP requested area as shown here. So zooming in into the CUP area, access to the site is provided by way of a proposed access drive from Storck Road. It's a 12-foot access drive, and that entrance will be paved, but the remainder of the access up to the compound will be gravel with an emergency turnaround, which you can see in this image. Further zooming in, the proposed compound, which will be 9,604 square feet, which will include two shelters, two propane generators, two 2,000 gallon underground propane tanks, and a 9-foot link chainlink security fence around the compound. I should mention that the CUP allows for up to six shelters and six generators with the same footprint for future expansion. So that's... go ahead.

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

Ms. Sellers: What are they using propane tanks for?

Ms. Wolfson: For power.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: Ohhhh.

Ms. Wolfson: Back-up power.

Ms. Sellers: Wow. How much power goes into there?

Ms. Wolfson: I would have to defer to the applicant to say specific numbers on that, but.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. It's just you said underground and then the... okay.

Ms. Wolfson: Sure.

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

Ms. Barnes: So if those are for backup power, do they get a monthly test, a weekly test, similar to how we've been hearing about other generators?

Ms. Wolfson: Again, I would have to defer that to the applicant for specific. I know that they do tests. I don't know how often.

Ms. Barnes: I saw him nod his head, but I'll ask him again when he gets up here.

Ms. Wolfson: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So, just again for some context, how big are these generators?

Ms. Wolfson: They're fairly small. You can see on the GDP here that they're 4 by, 4 by 12.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Wolfson: They're the little ones in the middle that kind of look like a USB stick. Okay, any further questions before I move on? Okay.

Ms. Sellers: And maybe this is a question for the applicant. So again, I was envisioning, like, a whole bunch of wires going in underground, and then we see this. This is not what I had envisioned. And so these shelters, what are these shelters doing?

Ms. Wolfson: They will house the fiber optic cable.

Ms. Sellers: And so everything's kind of coming in and, and then, okay. I'll probably have more questions, because I have no idea what's going on with this now.

Ms. Wolfson: Okay. All right, so in terms of public facility impacts, the use is expected to have little to no impact on current Level of Service as the facility will only generate one to two trips per month for routine inspection, repair, and maintenance. There are no anticipated impacts to utilities, schools, parks and recreation, and public safety. As far as the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use, it identifies this property within Agricultural/Rural land use areas where farming, forestry, and land conservation are

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

encouraged and community services are limited. Staff finds the proposed CUP consistent with the Comp Plan because the CUP is limited to those half an acre approximately, leaving the majority of the property 24 and a quarter acres unchanged. Clearing and disturbance are confined to the GDP limits. The shelter design and height are compatible with other rural structures, as well as mature vegetation provides a natural screening, and the facility footprint is relatively small, really comparable to several large sheds. So here's an image of what the shelter will look like. This is where the actual fiber utility hubs cables will be housed. It reflects the intended design, which is precast concrete wall panels with a painted stucco-like finish as conditioned shelters will be no taller than 14 feet, and all equipment will be enclosed within these shelters, except for the generators, which will be on concrete pads. The application was also reviewed under the Telecommunications Plan, which outlines siting and design standards for such facilities. Agriculture properties are a recommended siting priority, and the design follows Facilities Design Standard Number 2, which is to minimize both visual and environmental impacts. The compound, as mentioned, will be within existing mature trees with no lighting proposed and sited as interior as possible to reduce the visibility on surrounding areas. As far as the conditions go, staff proposes conditions to mitigate potential impacts, and are included in Resolution 25-284 which is in Attachment 3 of the staff report. These conditions include a maximum compound area of 9,604 square feet, a maximum shelter height of 14 feet, and the materials and design consisted with the submitted images that I just showed prior with pre-cast concrete with a painted finish. So in conclusion, staff finds the proposal has several positives. It's consistent with siting priorities, facility design standards, and health and safety standards of the Telecommunications Plan. Approval will likely result in enhanced and faster broadband coverage for citizens in the vicinity of the proposal. And the conditions mitigate negative impacts. Negatives: no apparent negative impacts are noted. Finally, staff is supportive of the project and recommends approval of the application, with conditions, pursuant to Resolution are 25-284. So with that, I'm happy to answer any, hopefully, questions that are not super non-technical. The technical questions I might leave to the applicant.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Ms. Wolfson.

Ms. Wolfson: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions for staff? Please go ahead, Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: So this is kind of like a two part, and it's okay if you don't know the answer, I'll defer to the applicant. But in prior approval such as the county's public safety communication towers, the primary function was to enhance direct 9-1-1, or emergency radio coverage. Would it be accurate to say that this fiber utility hub serves more of a network support role, strengthening broadband and emergency data connectivity, rather than hosting radio transmitters?

Ms. Wolfson: I would say yes.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. And then the follow-up to that is, can you confirm whether this facility integrates with or indirectly supports the county's existing 9-1-1 and Public Safety Communication backbone, even though it's not a tower or antenna site.

Ms. Wolfson: That I would have to defer the applicant.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you. Can staff confirm whether this facility integrates with or indirectly supports the county's existing 9-1-1 and Public Safety Communication backbone, even though it's not an actual tower or antenna site.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think there's a comparable facility on Sanford Road that Verizon has had for a number of years, and it's been there and nobody even knows what it's about. It's to the rear of GEICO, and it's been a very quiet place for 25 years.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? All right. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Charlie, you're going to answer all those high tech questions that we have, right?

Mr. Payne: That's what I'm known for, high tech. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission. My name is Charlie Payne and I represent the applicant. Appreciate your time this evening. It's always a pleasure to be in Stafford County. And I will... Emilie did a wonderful job explaining the project. I'll go through this fairly quickly and then answer any questions you have, because I know you have a busy night tonight. Just real quick, as Emilie noted, this is a conditional use permit. Even though it's zoned A-1, we're required to get a CUP for the fiber booster station. The site's relatively small. We're talking about 0.57 acres. It sits on 28 acres. So it's on the western side of Storck Road. Is that a correct pronunciation, Mr. Shelton? I don't think I've ever been on that road, but I...

Mr. Shelton: Welcome to Hartwood. That Storck is correct.

Mr. Payne: We Falmouth boys don't get that far up in Stafford, so.

Mr. Shelton: There's a restriction on how far you can go.

Mr. Payne: That's right, that's right. Can't get past... inaudible... I know it, I know it. And strategically, we locate these sites near what's already existing broadband, and the system is basically to boost the broadband that's already in existence. And that helps expand the capacity for broadband in the community and in the area. To your question on whether it does support 9-1-1 or emergency services, to the extent that those are connected to the broadband services, they do. This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to the extent that we are expanding broadband services to the county and to its citizens, and that's a goal also under your Comprehensive Plan. And you know, one of the things I know is really important to the Planning Commission is making sure that these type of facilities are screened, that we've mitigated impacts. Again, this very small footprint. The closest home is roughly about 500 feet away, and that's the property owner, so he's not leaving. He's going to stay on site as well. And I thought this chart would be very helpful to you in regards to what's required versus what's being provided. The land, the disturbance area is only going to be what's shown on the GDP. So everything else that's fully, that's wooded around us will remain in place. So basically, I think, as Mr. Shelton noted about the Verizon site, you won't know it's there. You won't see it. Accessing it for maintenance, etc., we're talking one or two trips a month just to, just to maintain it and check on the facility. So it'd be, it'll be a fairly benign location in use. Here's the compound, which I don't know if Ms. Sellers has any questions in this regard. Just real quick to kind of piggyback on staff's comments regarding the shelters and the supporting generators, we're talking very small generators. These are not tier four generators that you have been hearing about that use diesel for backup power. This is gas, very small gas generated facilities. It supports the shelters. They can have up to six shelters, so there will be one generator supporting each of the shelters and that's only if there's a power outage. The power use on these sites is like what you would use for a cell tower. So it's very, very low, a three phase power. So very low power needs here. But if you know power goes out, you need, still need the internet, and you still need broadband so the gas generators are there for that purpose. The other cool thing about gas generators, which I didn't, I didn't know until I was doing a little research on it, it emits, the emission is much lower

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

than it would be for diesel and it's cleaner. But anyways, those are just some fun facts, I know. There's also a 9-foot tall fence around the facility, and again, the wooded areas outside of the disturbance that's shown on the GDP will all remain in place. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Sellers: This is just out of pure curiosity I think. So the wires come in underground, and then in these little buildings, do people walk in them? Or is there like what I imagine the network room somewhere in this building looks like?

Mr. Payne: And Greg can kick me if I get this wrong, but my understanding is how it works is this booster station connects to the current existing network, right, and what it does is, and that connection, I assume, is underground? Okay, I got that right. And what it does is it boost the capacity of that system. And that's basically what it is. It's sort of a caffeine upcharge, if you will, to an already current, existing system. Does that answer your question? You look, you look, you look like it didn't answer your question.

Ms. Sellers: That's because, in the matter of six months, I've used calculus and now whatever science I took to do this 20 years ago.

Mr. Payne: Well, the good news with the booster station, you can figure it out quicker.

Ms. Evans: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question.

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

Mr. Payne: Oh, I'm sorry, yes, ma'am.

Ms. Evans: So there's no towers with this then?

Mr. Payne: No.

Ms. Evans: Okay.

Mr. Payne: No towers.

Ms. Sellers: It sounds like it's that... you know, in my house, you have the internet that doesn't work in parts of the house, and you buy this little contraption that makes it go. That's what it sounds like. Is that what it's doing, just on a bigger scale? Yes, an extender.

Mr. Payne: It's expanding...

Ms. Sellers: Yes, an extender.

Mr. Payne: It's expanding the needs that we have for broadband in the area, for sure.

Mr. Apicella: You're welcome to come up, sir.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, good evening. My name is Drew Patterson. I'm the Director of Network Towers. So essentially, all fiber, if it goes a certain distance, it needs to be boosted; it doesn't maintain its power over a certain distance. So all this is doing is the fiber lines are

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

going to come in, they basically come into these shelters. They're spliced in and inside these shelters, if you imagine, just an IT room. It's servers and routers and things like that. We boost the fiber and send it on the next link of the, on its way. So ideally, with more fiber going into the ground, you're going to see more of these across the country. They don't, there's not going to be a big need for them because they can go about 40 miles before they need to be boosted again. But it's a fairly simple shelter.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: When you say boosted – don't go anywhere – boosted from where? Where is that coming from originally?

Ms. Evans: Well, that's why I asked is there any towers.

Mr. Patterson: It could, it could come from anywhere. Fiber is in the ground everywhere; it could be any type of fiber. It could be...

Ms. Barnes: Is it coming from a data center?

Mr. Patterson: No, not necessarily.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Patterson: It could, but that's... it could be any fiber.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. That leads me to my next question then, and this is, and I'm pretty sure I know the answer, but I'm just going to answer it anyway. I mean, I'm gonna ask it anyway. Is this in any way, shape or form, connected to building up an infrastructure for potential data centers in the area?

Mr. Patterson: I'll defer to Charlie a little bit on that. I'm under a non-disclosure, so I cannot discuss who my client is.

Mr. Apicella: So I'm thinking, though, kind of to Ms. Sellers' point, you have fiber in your house through Comcast or whatever provider, and this ensures that it continues to run efficiently, effectively, especially as you go further out. I imagine this is kind of multi-directional, too?

Mr. Patterson: It is. And just to be clear to your point, it's a good question. There is no fiber provider out there, regardless of who it is, that doesn't need to be boosted under certain increments. And as you'll see, our facility is built for multiple uses. It's kind of like building a cell tower and building it so that you can have multiple users.

Mr. Shelton: I have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Go ahead, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Payne: The answer to your question is it's to benefit multiple users, not just one user.

Mr. Shelton: Is this connected with the recent installation over the last four months of fiber optics on Warrenton Road that's coming to Storck?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Patterson: I cannot answer that question. I'm not sure when the fiber went into the ground for this facility. I don't know the exact... we're building the facility, we don't own the fiber. We're just the fiber booster facility. I'm not sure when the fiber is going into the ground that will serve this facility.

Mr. Shelton: The reason I ask is I'm the recipient of 500 feet of that conduit that moved up Warrenton Road.

Mr. Patterson: That's something I'd have to get back to you on.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions, Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: As far as testing the generators, how often does that take place? How loud is that?

Mr. Payne: My understanding is maybe once a month.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Payne: For the generators that are in place for the particular shelters.

Ms. Barnes: And nothing like a diesel generator?

Mr. Payne: No, no.

Ms. Barnes: How do we get the new data centers to use propane instead of diesel? [*Laughter*]

Mr. Apicella: That would be a lot of propane.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, that would be a lot of propane. I'll ask the question again, is this in any way, shape or form related to infrastructure that might be required for potential data center?

Mr. Payne: Any way, shape or form? Yes, it would help all users in the in the entire area.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: It sounds like it would also help with 5G network...

Mr. Payne: Exactly, all users.

Ms. Sellers: ... automation of vehicles and all sorts of systems.

Mr. Payne: Yep.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

Ms. Sellers: And is this a few years ago, and you may not know this, but a few years ago, when Dr. Benson was here with the schools, he did a study on broadband and the network to the schools. Have you guys looked at that at all and seen how that relates?

Mr. Payne: That wouldn't be something we would be looking at. What we're looking at is the need for the, the infrastructure to be boosted, if you will, whatever the appropriate term is.

Ms. Sellers: Well, that might be something to ask the schools for that report to make sure, you know, we're using the infrastructure as well, if it's there, you know, using it as well.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions for the applicant? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Are there any plans to, I guess, in the future, to allow potential collocation or integration with future county infrastructure through this?

Mr. Payne: I'm not sure.

Mr. Patterson: I would say that that's certain, certainly a possibility, yes.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. All right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Payne, again with your two 1,000 gallon LP gas tanks, they're going to be UST sub level?

Mr. Payne: Correct.

Mr. Shelton: They're not going to be above ground.

Mr. Payne: That's correct.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Yes sir,

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: I think I was on my last slide, Mr. Apicella. Again, I think I've already noted all of these, all of these comments, and I'm happy to answer your questions.

Mr. Apicella: I don't see any more questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, again, going to open the public hearing on this matter. It's an opportunity for the public to provide their comments on this specific item. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. If you'd like to speak on this one, please come forward.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Maxson: I appreciate that Mike. Kristen Maxson. Tax map 25-33, 17 Storekeeper Road, I think, there's quite a few addresses on the same property. There are two tax map listings on the Stafford GIS. Both listings specify 27.843 acres, and there's happens to be approximately six buildings. Both parcels sit both north and south of Stock Road. Parcels are to be unique, and this is confusing the public. There are 2,000 gallon propane tanks underground, which wasn't given in the hearing today, but you can see it in the agenda if you read it. For this study, site location is incorrect on page 92 of 469 for attachment both A and attachment B and attachment C and Attachment D for National Map Viewer in relation to fire stations, historical, environmental and others. Site is not off Hartwood Road. Might be using another study and not giving the true study done. Date generated was January 24, 2025. Application was signed April of 2025 so there's some confusion there. Parcel addressed in the, in signatures is 183 Stock Road, map 25-33, page 68 of 469. Public might ask why properties are not parceled for different residences. This is a conditional use permit, as described in requesting the permit, it is labeled not applicable under page 124 of 469 for conditional permit. So this leaves the public confused Where is the waiver? Since this is a building and not a tower, height, Section 2... 28-225 is important, however, it's checked as not applicable. The future additional four shelter, shelters could be a tower, but not presented here. There's no specification of height in this study. Past studies have not posted the signs, and so is there a sign in this study at this particular site? Thank you so much for your attention.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson.

Ms. Maxson: And I appreciate, I appreciate all that is done for Stafford County, including our presenter here.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing. Any further comments, Mr. Payne?

Mr. Payne: No.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you. I'm going to bring this back to the Commission. Mr. Shelton, this is in your district, how would you like to proceed?

Mr. Shelton: I'd like to propose a motion to approve CUP25156616, a Resolution 25-284. I see this is an enhancement to broadband which better provides coverage to the great southwest part of Stafford County.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Ms. Evans: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I got two seconds there.

Ms. Evans: Ms. Sellers had it first.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No sir.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers? Ms. Evans? Anyone else? All right, can we have the voting screen up please? Cast your vote. That motion carries 6-0 (*Mr. Bratton absent*). Thank you very much. Congratulations. Moving on to the next agenda item, Mr. Zuraf.

3. COM25156481; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Stafford County Fire and Rescue Station #8 – A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2232, for placement of a proposed public building or public structure, specifically a new fire and rescue station on Tax Map Parcel No. 17J-1A (Property). The Property consists of 8.00 acres, located on the north side of Mountain View Road, approximately 430 feet west of the intersection of Rock Hill Church Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: January 11, 2026)**

Mr. Zuraf: Please recognize Mr. Said Habibi for the next staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Habibi, welcome back.

Mr. Habibi: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission and everyone. I am Said Habibi with the Department of Planning and Zoning, and tonight I'm presenting item number 2, item number 3, a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review for Fire and Rescue Station Number 8. It's working? Okay. A summary of the application. The applicant has requested a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review for the construction of a new fire and rescue station. Fire stations are classified as public facilities, therefore this type of use is subject to Comprehensive Plan review in accordance with Virginia Code 15.2-2232. The site is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural district. It's covering only one parcel, and the Tax Map Parcel is 17J-1A, and the total area is 8 acres. This is the location of the site. The property is in the Rock Hill Election District, located on the north side of Mountain View Road, approximately 430 feet west of the intersection with Rock Hill Church Road. The site is not located within any TDA, and as well as it's not located within the Urban Service Area boundary of Stafford County. Zoning. The subject parcel is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural district, and surrounding zoning districts are primarily A-1 to the north, east, west, and south. The property has been zoned A-1 since before 1978, therefore it's not subject to any proffers. Existing condition. As mentioned in the first slide, the site has a frontage to the Mountain View Road. The property is largely undeveloped, consisting primarily of grassland. A Resource Protection Area of approximately 0.1 acres is located on the northeastern portion of the property. Apart from this, there are no major environmental features. The Proposed Building. The proposed building, parking areas and associated infrastructures are situated outside of these sensitive environmental areas with no encroachments or grading impacts to the RPA or wetland proposed. Future Land Use Comp Plan. This is the the future land use. The project site is located on the northwestern side of Stafford County. The future land use for the site is identified as Agricultural, and all surrounding sites are also designated as Agricultural in the Comprehensive Plan 2021. GDP. The proposed fire and rescue station consists of one-story 20,588 square-foot building designed as a modern combined facility with a maximum height of 35 feet, consistent with A-1 zoning requirements. Access will be provided by two entrances. The primary access will be from Mountain View Road, Route 627, with a 60-foot right-of-way, and the secondary access will be from Lexington Farm Drive on the west. The plan provides 32 parking spaces, 24 space for staff, six for public, two for ADA and two space for loading. Landscaping and buffers include a 35-foot buffer along Mountain View Road and the eastern boundary with the existing tree line preserved. A 10-foot street buffer... sorry, it's not a street buffer, it's a street landscape strip... is included along Lexington Farm Drive. No extension of public water or sewer infrastructure is required at the site... as the site will utilize on-site well and septic system elevations. The architectural design uses board-and-batton siding, stone accents, and a standing seam metal roof aligning with the county's Neighborhood Design Standards and blending with

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

the surrounding rural residential character. This is another elevation of the project; it looks like north elevation. And this is the colored render south elevation, I guess. Staff Analysis – Public Facilities and Services. The project fully aligns with the Comprehensive Plan’s location, site location, site selection, and design criteria. Strategically located on Mountain View Road, it improves service coverage and response time in the western district while meeting Level of Service standards. The 20,588 square-foot facility meets recommended design standards, integrating fire and rescue operations into a single modern building that provides ample space, safe site circulation, and minimal impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed fire and rescue station supports Comprehensive Plan goals by addressing service gap in the west rural demand zone, improving response times and maintaining the county's ISO 4/4Y rating. The facility allows 24/7 staffing and future expansion, consistent with the Chapter 5/Public Facilities policies of the Comp Plan. Transportation improvements are also consistent with the plan, as the 60-foot right-of-way along Mountain View Road meets County and VDOT standard ensuring safe access and emergency circulation. Summary of Positive and Negative Features. The proposed Fire and Rescue Station Number 8 is permitted, is permitted by-right in the A-1, Agricultural district, and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, advancing the County's public safety and Level of Service goals. It's strategic location enhances emergency responses coverage in the west rural demand zone, and the site design provides safe access, ample parking, and room for future expansion. The architecture also complements the surrounding rural character, and no significant negative impacts are noted.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: So with the Comprehensive Compliance Review, what exactly are we judging this on? I see there's no negative, which I find hard to believe. The transportation there is pretty, pretty slim, but yeah, what are the standards for that?

Mr. Habibi: The location, we're looking at the location, the design criteria, and pretty much the location design and its impact on the surrounding zoning district. And this is A-1, and the surrounding zoning districts are also A-1, so there's not any significant impact.

Ms. Sellers: And so we don't take any consideration, the, I mean the characteristics of the transportation network there? I mean this site is like, right on one blind curve and another blind curve with these narrow roads.

Mr. Habibi: We do. This project is generating, I guess, 30 trips per day. It's very low. That's why they didn't submit a TIA and, but it got a waive from the Transportation Department of Stafford County already, and the breakdown of the 30 trips per day is with the applicant, but, yeah, it's very low; it's just 30.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I understand that, but fire engines are not small vehicles, and this is in a part of the county that doesn't have much water. So these are going to be vehicles that could potentially also be carrying water. And if you've ever been on Truslow Road when the Berea station is sending out, what do they call it a Quint truck, or whatever that big old vehicle is, you know, it'll run you off the road. And this part of the county is, is worse than Truslow Road, hard to believe it is worse than Truslow Road. I mean, this location is right on one blind curve and another blind curve, and it goes uphill and it's narrow. I'm just really confused by Transportation not getting more involved in this.

Mr. Apicella: So there is a comment at the end of the recommendation of the staff report. I'll just quote it; “Staff notes the applicant should coordinate with VDOT during site plan review and implementation

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

stages to ensure compliance with all applicable access, site distance, and roadway design standards, and to avoid potential transportation related issues.”

Mr. Habibi: That’s correct.

Ms. Sellers: But we don’t have a TIA and so VDOT is going to need something to review it based on.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chair, if I...

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Zuraf: So really with traffic studies, that's going to really focus on Levels of Service more so than road safety, unfortunately. It's, you know, it's going to be the overall Levels of Service in there. Your volumes are probably not high enough to, that it would probably not trigger. And the traffic studies really kind of getting at whether, you know, road winding is needed. And then once, but once they get to site plan, that's when VDOT is going to be concerned with making sure site distance is maintained from that, from the proposed intersection. And they have, they'll have to meet that and provide that.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Sellers: I mean, just yes, they are looking at Level of Service. But as part of the state, statewide transportation plan, they want to also know what is the character and the use of the surrounding area. And this is a, you know, this is a change to that use. I mean, we're going from maybe a house or two every couple of acres, not even couple acres. I mean, these are, this is a very rural part of the of the county, and now we're, we're putting fire engines on there. And it's a career station, right? I'm assuming this is going to be staffed by the career staff. So this is a 24-hour a day, seven day a week, trucks running in and out. And if the numbers are still similar to what they were at Berea and the Garrisonville station, there's going to be trucks running in and out of there a lot. And so maybe, yeah, maybe the number of vehicle trips isn't going to change, but VDOT is going to... the state's going to need to know this road is not sufficient. Neither of these roads are sufficient to hold those, that type of vehicle, but. That's all. I have.

Ms. Caudill: So I know that this is just a Comp Plan Review, and I just, just hopefully you can answer this question. But since the site relies on a well and alternative discharging septic system, has anyone else confirmed that this site is okay for, for that, like this proposed use?

Mr. Habibi: Yes, that's correct. We even for the Comp Plan, we send the information to the Utilities and they approved it, yes.

Ms. Caudill: Has this been sent to the Health Department to...?

Mr. Habibi: No.

Ms. Caudill: I'm seeing a, I'm seeing a shake of a head, but okay, I will, I'll ask the question again, so when he comes up. But thank you. I appreciate it.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Ms. Barnes?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so when it comes to the water use, it's outside of the Urban Services Area, so it is going to be hooked up to well and septic, correct?

Mr. Habibi: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: And the well and septic is probably not much different than, because you're not, you're not using that well to gather huge amounts of water to go and put out fires. That well is going and the septic is going to be used for basically day to day living, firefighters or emergency services staying there overnight, cooking, bathrooms, things like that.

Mr. Habibi: That's correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Well, where are you getting the water then, because there's not a water line and you got to have a truck with water on it to go put out a fire. So where are they filling the truck up at?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton? I think we have an expert here.

Mr. Shelton: I think what, our units are filled from a hydrant. Almost all of our apparatus has, carries a minimum 500 gallons of water. Majority of the pumpers are 750; we have some that are 1,000 gallon, so they would not be taking water from that site. They would go to a respective area, Urban Services Area to refill the pumper itself.

Ms. Sellers: Another vehicle trip. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Any further questions for staff? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Have you had any concerns voiced by anybody in the immediate area, having the fire station directly next to residential?

Mr. Habibi: You mean the community public?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Habibi: No, we haven't heard anything.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Have you heard the other, the other side of it? Yes, we'd love to have a fire station.

Mr. Habibi: Actually, we, in the staff report and even the comment review report which we sent to the applicant, we asked, we kind of, we cannot, it's not a requirement, but we always encourage them to hold a meeting with the community and let them know about the... *inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: And did that happen this time?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Habibi: They didn't hold but they might have their reason for that, but we encouraged them, we asked them. But it's not a requirement. It's just a we can, we can do it as a recommendation.

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

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, Mr. Shelton, I'm gonna ask you a question. Do you have any further background? I thought this was combining a couple of facilities.

Mr. Shelton: Yeah, let me reiterate that this is combining two older facilities that are 35 or 40 years old into one consolidated facility. It's going to enhance the ISO rating, which is presently at 4 and 4Y, which means that anyone in that particular area within five miles of a fire station and 1,000 feet of a fire hydrant receives a reduced insurance premium. So it's got a lot of advantages from the standpoint of public safety.

Ms. Sellers: What stations are they combining?

Mr. Shelton: Rock Hill Fire, Rock Hill Rescue.

Mr. Habibi: It's a Fire and Rescue Station.

Mr. Shelton: And again, you were right, Ms. Sellers, it will be a career station, and if I understand the data that staff put together, it's going to be a staffed engine company, which consists of four personnel and a staffed EMS unit of two personnel.

Mr. Apicella: All right, any further questions for staff? Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward.

Mr. Overton: Good evening, Chairman and Commissioners, Mike Overton with Capital Projects here to represent the County for this potential project. Happy to answer any questions you have.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: So I'll ask the same question, did you have any kind of community meetings, or any kind of discussion with the immediate community regarding putting a fire station here?

Mr. Overton: A meeting has not been held with the existing residents. There are three existing residents, residential uses that surround this property, the closest one being just over 400 feet away from the proposed building. The closest structure is actually an agricultural building to the west of the . We have been working diligently with a developer that actually sold the county the property. They are developing 10 residential units behind the fire station, so it wraps around the horseshoe-shaped project. And we have been working closely with them, and they've been very supportive of our work there.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, let me get that straight. So there, we're going to build a fire station, and then they're going to build 10, obviously it's going to have to have, like, a 10 unit, they're going to have to be a minimum of 3 acres out there. So, I mean, they're not going to be like, we're not talking about 10 tightly fitted houses around the perimeter of that.

Mr. Overton: Their site plan was approved many years ago, and I believe they just got site plan, an updated approval this past July.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: What's going to go in first, the houses or the fire station?

Mr. Overton: It's a race. *[Laughter]*

Ms. Barnes: So, this is a public hearing, so the county was required to send notice to those immediate properties surrounding the fire station, correct?

Mr. Zura: The immediate abutting properties.

Ms. Barnes: Immediate abutting, so technically, they were given notice and they do know. Okay, well, we'll have a public hearing, so I'm sure you guys will be here to talk about that. Okay, all right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: So I'll ask the same question that I did a couple minutes ago. Since you're going to rely on a well and alternative discharging septic system, has the Health Department or anyone else reviewed that that can actually happen for that proposed use there?

Mr. Overton: Yes, both have been reviewed and approved for this site.

Ms. Caudill: Okay.

Mr. Overton: The well has actually already been tested and yield has been confirmed, and the drainfield has been engineered and approved by VDH for permitting.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think if I'm correct in looking at staff report, you're putting an underground storage tank to provide the fire sprinkler system for the station also, are you not?

Mr. Overton: That is correct. There will be an underground fire suppression tank. It is a public facility. It's a commercial facility. It must have a fire suppression system in it, so that water will be initially filled, likely from the well. However, it will probably sit there, hopefully for decades, without being used. There will be a smaller potable water tank to help buffer the peak loads and demands of the Fire and Rescue staff. Obviously, you can imagine when they come back from a call, there's a higher, more intense use for showering and that sort of thing. But otherwise, the comment that was made previously, that the water consumption will be very similar to a large residential sort of use. The septic discharge permit was issued based on, I believe, under 900 gallons per day; a typical residential use is usually around 600 for a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you, Mr. Overton.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: So it's combining the Rock Hill Fire, Rock Hill Rescue?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Overton: Correct.

Ms. Sellers: Why didn't we attempt to just put it in place of those two facilities on Garrisonville Road?

Mr. Overton: My understanding is the optimization of the location for response from Fire and Rescue to meet the standards of cover requirements. There was a study done, 2019 I believe, that identified that the existing stations were not in the ideal location to serve the development pattern of that area of the county.

Ms. Sellers: So we had, so we had to move it. Well, we don't have to move it, but.

Mr. Overton: Well, one of the sites probably is not large enough to support this facility as well.

Ms. Sellers: Right. No, I understand that. It's just from a transportation network I have still concerns, because Garrisonville Road isn't that great at that area, but... just trying to figure out this. And then, why is this one moved up? Like there are no other locations? Because there were a couple of other locations the county could place fire stations on that have been proffered over the years. So why did we purchase property instead of looking for proffered land or county-owned land?

Mr. Overton: There was none in the search that we performed for this region for the county, as far as county- owned parcels in that vicinity. We studied a stretch of about two miles along Mountain View Road, which was the targeted area for that was recommended for the station to optimize coverage, and it so happened that we met with a developer, and this way, we did not have to displace existing residents as well, because there are very few properties that are actually available that are currently undeveloped.

Ms. Sellers: Right. And so it's based on some study that said these folks out here didn't have coverage, similar to why we purchased the trailer that then became the Garrisonville station probably 15 years ago now, but. Is it a similar situation, or is there a reason you focused on Rock Hill and like that two mile area?

Mr. Overton: For Rock Hill specifically?

Ms. Sellers: No. Why was...

Mr. Overton: The Comp Plan identified three stations that were in need of replacement, and Rock Hill was, I guess, the optimized one. That was a decision made by Fire and Rescue. It was identified in the Comprehensive Plan as the priority station to have replaced.

Ms. Sellers: It's just very concerning to me to see, you know, we're gonna... and I saw the sign, I drive through that area to go out to Manassas several times a week, so I'm just very concerned that we are putting this facility here on a road network that cannot support it. And people, you know, you know it's not, it's not as egregious, I think, of some of the school's decisions lately, but it is certainly on par with this. We need to talk about the appropriateness of that just location and why we focused in on somewhere where it's just not able to maintain that infrastructure. And the infrastructure being, you know, these, these very large vehicles. A fire engine is not a small vehicle going on these narrow roads. So that's my concern, and why I'm trying to figure out why we focused here, where there is just very... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: We've got the Chief standing up in the back. I wonder if he wants to provide any reinforcements here.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Overton: To address the transportation issue, we have looked at it. The engineers have had discussions with VDOT and all of the intersection distances, including for the new proposed roadway for this small residential development, will be met or exceeded. The entrance will be a very wide entrance way. So it's not like you're going to be coming down a driveway that's 15 feet wide with a fire engine turning onto the roads. It's going to be a traditional, much wider entrance, commercial entrance with turning capabilities. It is something we did specifically look at, is all the turning radiuses and movements onto and off of the property.

Mr. Grainger: Mr. Chairman, Joe Grainger, Assistant Fire Chief. I'm happy to answer any additional questions. To speak to the location of the new Rock Hill Fire Station, currently both Rock Hill Rescue/Rock Hill Fire sit along 610, where we can't respond north because of Marine Corps Base. So when we were looking, we were looking to an area where we could have a 360 degree response pattern, decrease response times and serve the community better.

Mr. Apicella: So you heard Ms. Sellers' concerns about transportation and the staff comments associated with that. What's kind of the engagement that you're going to continue to have with our county staff and with VDOT?

Mr. Grainger: Obviously, we're going to work with staff and VDOT. We're already on these roads providing service now. So, and we are large, we're out there, we know that. But really it's about being able to provide service to the community.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: And I'm not sure... I'm sure you may be able to answer it, but I'm assuming that warning signs and all of that are going to go on Mountain View Road saying, hey, we've got a new fire station. Watch out for apparatus. I'm assuming that that's going to be the case.

Mr. Grainger: There will be some warning signalization at the site...

Ms. Caudill: Okay.

Mr. Grainger: ... as well as a monument sign that will identify what is there, yes.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, that's it. Thank you,

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: So as far as noise mitigation goes, I mean, obviously this is a fire station. We're going to have lights and sirens. Is there any way to – and I probably know the answer to this, but I'm going to ask it anyway – to mitigate having, you know, those lights and sirens going off all times of day and night, so that the folks that live next door aren't being awoken like an alarm clock every time a fire goes off.

Mr. Grainger: Based on my discussions, yes, that is going to be the case. There will not be sirens blaring throughout the night as vehicles or emergency responses leave the facility. And there are no outside sirens or anything like you would conceive of an old school type fire station when a call comes in.

Ms. Barnes: So when there's an emergency, they pull out and you're going to wait for a while. Is there some kind of a procedure before you start those lights and sirens going?

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

Mr. Shelton: Could I clarify one thing? In the Commonwealth of Virginia, if it's an emergency vehicle, you must be sounding sirens and exhibiting lights. That is a Title 46 Code requirement. So it's not an emergency vehicle that's not displaying lights and siren.

Mr. Grainger: I believe there's an average of five calls per day currently served from this station. So it's not going to be a non-stop barrage of emergency calls coming out.

Ms. Sellers: Five calls per day, and we're building a whole new fire station out there?

Ms. Banres: Somebody's got to serve them. I mean, I, I'm, I would think that regardless of how many calls you have, you've got to have somebody out there.

Mr. Grainger: Correct. And it's again matter of the response time. So I mean, every, every second is critical in emergency situations, so.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Evans?

Ms. Evans: Yeah, so just to piggyback off what you were saying, so then what do you, what do you have now? Don't you have the Rock Hill Fire Station, like you're combining the two. So...

Mr. Grainger: Correct. The two existing stations are on Garrisonville Road, much further north. And again, the response pattern for that, those facilities are to the south.

Ms. Evans: Okay.

Mr. Grainger: Only to the south.

Ms. Evans: But you're only... you just said, but you're only doing five calls just for this station that, the new station that you're building, right?

Mr. Grainger: That's the historical numbers we receive from the existing stations.

Ms. Evans: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Well, ideally you have zero calls a day.

Mr. Grainger: Ideal.

Ms. Barnes: And but, yeah, but regardless of whether you have 0 or 5, you've got to have some level of coverage out there for the folks that are out there.

Mr. Grainger: Correct.

Ms. Evans: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. I'm hoping for zero calls per day.

Mr. Apicella: All right, I think that's it. Thank you very much, sir.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Grainger: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm now going to open the public hearing on this matter. Like before, it's an opportunity for the public to provide their comments. Before starting your discussion, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green eye appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if you'd like to speak on this one, please do so now.

Mr. Fuerst: All right, good evening. My name is Richard Fuerst. This is my wife, Julie. We live at the property right next door. And so he stated 400 feet from the fire station is my barn, and then another 100 feet is my house. So, you know, we're obviously concerned, property values. You know, I'm concerned about the water. It's good to hear that, and I'd like to see that in the policy of they did just put the well in. And so we were concerned about when we're hearing about this, what is that water going to be used for? Because, you know, I don't, I have no idea how much water is down there. Obviously, all the neighbors are on septic and well, and so that's another concern of ours. We're worried about the noise pollution, as you just saw. You know, right now, I have 10 acres. I'm surrounded by 50 acres. This is, and 8 of this, this, this this 8 acres that you're talking about was sold by the previous owner. The current owner has, owns it now, owns the other about 50 acres, and has the site plan is in with the county now. So just to clarify a few things there. But we're obviously worried about the noise, we're worried about the light, we're worried about the traffic, as Ms. Sellers pointed out. You know, if you've... go drive down Mountain View Road. It's very busy now. We've been there about 12 years. When I, if I go to work at 7 o'clock in the morning, I will sit there sometimes for 5 or 10 minutes. I can't get out the driveway. Coming here tonight because the traffic is going the other way, you can't get out of my, I can't get out of my driveway for 5 or 10 minutes because of all the traffic going down, so. And then, as she pointed out, there's that... it's turning down, coming down a hill and a hard curve there, you know, so I don't, I'm sure you can check on the statistics on how many accidents. That road's very narrow with large ditches on either side. So probably, on an average, once a month there's a, there's a car in the ditch there. So I think, you know, what I'm worried about is, when you go to the Department of Transportation, that road is going to have to be significantly improved to get those vehicles in and out of there safely. And so then, then you're going to have to worry about light pollution with a light there, I would imagine. So all those, those are all our concerns. And then, of course, the water is the big one. I question now, I didn't, I didn't know anything about the calls, but I'm wondering, too, you know, you've already got two sites. I understand combining them into one site would be optimal. And then the taxpayers are going to pay all that money to build a site here. And, and if you, if you go out there and take a look at it, it's, it's a, you know, there's all surrounding farms, and there's going to be, I think, like she said, 9 lots there, including mine, and, and now we're going to have a great big fire station here. So it's, it's concerning to us that this fire station is going to be there. I guess the good news is, if we have a medical emergency or a fire, they're 400 feet away. So thank you very much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. So Fire Station, Station 8, project 25156481, on parcel map 17J-A-1. Parcel number is not found when searching within the Stafford GIS Application. Rather, when searching on 17J, it will come up, So it will display, but it won't display under querying 17J-A-1. So there's a discrepancy within the GIS data read, and I don't know why you give the right information and doesn't come up, and then you give less information that comes up. So I don't understand that. So project 24155988, Lexington Farms construction plan. And it's it's out there. I think it was there quite a long time ago, but there's no information that is really on it. It says plat PM 25000, I think there's 5 zeros there, 50, the road is not there. But under the presentation today, it shows that it is there with the study. June 25, 2024, this lot sold for 425k acres, then appraised at 150k pushing down land values to local

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

neighbors. The public is confused with the figures here. Land owner adjoinings are not attached to this application. And I also forgot to mention that the neighboring list was missing for the fiber optics study. So people need to know, the neighbors need to be, you know, attached to the applications, inserted in the applications, not, you know, attached somewhere else. And I apologize for not mentioning it earlier. And I appreciate all your time. Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson. Anybody else? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing. Oh, I'm sorry, ma'am.

Mrs. Fuerst: Hi. I am Julie Fuerst, my husband, here with my husband, Rick. I am concerned about the road, as he said. Those ditches are, the road is narrow, the ditches are deep. Something's going to have to change before we have emergency equipment on those roads. Two, I'm really concerned about the noise. Five calls a day. The first gentleman, I think you said 30 calls a day, you're getting out of... 30 vehicles a day coming out of the Berea station. And then he said five. That's a big number difference. So I am concerned about that noise, the property value, and concerned about the water. They do have a well there already. We watched them put it in, and we were told that it is to fill the tanks of the trucks. That's what we were told when they were putting the well in. So I'm, I'm also concerned that we have not been approached at all by anybody about this, and we are right there next to it, the station; a house across, another house next to it. Nobody said a word to us. We did get a I think there was a hearing in June? Was it in June? We were out of the country, so we couldn't go to that one. But those are my concerns. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Anybody else? All right, I'm going to close the public hearing on this item. Sir, would you like to come up and respond to that, and the Chief as well?

Mr. Overton: Clarification on trips per day. So its anticipated to generate 15 vehicle trips in and out of the site per day. Approximately five of those would be emergency response calls. The other are getting the staff to the site and leaving the site for two shifts per day, and then approximately five bit five visitors on a busy day, and that adds up to the 30 trip estimate per day.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I have a question. With today's technology, is there anything that that you all can put on the on Mountain View Road on both sides, like a warning light, a yellow light, or something to alert folks who are coming up and down those roads when a when fire or rescue apparatus are coming out.

Mr. Overton: There is a technology to do that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I know we can't set a condition on a Comp Plan Compliance Review, but I would strongly recommend it based on the concerns that were mentioned. I think that would be very helpful, and hopefully, you know, mitigate some potential accidents that might otherwise occur. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: To clarify, you are not using the wells to fill the tanks of the tire fire trucks.

Mr. Overton: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so we need to make that very clear, because if I, if I were a neighbor, I'd be really concerned about that as well.

Mr. Overton: Understood.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: And just I guess this is for the staff we did... do we have record of sending out notices to because I look on the application here that we usually have a list of neighboring properties, and I usually see it, and I don't see it on here, of the names of the people that were that were notified. There's usually a list.

Mr. Zuraf: We, yeah, we did send notice to abutting property owners. We do not require them to provide that anymore, because we generate that list ourselves.

Ms. Barnes: So it's not required to be on here.

Mr. Zuraf: They don't have to do it because we, we find it ourselves.

Kristen Barnes: Okay. All right, I just want to make sure that at least, I mean, obviously people are here, so somebody did get a notice then. Okay, that's all for now.

Mr. Overton: To address a roadway concern that seems to be a major concern. It is a very steep ditch off the side of the roadway. Um there was not a sufficient right of way previously. The developer of the Lexington Farms Property uh uh provided an additional 30-foot of right-of-way to the roadway, I believe, in Comprehensive Plan that is scheduled for a potential future improvement. So there is now some additional right-of-way area there that could allow for a future widening.

Mr. Apicella: We don't know when that's scheduled or funded.

Mr. Overton: I've talked to transportation, and there is nothing currently in the plans for that.

Mr. Apicella: Hopefully that happens sooner rather than later. Other questions, Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yes, when did you guys purchase this property?

Mr. Overton: It was summer of 2024.

Ms. Sellers: And I do see that it's in the Capital Improvements Program, but I'm not seeing in the Comprehensive Plan. Is there a reason why it wasn't included? Why this is being brought to us now?

Mr. Overton: It's part of the approvals process for moving the project forward.

Ms. Sellers: Is it, because it's not in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Overton: Correct. The replacement of the three existing stations that are identified in the Comprehensive Plan, this is one of those. However, a specific site was not identified in a Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, you wanna chime in?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Ms. Sellers: Right, and that's why we have to have a Comprehensive Plan.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Well, we have to have a Comprehensive Plan review, because it's a public facility going on an A-1 site, right?

Ms. Sellers: It's not in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Apicella: It doesn't always have to be in the Comp Plan. A public facility is... a comp... Let's go back to the basics of what a Comp Plan Compliance Review is. It is to determine whether or not, in this particular case, a public facility can go on an A-1 property. It is also in the Comp Plan that provides certain criteria or recommendations that say when a new facility is needed and where it might be needed, in generality, but doesn't have to be specific that says it's going to be on this specific parcel. Is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct. Yeah, in our Comprehensive Plan, we've we only really identify known sites, usually that's those sites that are provided via proffer or if the county has already acquired some land, the Comprehensive Plan estimates future needs. As mentioned, there was a identified need for three, three new facilities, replacement of some facilities, and we have that also for schools. We estimate how many new elementary schools, middle and high schools are going to be needed over the next 20 years, but in most cases, we do not. I know this specific locations until it gets around to the time of of planning, and which it's out several years. And that's that happened with High School 6, you know that that site was not specifically located either, just for example.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: And one more point, as, as Said mentioned, a public facility is a by-right use on an A-1 parcel.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And to clarify, this is, this reminds me a lot of when we were looking at the high schools and the new elementary schools, the Comprehensive Compliance Plan is, is not asking us whether or not we like where this is going, what we think this is, this is just, is it compliant with our Comprehensive Plan... *inaudible*.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Ms. Barnes : Okay.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Yes, I will agree to some of that. But we purchased this property in 2024 so we knew what was going there in 2024. And here we are, a week after an election where three new members are coming to the Board of Supervisors, and we're doing a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review of a property we already purchased that already has money in the Capital Improvement Program, and it's not in a

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Comprehensive Plan. That concerns me, because this does not go to the Board of Supervisors. This stops here. This does not feel right. The timing feels wrong. I'm very frustrated with the transportation because whether we you got, you know, there's we know what happens here at the local residency level, but the State puts together a statewide transportation plan, and we look for things like, where are fire stations? I live in Stafford County. I serve on the CTB. I had no idea this was coming. And so now I'm sitting here not only frustrated with the school division for giving us nonsense, but now we have a fire station going on roads that cannot handle it, and we're going to be upset with VDOT when they're saying, what do you mean we're putting a fire station there? And this doesn't, this doesn't work. So right now we are so far behind because there's not only no transportation money available for this, we don't even have this on the State's radar to get it in the next round or the round after that. So these, this is a 10 year thing right now where these folks will have a fire station here with apparatus going in and out of a road that, again, it's not just deep ditches and narrow, it banks up a hill like this, and so I don't know what sign you're going to put up for people to see. I mean, during the night, they'll see it, they'll see the lights, but during the day, what's going to happen? You're going to go across this blind curve, and somebody is going to get hurt, and it's going to be 10 years before transportation even has an ability, an opportunity, to fund anything here. So I am very frustrated. I feel like this is, this is a very last-minute thing being brought to the Planning Commission a week after an election of four board members, and we knew four board members were on a ballot. This is wrong, and we knew two of them weren't returning. So at this point in time, you know, this is very frustrating. It feels, it feels very political, and I, for one, am not very happy about it.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, when did this process start for specifically deciding that this was going to be built here, and when did, did the site plan go to the county?

Mr. Overton: The process was started about two years ago, when we were coordinating with Fire and Rescue to locate a parcel, and the Board approved the purchase of the parcel.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Overton: It again, it was, I want to say, June of 2024?

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And when, and this might be a question, too, even if the process started in two years ago, it doesn't come to us until a certain point. So it takes a while to get through the process, to get to the site plan approvals, to get through all of that. It's not like if the process started two years ago, that it should have been in front of us two years ago. I mean, it does take some time.

Mr. Apicella: So, I just want to clarify what you said. So the Board was aware two years ago, or at some point, not last week or last month, because they had to approve the funding to purchase the site some time ago.

Mr. Overton: That is correct.

Mr. Apicella: The current Board.

Mr. Overton: That is correct. The Board of Supervisors approved the purchase of the property. They've also approved the funding of the project through the CIP Program at this specific site.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all right. I think we've... Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: And the reason why this is not in the Comprehensive Plan is because in 2021 is when we updated the Comprehensive Plan well before I think this was even on the radar, correct?

Ms. Sellers: We're supposed to update it when we have something.

Mr. Apicella: It updates every five years.

Mr. Zuraf: The last update was in 2021.

Ms. Barnes: Correct. I remember I was on that committee, and at that point in time, there's no way we could put it in there because obviously we didn't know about it, and that's why we have a Comprehensive Compliance Review as the project is nearing, obviously, whatever the administrative completion is.

Ms. Sellers: But it's supposed to be updated when you put a new facility in there, it is... we are supposed to update the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Apicella: We would be updating the Comp Plan constantly if that were the case.

Ms. Sellers: Well, that is, that is why it's a living document.

Mr. Apicella: We update, we... Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Barnes: Isn't that what we're doing right now? We're updating the Comp Plan.

Ms. Sellers: Two years into the process.

Mr. Zuraf: This is just a review. This is not a Comp Plan update, so when we get around to the next Comp Plan update...

Mr. Apicella: It will be incorporated at that point. All the things that have been in the queue since 2021 will be incorporated into the revised Comp Plan. We wouldn't do it every six months or a year, because there's a lot of activity...

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: ... and it would be a burden on staff and the Planning Commission and the Board, if that's, that were the process that we had to follow. All right, I think we've I think we beat this one. I appreciate your concerns. I think they've been heard. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Overton: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, Ms. Barnes, this is in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I'd like to move to approve Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review, COM25156481.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Ms. Barnes, any further comments?

Ms. Barnes: I think we're making this a little bit more complicated. I mean, obviously there's some very good questions that have come forth, and I'm glad we have a transportation person on here to raise those questions. And I hope that those questions remain. I hope that those questions are not forgotten tonight, and that we keep up after that. But it's a very simple question. To me, it's just it.. is it compliant with our Comprehensive Plan? And to me, it very clearly is compliant. There are other questions, but that's not what's before us tonight. So that's why I'm moving to approve this.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think one of the things to look at as a planner, is that we're enhancing the level of service for our citizenry in Stafford County.

Mr. Apicella: Other comments, Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Of course I have a comment. No, I will not be supporting this. I think that's clear, and I have questions to the Board of Supervisors as to why they would fund something that is not in a Comprehensive Plan that the people around it have not been known and as a taxpayer, that frustrates me, because this is outside of every single state process. Now we are 10 years behind and somebody is going to get hurt. It's the very same thing I said with the schools on Truslow Road is going to happen here. A fire station gets built a whole lot faster, because there's not as many, like, little rooms that have to be built. We've seen it. So this is in a, oh, it's going to open in a few years. This is a, it's probably going to be open in what, 18 months, 2 years, and we're going to see fire engines going up and down this road. They cannot have it. This should have come to us when they purchased the property. This feels like a wrong, wrong thing for new members of the Board of Supervisors who are potential to come in in January. And here we are, a week after an election with so many items on this agenda, including this, because we've seen a turnover in the Board of Supervisors. Wrong, wrong, wrong. I cannot believe we're doing this. Oh, and the Board of Supervisors don't get to see this. So, very convenient. I think this is very political. I think 100% the district supervisor did this on purpose, and I think it's wrong, and we should all be very upset by it.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Sellers. Any other comments? All right. Can you give us the voting screen, please. Cast your vote. All right, some folks did not vote. Okay. Can we reset and redo? Okay, on the motion recommending... no, on the motion to approve the Comp Plan Compliance Review Application, please cast your vote. Ready?

Ms. Barnes: What does that mean?

Mr. Apicella: What do we do next? Counsel?

Mr. Zuraf: A recess...

Mr. Apicella: A recess?

Mr. Zuraf: Can we do a recess?

Mr. Apicella: Sure, okay. Okay, we're going to take a recess for 5 minutes.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

The meeting recessed at 8:04 PM.

The meeting reconvened at 8:16 PM.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, reconvening the Planning Commission meeting. I'm just going to ask counsel where we are with respect to a 3-2-1 vote on this matter.

Ms. Lucian: Since there is a majority that voted for it, it passes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, well there we are. *(The motion passed 3-1-2-1 [LS opposed; KE, KC abstained; CB absent].)* Thank you very much for that clarification.

Ms. Barnes: We learned something tonight.

Mr. Apicella: All right, moving on to the next agenda item. That will be item number 8, Time Limit Extensions.

Mr. Zuraf: Item number 8. Please recognize Emilie Wolfson for the staff presentation.

4. RC25156318; Zoning Reclassification – Buc-ee's of Stafford – A proposed zoning reclassification with proffers, from the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-60C, 29-60D, 29-60E, 29-60F, 29-60G (portion), and 29-ROW, consisting of approximately 38.68 acres (Property), to allow a travel center with vehicle fuel sales and high-intensity commercial retail. In general, the proposed proffers include, but are not limited to, provisions that would: make the reclassification contingent upon approval of the concurrent request for a conditional use permit; require the Property to be developed in general accordance with the generalized development plan (GDP); require signage be in general conformance with the site signage package; require architectural elements and design in conformance with illustrative building elevations; specify how access to the Property is provided; require specified transportation improvements; and address vacation or abandonment of right-of-way located at Tax Map Parcel No. 29-ROW. The Property is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026) (History – Deferred at the October 29, 2025 meeting to the January 14, 2026 meeting)**
5. CUP24155520; Conditional Use Permit – Buc-ee's of Stafford - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to permit vehicle fuel sales, high-intensity commercial retail, and a comprehensive sign plan in the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-60C, 29-60D, 29-60E, 29-60F, 29-60G (portion), and 29-ROW (Property). The Property consists of approximately 38.68 acres and is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive, within the Garrisonville Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent request for a zoning reclassification to the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District. **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026) (History – Deferred at the October 29, 2025 meeting to the January 14, 2026 meeting)**
6. RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment – A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 39-71A, consisting of approximately 49.85 acres zoned B-2, Urban Commercial to modify proffers related to transportation, to incorporate language and requirements relating to the existing Water Infrastructure Agreement, to modify development phasing in relation to utility infrastructure

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

requirements, and to adjust proffers related to water use. Other existing proffers applicable to the Property pursuant to Ordinance O23-27, dated November 14, 2023, would remain unchanged. The Property is located along the east side of Old Potomac Church Road, across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: September 19, 2025) (History – Deferred at the June 11, 2025 meeting to the July 23, 2025 meeting; Deferred at the July 23, 2025 meeting to the August 27, 2025 meeting) (Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

7. Application Time Extension – A request to grant a time limit extension for action for a Conditional Use Permit application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits,” for a project known as Riverside Business Park Riverair Medical Office.

Discussed before Item 1.

8. Application Time Extension – A request to grant time limit extensions for action on multiple Zoning Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, “Review and requirements,” and Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits,” for Austin Ridge Logistics Center, GWV Data Center, and Market at Austin Ridge.

Ms. Wolfson: Hello again. Emilie Wolfson, Planning Office. So this is a consideration to grant a time extension for three proposed development projects: Austin Ridge Logistics Center, GWV Data Center and Market at Austin Ridge. Our zoning ordinance includes various time limit extensions for which applications under consideration needed to be acted on within set time frames. One of those time limits does restrict the amount of time that should be spent on a project to 12 months, but with the caseload we've had before us, and the general issue of addressing all the comments we put forward to applicants, occasionally we run into issues with projects that end up needing additional time. So, we have before you, I'll go through each request one by one. The first is Austin Ridge Logistics, which is a conditional use permit and zoning reclassification for a data center, storage warehouse and related infrastructure and accessory uses. The 12-month time limit for this application was on October 30, 2025. The applicant has requested that the time limit for this application be extended to April 30, 2026. Additionally, the next two applications are conditional use permit and zoning reclassification of a data center and related accessory uses. GWV Data Center. The 12-month timeframe limit for these applications is up on November 25, 2025. The applicant has requested the timeframe for these applications be extended to May 25, 2026. Lastly, the two applications, Market at Austin Ridge, are conditional use permit and zoning reclassification to allow for development of various commercial and office uses within the B2 Zoning District and data centers, office, hotel and a mini storage warehouse uses within the M2 Zoning District. The concurrent CUP would allow multiple drive through facilities and vehicle fuel sales. So, the Planning Commission previously had approved a time extension for this item on January 8, 2025, which extended the time limit to September 21st of this year. However, both applications were amended by the applicant, which were received and deemed administratively complete on December 11th of 2025. Due to the significance of the proposed changes for both applications, the applicable 12-month timeframe has been reset to align with the date the amended applications were deemed complete, and the applicant has requested that the timeframe for these applications be extended to June 11, 2026. I have

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

timeframes for each of the applications. If we want to do that one by one or ask general questions, let me know what your preference.

Mr. Apicella: Why don't we go with questions? Questions for staff? Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: It's not so much a question. I know I've mentioned it before, but like, I keep track of, like, the project pipeline report, and it has been a year for some of this stuff. So how many times are you all actually allowed to come back and ask for an extension?

Ms. Wolfson: The Planning Commission would be granted a 12-month extension, and then an additional six months. So, 18 months after that it would have to go to the Board.

Ms. Barnes: Clarification. The County doesn't ask for it. It's the applicant that asks for the extension. Just to make sure.

Ms. Wolfson: The applicant asks for the extension, we come forward and tell you.

Ms. Caudill: We'll say that. Okay, that's fine. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: So, this is a combination where the applicant is asking for the extension, but staff is also asking in order to get their work accomplished too. Am I correct?

Ms. Wolfson: In the Zoning Ordinance it's a requirement that we would have to come to you all after the 12 month lapses, so the applicant requests the extension because of the zoning ordinance requirement to come forward.

Mr. Apicella: Can I ask it a different way? From staff's perspective, have the applicants been diligently working towards the continuance of their project?

Ms. Wolfson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all right. Any other questions for staff? All right. Thank you very much. Is there a motion? Mr. Shelton, I think all three of these are in your district. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to extend all three.

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further comments? Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I have one comment. I just want to acknowledge. I know a couple of things were said earlier about one of the projects, about an applicant and some questionable corporate behavior. This

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

has nothing to do, this extension of time has nothing to do with that but I just want to acknowledge that we do hear you and we understand and we do know what was going on. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? I'll just add that however you vote on this is not an indication of whether for or against any of these projects. This is the process of providing applicants additional time, as long as they're continuing to work diligently towards the conclusion of their application and getting it before the Planning Commission. All right, with that said, let's vote on this. All right, that motion carries 6-0. I can't see the screen. It's too small. All right. Thank you very much. Moving on to the next item, item number 9.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, please recognize Shaun McLellan for the next staff presentation.

9. WAI25156730; Poplar Glen Minor Subdivision Waiver - A waiver request of Subdivision Ordinance, Sec. 22-144, "Lot Frontage," Sec. 22-151, "Reverse Frontage," Sec. 22-179, "Dedication of Streets," and Sec. 22-186, "Adoption of state highway department standards," for a minor subdivision proposing five lots located on Tax Map Parcel No. 17-34C, zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 37.863 acres, located between Heflin Road and Tacketts Mill Road, on the north side of Poplar Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. **(Time Limit: January 11, 2026)**

Mr. McLellan: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I'm Sean McLellan with Planning and Zoning and I'm here to present item number nine on tonight's agenda. Tonight's request is a consideration for request of waivers for the subdivision ordinance to include lot frontage, dedication of streets reverse frontage and VDOT standards for the proposed Poplar Glen minor subdivision within the Rock Hill Election District. Here are the specific code sections the applicant owner is requesting waivers from. The waiver request is associated with the plan to subdivide tax map parcel number 17-34C consisting of 37.86 acres. The applicant owner is John Owens, and the engineer is John Fairbanks PE with Fairbanks and Franklin. The subject parcel shaded in red and all surrounding parcels are zoned A-1. It is located on the north side of Poplar Road, east of Heflin Road and west of Tacketts Mill Road within the Rock Hill Election District. The parent parcel has frontage on Poplar Road. The applicant is proposing two private easements to be approved so he can subdivide his tax map parcel number 17-34c into a total of five parcels for a single-family detached development. The proposed development will be called Poplar Glen. This is an aerial photo showing the existing conditions. The parcel is currently vacant. An area wetlands start at the northeast corner of the parcel and wind down to the pond. The parcel is not restricted by an RPA, floodplain or any utility easements. It is located outside of the Urban Services Area, and the proposed lots would be served by well and septic. The six-acre density requirement in the A-1 district would allow up to 6 parcels. The applicant has submitted a plat showing the proposed access points to each parcel. The proposed access easements are colored in yellow for clarification. The conceptual layout shows the proposed private ingress/egress easement and private street on the west side of the property serving proposed parcels one, two and three. It also shows the proposed private access easement on the right side of the property serving proposed parcels four and five. This is the proposed private street and ingress/egress easement to the west of the parcel. For this proposed access the applicant is requesting waivers for Section 22-144a, Section 22-179, and section 22-186. Regarding this private street entrance, this is the code language for each subdivision ordinance section that applicant is requesting waivers for. First the lot frontage, because the proposed parcels two and three will front on a street which does not meet the requirements of State Highway Department standards. The second dedication of streets is to continue the private street for the three parcels on the west side of the property and not dedicated to public use. Third is the adoption of State Highway Department standards. It allows the lots depicted on the plat to be served by a private street

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

with an ingress/egress easement in lieu of a VDOT standard subdivision street. The proposed access would be one line with one serving a private drive than a public road.

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

Ms. Sellers: Can you tell us a little bit about what the difference is between the standards that VDOT has established between a private drive and a public road.

Mr. McLellan: A street has to be defined as a road to serve three or more residential properties.

Ms. Sellers: No, I'm thinking more of the construction of that road. You know, there are different, Lord, why do I know this, but you know, there are different things that you see within a road and so my concern is VDOT has the different levels within how they develop the road and which part, in addition to the width and all those things. So what exactly is the applicant trying to get to not do on this private road?

Mr. McLellan: I'd have to defer to the applicant to see exactly what he's trying to do there.

Mr. Apicella: Maybe I'm wrong, VDOT road would normally be paved. A private access easement doesn't necessarily have to be paved.

Mr. McLellan: I believe there's also swales and ditches VDOT require.

Mr. Apicella: Right, those are two big differences between a VDOT road and a private road.

Ms. Sellers: Well, it's not just paved, but there are, like...

Mr. Apicella: Well, there's width too.

Ms. Sellers: I mean, there's the width, but the way...it's there's the pavement that we see that's a top coat, but there's stuff underneath that road. That's why, when they finish the subdivision and it hasn't been dedicated yet, you'll still see the manholes poking up because they haven't put that top coat on that we all see is like, okay, that's it, but there are standards underneath that, and those are the ones that I'm trying to see. And that's going to determine how the maintenance schedule, what it's going to cost for these folks living on that road to maintain their road so it doesn't just cripple and crumble. And there's also aggregate standards throughout the state, and I don't know what that is here, but yeah, there, there's the top surface, and then the sub surfaces.

Mr. Zurf: Mr. Chairman, if I could add. Yeah, so really in this case, this would allow the applicant to have, really, more of a private kind of driveway set up and the applicant probably can confirm what the condition of that road might be, but it could very well just be kind of a gravel driveway but if it's anything more, the applicant can clarify whether it's going to be a paved surface, but it could very well just be a gravel driveway, as opposed to a full, like 20 foot wide paved roadway with ditches and everything like that.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Do we know the reason why that ordinance exists? The ordinance saying that if you have three or more houses, that it has to be a public road. There's got to be a reason for that ordinance otherwise, I don't think it would be in there. Do we have that idea? Is it a safety issue?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Zuraf: I think it's a maintenance concern that they're not taking in a full public road because the road would be dedicated for VDOT maintenance and they don't want to just have to take on a whole road that may serve just one property. They want to make sure that it's serving at least three properties.

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

Mr. McLellan: The owner applicant also, they have already obtained an approved street name from our GIS department, Libra Lane. This is for the proposed private access easement on the right side of the property. Again, the definition of a street is any means of property access that serves three or more distinct properties and this easement will only serve the two parcels in total and will not fall in the definition of street. For this proposed access, the applicant is requesting a waiver for Section 22-151, reverse frontage, due to the subdivision being adjacent to Poplar Road, which is classified as a major collector road per VDOT. This is the code language from our subdivision ordinance section. The applicant is requesting a waiver for. Um, the proposed access would be more in line with one serving a private drive rather than a public road. The applicant states that it's not practical for lots one and five to share driveways as the frontage is separated by an existing parcel, tax map 17-34A. They also state that constructing a new public road for the subdivision would significantly increase the amount of land disturbance and that is not financially feasible given the number of lots. Both easements will be 50 foot wide. The private ingress easement to the west is approximately 1483 feet in length, and the private access easement on the right is approximately 440 feet in length. Parcels one and five do front on Poplar Road, but they are planning to use the proposed private easement entrances for ingress/egress and not their own separate driveways. This site distance calculation is for the proposed private street on the west side of the property. Per the applicant's letter VDOT will classify the private street entrance as a low volume commercial which is defined as any entrance other than a private entrance serving five or fewer individual residents or lots for individual residents on a privately owned and maintained road or land uses that generate 50 or fewer vehicle trips per day. Per the plan drawing, it does depict a stopping distance of 305 feet in both directions, based on the posted speed limit of 40 miles an hour. VDOT's, minimum stopping distance per their geometric design standards at 40 miles an hour is 305 feet, therefore meeting the requirements. The applicant formally requests that Stafford County Planning Commission consider the waivers request subdivision ordinance Stafford County code sections, 22-144A, 22-179, 22-186, and 22-151. In the applicant's request letter, the owner, John Owens, states the intention is to improve and build the area in a responsible manner, and that minimizes impervious services, land disturbance and environmental impacts, keeping the area's rural character intact. Section 22-241, authority to grant specifies following: where permitted one or more of the minimum requirements established under this chapter may be waived by the Planning Commission upon assurance of the subdivider that each of the following conditions has been met. The minimum requirement, if applied to the proposed subdivision, would impose an unreasonable burden upon the subdivider, or the granting of such waiver will have no substantially adverse effect on the future residents of the proposed subdivision, nor upon any property adjoining such proposed subdivision. The staff does recommend the Planning Commission make findings relative to the criteria for granting waivers. This concludes my presentation. I can answer any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Shaun, can you pull up the diagram? The one that shows the road. I'm interested in the length of the road. So the one that's sort of in the middle of the picture, that private access easement. What would the length of that road be whether it's private or...

Mr. McLellan: Roughly 440 feet, I do believe. Yeah, 440 feet in length.

Mr. Apicella: Are you aware of any environmental issues on on this parcel or parcels?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. McLellan: No, like I said, there is a little bit of wetlands in the upper northeast corner, and they're kind of what just winds down to the pond. There's no RPA, there's no floodplain, there's no utility easement restrictions.

Mr. Apicella: And if this waiver were not approved, how many lots do we think they could get out of this area?

Mr. McLellan: Two, maybe three.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Ms. Barnes, did you have some questions?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, for the, directionally challenge. I thought I had it. So, for the private ingress/egress, otherwise known as a private road, the reason we need the waiver is because they don't want to make it a VDOT maintained road?

Mr. McLellan: You got it, yes.

Ms. Barnes: And why don't they want to do that?

Mr. McLellan: Because they want to make it more of a private drive than...

Ms. Barnes: I understand that, but, but, but I'm not understanding why. If there's three houses on it, why not make it a road?

Mr. McLellan: I would have to defer to the applicant to find out.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So basically, the unreasonable burden here is lot yield. That's what I'm getting.

Mr. McLellan: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions for staff? Shaun, you did a great job. Thank you.

Ms. Caudill: Are you new?

Mr. McLellan: I am.

Ms. Caudill: It's very nice to meet you.

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

Mr. Fairbanks: Good evening. I'm John Fairbanks, with Fairbanks and Franklin. I will just give some background on the reason why we're doing this. The situation is, the current yield from the lot would be, from this parcel, would be six residential lots based on one lot per six acres. And what we would be required to do, if we develop this with six lots is design a public road with an entrance on Poplar Road, and based on VDOT standards, you must have two connections. It's the SSAR interconnectivity standards, which requires a separate connection to an adjacent parcel as well. And so, there's only two available connections, and this is actually noted in the letter as well that you should have a copy of in

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

our request. Basically, the parcel to the west, which is undeveloped, and then also the Barrington Woods stub that has been left that's also an undeveloped...

Mr. Apicella: Do you have a diagram you can show us?

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah, I don't. I asked if it was appropriate for me to have a presentation prepared, and I'm sorry,

Mr. Apicella: Is there any chance we can pull up the slide, Shaun, that you used?

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah, because I can certainly, you know, talk from the plan you know that we had looked at.

Mr. Apicella: Computer please. Yeah, I think that's, that's a good slide, the one that, yeah, so if you could explain where you're talking about, if this will help.

Mr. Fairbanks: Can we look at the zoomed out?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, is there another one that zoomed out?

Mr. Fairbanks: I think the thing that shows the bigger picture is certainly more valuable. Okay, yeah. There you go. Okay, this shows the overall. Essentially, the parcel that's to the north, it's a triangular parcel that does have a home on it. That is a single residential lot. The land to the west, which abuts the longer yellow vertical line there, that is undeveloped. So we would be required to connect for a six-lot subdivision a public road to an adjacent parcel, which would be the parcel to the west, or the Barrington Woods undeveloped right of way, which is on the other side of the wetlands. We would have to actually, if you look at the area on there, the hatched area in the northeast corner of the property is all wetlands. And so, you know, we're not planning to touch that. That's our goal. And so...

Ms. Barnes: But it's not an RPA?

Mr. Fairbanks: It's not RPA, that's correct. It's an intermittent stream with fringe wetlands. And so, you know, what we're trying to do here is actually develop this, this land, in what we consider a very responsible way that is not nearly as impactful as a VDOT road that would have a significant width to it, a 50-foot right-of-way, considerable clearing, and all you can get is six lots out of it, and we need to extend that road to the adjacent property, or to the Barrington Woods right-of-way connection, and just to be frank about it, that's not feasible from a cost standpoint. There's no way that for six lots, you can support that type of infrastructure. And so that's why we've come up with this alternative, which is five lots, it's less than what's allowed, you know, by-right, essentially, but it does not require a public street. That's the purpose of this.

Mr. Apicella: So, at least from my vantage point, lot yield or cost is really not an issue in terms of granting a waiver. I'm more concerned about what the impacts might be on the wetlands if you still had to move forward with a public road? Again, if you could help me understand what the...

Mr. Fairbanks: Good question. If we were to put in a public road that extends to Barrington Woods, that would have to be elevated above the wetland level, the impacts would probably be a corridor that is cleared in the range of minimum 50 foot, likely 60 to 70 foot, you know, 60-foot wide, roughly, to have a public road connection there. So we're just talking 60 foot and I'd estimate that the length is just, you

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

know, looking at it, because the Barrington Woods right-of-way is 50-foot wide. And you know, we're probably talking a length of at least, just on our parcel alone, 100 foot. We did not delineate what is offsite, and so I guess what I'm saying is it's a significant wetland impact if we were to go that route.

Mr. Apicella: So forgive me for asking this question because it sounds kind of basic. Why can't you just do two public roads based on what I see here, and not two private access easements. So the length of the 400 feet on the one on the bottom, I don't know how long the one is on the other side. Why can't you just do VDOT standard roads there in those two places?

Mr. Fairbanks: Well, I think from a design standpoint, you'd have two connections on a public road, on Poplar Road with a public street, which would not be desirable, you would have to still extend through the property to have a connection to the adjacent parcel. If you design a public road, it has to interconnect with an adjacent parcel or right-of-way.

Mr. Apicella: So, what you're saying is this is not a feasible approach to meet the requirements.

Mr. Fairbanks: No, I think what you could have, you know, if you're going for, you know, two connections, like what you're saying, you could have a cul-de-sac at the end of one, and have a public road with a cul-de-sac, and the other would have to connect to Barrington Woods or the adjacent property. So, I mean, which, once again, is a considerable amount of infrastructure, considerable amount of impervious area for...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'm just looking for a way to avoid impacting the wetlands. So, is it possible that you could design something that does not impact the wetlands? Again, cost, from a waiver perspective, is not, in my opinion, a criteria or yield is not a criteria. But I can understand and appreciate the concern about potentially impacting wetlands. So if you can come up with another approach that, still again, cost, not under consideration, that would not impact the wetlands.

Mr. Fairbanks: Well, I think what I can say is that there's no way to connect to Barrington Woods subdivision at the existing stub without impacting the wetlands. There's no possible way to do that if you were to connect with the public street there. I mean, that would be a wetland impact. There's no way to span that that area.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: So, I'm chopping up a bit here. So you stated you wanted to look for the most responsible way to develop this. Have you considered that the most responsible way to develop this, and the way to get around having to have these waivers, is to build less houses?

Mr. Fairbanks: That is a way that would have less yield. Yes, I also know that the only way that this project would move forward would be if the yield is more than 2 lots.

Ms. Barnes: That's not, I can't really take that, the lot yield, I can't really take into consideration. What I'm looking for is a way, you know, we have these ordinances in place for a reason. And as far as that private access or private ingress/egress on the left-hand side, those are, I have looked at houses, and I know people, those are a total nightmare for the three houses that have to maintain that together. I do not like those. I would much rather see a public road that's maintained by, obviously, by VDOT, a design where that can happen, or less houses. I mean, the thing is, is that and this is one of the things that I've noticed is that the math may work, you may be able, with the math, to get six houses, but the geography

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

doesn't and in a lot of cases, that limits the number of houses on here. The lot yield and the profitability of the project, I understand it, but that's not what I would call an unreasonable burden. If we don't approve the waivers, that land can still be developed, you just can't put as many houses on it. And there is a statement, I think in, I don't remember where it was, that says that building, you know, the five houses, as opposed to building however many, the two or three that you possibly could without these waivers, is not going to impact the surrounding community. Every house that is built on a road like this. Every car that is built on a road like this impacts the surrounding community. So, I'm not convinced that this is the way to go. I think that there's going to be a better way to go with less houses and not having to have these waivers or just follow the ordinance like everybody else has to do.

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah, you know, we're in a position where we have a parcel that is in some ways one of the most challenging types of parcels to work with, because to go through a major site plan process for five or six lots would never work. And I know that what we were saying is the decisions are not made from an economic standpoint, but it is a reality that there's no way that this could be developed. No one would develop this with five or six lots with a public street that has the level of improvements.

Ms. Barnes: But would anybody develop it with two or three houses that don't need waivers and don't need a public road?

Mr. Fairbanks: I'm not sure. Yeah, I can't speak to that.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: So on the one with the three houses on it, would you guys be willing to design it in a way that should this property, what is it like 17-34 so I don't know where that is, but the one on the other side, if they come in for a rezoning, they could build the public road and you guys would already have the right of way in place. Does that make sense?

Mr. Fairbanks: It does make sense.

Ms. Sellers: For future...because what I'm looking at is you have a, you know, 17-34, 17-35 I think, to the north or up top on the picture. And so there is a potential for these two properties to be further developed. And so could a grant, could a waiver be granted, but have some conditions on it, where you guys design it in a way that this right of way is in place. If that makes sense.

Mr. Fairbanks: I really need to confer with the owner and the applicant to know if they're, you know, if that would be something they'd be willing to do. I think that the challenge of that is, you know, it still requires, that would be something that likely would require a major site plan, and also, if you're talking about building that to a certain standard and designing the road, you know what we're doing here, and I know that Mike Zuraf had said this as well, is that we're really putting this in intending to put this into a driveway standard. And the intent is that you can have in a minor subdivision, a private access easement that serves a lot that it does not front on the road. And what we're doing is we're essentially asking for a waiver to add one more lot to that. You can already do that for one. We're asking to do that for one more.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I'm thinking in the future, though.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Can I just ask one question is to follow up to Ms. Sellers? Can we even do conditions on waivers?

Mr. Zuraf: No, no. It's a yes or no vote on what's proposed before us

Ms. Barnes: And you can only have one private access easement per neighborhood. Is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: It's one what's required is one lot off of a PAE. And that's what's being requested to be, you know...

Ms. Barnes: And max is two lots off of a PAE?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, with the frontage lot, where the lot goes through or the PAE goes through, they can have access, plus the the lot that the PAE serves.

Ms. Barnes: I don't have a problem with the reverse frontage, and I've seen places we do that, but we just had a waiver come through just a couple of months ago on a very big project in Hartwood on Able Lake, where they wanted a waiver to build a much longer road so that they could build many more houses and we denied that waiver, because building more houses is not is not something that we can be concerned with, or lot yield or profitability. If you can build less houses and still develop this parcel, then you haven't met the threshold for an unreasonable burden to me. That's where I'm kind of caught there. It looks to me like there could be houses built here, maybe not, obviously, not six, even though the math works. It's a tough lot. There are a lot of tough lots, and you don't always get to max the lot yield because of the way that the lot is structured and it's unfortunate, I feel for you, but that's the way it is.

Mr. Fairbanks: We are not looking to maximize the lot yield. I mean, we are looking for five. I do understand that.

Ms. Barnes: I mean, even at five, to me, without these two waivers, which you know, everybody is required to abide by these ordinances. Without these two waivers, you could still develop their property. I mean, it's not like this is a completely landlocked piece of property, that without a waiver, you're stuck. You're not going to be able to develop it at all. So that's where I'm having a hard time with the unreasonable burden on that.

Mr. Fairbanks: Well, I think to develop the property, you still need a reverse frontage waiver, because you're going to have a lot with the frontage directly on Poplar Road and you may be able to get a lot behind that off of a private access easement. So it's still is a Planning Commission action, you know, to be able to develop this land.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, is it possible to bifurcate the two issues?

Mr. Zuraf: I think we'd have to see how that's planned out.

Mr. Apicella: I think what Ms. Barnes is saying is she's okay with the reverse frontage piece of the waiver request. I am too.

Ms. Barnes: And even if you just had on the private ingress/outgress, I guess, ingress/egress on the western properties of the three houses, if you took that down to two, it'd be one less house, but you

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

wouldn't require that waiver for the VDOT road. Am I understanding that correctly for the western waiver?

Mr. Zuraf: Sorry, can you repeat that?

Ms. Barnes: I'm not sure that I can. If they took that, the western private ingress/egress, which is, I'm just going to call it a private road, because that's just hard to say, you require a waiver for that, because you've got three houses, correct? You wouldn't require a waiver of that if you had two houses, right?

Mr. Fairbanks: The complicating thing there is that you're allowed one access easement in a minor subdivision,

Ms. Barnes: So then you'd require a waiver for that

Mr. Fairbanks: For two accesses. That is correct.

Ms. Barnes: I think that sounds like a better plan to me.

Mr. Apicella: Go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: I'm obviously less concerned about these two houses here. You can put a gravel road in that really doesn't cost that much money and they'll know before they buy the house that they have to maintain it. I'm assuming.

Mr. Fairbanks: There would be a maintenance agreement, absolutely, between the parties.

Ms. Sellers: So, I'm less concerned about those. This one, and again, it's because of the potential for future development and the most expensive part from, well, the one that can throw the state's plan off is the right of way, and then really that right of way, and if we have to move any utilities, and that's why, just kind of looking at these three ones, is there a way she could design it, and just assume that your neighbors there are going to sell their property too, put in houses, and that's going to have to be a state maintained road, and there is a state program to help bring it into the state standards. But if we have to purchase right of way and move utilities, and that program is unattainable. So that's kind of what I'm thinking here is just figure out how we can make it maybe to where in the future, a road can be built to standard. But those are my thoughts. Again on the other two, a gravel road doesn't cost that much to maintain.

Mr. Apicella: So are there questions? Mr. Zuraf, you look like you want to say something.

Mr. Zuraf: Just on the earlier question, as far as bifurcation of the requests. I think it would be optimal to have the request modified and the plan modified to be clear. So also, from our standpoint, we're making sure that the adjustment is appropriately meeting all the requirements and that the waivers are appropriate because it is a little complicated.

Ms. Barnes: Can you do that via deferral, or do we have to do that via denial and have them come back.

Mr. Zuraf: I mean you could defer. A deferral would work.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: How would that work with the applicant, if we had a deferral and had you come back with maybe an alternate plan? Because I can tell you, as it stands right now, I will make a motion to deny the waiver, because I think that this, I don't think that you've met the threshold of an unreasonable burden being that a state-maintained road costs too much. Yeah, that's unfortunate, but that's not that's necessarily not part of our consideration. It really can't be and/or you can still develop the property, just maybe not the way you want to. So those, to me, are two ways that you haven't met the unreasonable burden. So what I'm asking you is, is if we possibly did a deferral and see if maybe we can have either less houses or have you, you know, take a look at what Commissioner Sellers was discussing about maybe reconfiguring this so that, I mean, obviously I would just prefer the less houses, because it's a tough parcel. Parcels don't work. And, you know, we've told people no before, and I don't want to give necessarily special privileges to one applicant when we've told other applicants before, "No, you can't have the waiver. Just build houses and shorter roads." So that's where I'm at with that. So that's what I'm asking you, is, do you think a deferral would be an option for you to come back and bring something else to us? Because personally, I'd rather do that then just tell you no and send you away.

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah, I guess, I'm sure what I was understanding from what you were saying was you would be more inclined to have to accept two ingress/egress easements with two lots with frontage and two in the back that are accessed by access easement. It's that fifth lot, essentially, because I mean that does...

Ms. Barnes: Or just, I'm sorry, or just what is it the staff said, that without either one of these waivers, you could put two, possibly three houses on there, and then you wouldn't even have to worry about us.

Mr. Fairbanks: I think that we would need a reverse frontage waiver regardless, because actually have direct frontage.

Ms. Barnes: And honestly, the reverse frontage is not a big deal to me. I mean, we do, we've done quite a few reverse frontages. And it's, you know, it's, I think it's the other part that is concerning. Am I getting into uncharted territory here? Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Fairbanks: I would need to confer with the applicant. I mean, that's really, you know, where I stand. So I guess...

Mr. Apicella: Do you want to take a minute?

Mr. Fairbanks: Can I take a minute?

Mr. Apicella: Yep, we're going to take a five minute recess.

The meeting recessed at 8:58 PM.

The meeting reconvened at 9:04 PM.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, we are ready to restart the meeting. So you've heard what Ms. Barnes had to say, what's your reaction?

Mr. Fairbanks: I appreciate you taking the time to let me confer with the applicant and we want to ask for a deferment, please. We're going to work with staff, rework the plan, and, you know, come up with, hopefully something as soon as possible that can be accepted.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, this is in your district, Ms. Barnes. How would you like to proceed this one?

Ms. Barnes: Thank you very much for being willing to work with us. I'd like to defer this. It's either going to be the December 10 and that's going to be a month away. Do you think that's going to be enough time for you? Okay. Would December 10 work? Are we packing our agenda too much there?

Mr. Apicella: Well, it has to be done by January 11. So the first meeting in is January 14, so it has to be December 10.

Mr. Zuraf: December 10 works.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, all right, let's do that. Defer to December 10.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Lots of seconds. All right. Any further comments. Ms. Barnes, Ms. Sellers, anyone else? All right, please cast your vote. That motion carries 6-0. Thanks for working with us, sir. All right, moving on. Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

10. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

11. R25-233: Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Amendments – (1) Modify plan and plat application review processes to align with State Code amendments and (2) Establish definition for “contractors equipment and storage yard.” **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026)**
(Authorize for Public Hearing by: December 10, 2025)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: January 28, 2026)

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, I have a few items to go over with you. You received in your package the usual project pipeline report, where you see all the projects that are that we're working on.

Mr. Apicella: Can I just make a quick comment? It's very impressive. I see 40 items on this list. That's a lot, and many of them have a great deal of complexity. I don't envy you all. I know you guys are working hard, and I appreciate everything you're doing to work through this pipeline report. Ms. Barnes has a question.

Ms. Barnes: Quick question. I noticed that this waiver wasn't on the project pipeline. I don't know if we normally put those on there, or maybe I missed it because I didn't know anything about this until last Friday. Is there a way that we can possibly, in the future, include those on the project pipelines? I mean, you know, obviously, depending on when that waiver, that application comes.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, those are actually quick turnaround items. They usually come in and get to the Commission pretty quick, but we'll look at that and see if...

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: If you can.

Mr. Zuraf: If that's possible to get those in at least so you can see them at a meeting in advance. We'll work towards that.

Ms. Barnes: I was driving around Rock Hill yesterday looking at this. So, yeah, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: And you will see on that report we have three possible items identified for public hearing on December 10, which happened to be the next three items that I have to talk to you about, which they are all referrals from the Board. So item 11, that is a referral. I mentioned this at the last public hearing, last Planning Commission meeting. But item 11 is request to amend the zoning and subdivision ordinances for modifying basically plan and plat review processes and timelines. Basically, that would allow us to, require us to, align with state code requirements that were adopted effective July 1. So basically modifies review timelines that site plans have to follow, but also it does, we included in this a definition that's desired for construction equipment and storage yard, contractors equipment and storage yard. That is a use we have in our zoning ordinance, but it is not defined, and so that's included in that proposed ordinance. And we did receive a comment on that, and tonight, we did provide an alternate version of the proposed ordinance. It includes one minor change to the definition for contractors equipment and storage yard. It's on page nine, and it basically just deletes the reference to contractor, to not create any confusion as to what that means. And so other than that, we would recommend that item, we feel that it could be ready to be authorized for the December 10 public hearing, if you just so desire.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a motion to put the amended version to a public hearing on December 10?

Mr. Shelton: Motion.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Evans: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Any comments? Yes, please go ahead.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, on number 13, Stafford County water/sewer/reclaimed waters.

Mr. Apicella: No, we're just, we're doing each one separate.

Ms. Barnes: Oh, separately.

Mr. Apicella: So we're just doing the first one, which is item 11. Ms. Sellers, did you have a comment?

Ms. Sellers: Like, this one looks like it's reducing the timelines of things. Is this something the Board of Supervisors is going to take to the new General Assembly, to go back?

Mr. Zuraf: This is what was adopted last year by the general by the General Assembly.

Ms. Sellers: Right. We have a brand-new general assembly coming in with a super majority. So are we going to ask them to consider allowing the 60 days instead of the 40 days? Is the Board of Supervisors considering a legislative agenda to go and ask them to undo what the last General Assembly did?

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

Mr. Zuraf: I'd have to check to see.

Mr. Apicella: That would be something that would go on a legislative program for the upcoming year, right? That's not something we could deal with here at our level right now.

Ms. Sellers: Just saying, do we need to deal with this right away, or should we give the new board time to talk amongst themselves and meet because there should be a legislative dinner coming up in the next two weeks. So is this something to bring up and then come back to us and then move forward, would be my question.

Mr. Apicella: So even if the legislature was inclined to do something, it wouldn't even be effective until January, I'm sorry, July 1, right, so in the meantime, we still have to adopt what's in place, the changes, basically taking the Planning Commission out of the preliminary plan subdivision review. That's most of the changes. That's 99% of the changes are reacting to the Assembly's changes and we have to..we don't have a, you know, we would be out of compliance basically, with the state code if we didn't make these changes right now.

Ms. Sellers: I mean, you're taking a chance, and we may get sued, but I'm just saying if that's something the Board wants to challenge.

Mr. Apicella: It can always be amended in June.

Ms. Sellers: I'm just saying, I mean, like 60 to 40 days probably didn't seem like much to much of the General Assembly, but that's a significant reduction in time. So that's all I'm saying, is, should we wait and hear what the Board of Supervisors is talking to the new... our entire delegation is new.

Mr. Zuraf: I would just recommend that we follow state code.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I would agree. And again, if and when the legislature changes the provisions, hopefully they will add more time we can, the Planning Commission and the Board can change it again down the road, right? So I think I heard a motion. I forgot who made it? Is there a motion to put this to a December 10 public hearing, the amended version? All right, just going to do this by voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Ms. Evans: Aye.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Opposed?

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that motion carries 5 to 1. Next item.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

12. Board of Supervisors Resolution R25-292, referring to the Planning Commission Proposed Ordinance O25-40, to modify requirements regarding proof of no delinquent county taxes prior to initiation of certain zoning applications. **(Time Limit: February 20, 2026)**
(Authorize For Public Hearing By: January 14, 2026)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: February 11, 2026)

Mr. Zuraf: Item 12. This is another referral from the Board to consider a zoning ordinance amendment. Basically it would modify the application requirements specific to certain land use cases, rezoning, conditional use permits and some zoning applications. So, there is a requirement that we currently have that basically the applicants have to show proof that any delinquent property taxes are all paid. And there is a provision, basically in the state code, it is an extra caveat that allows for there to be an agreement if the delinquent taxes are not paid, as long as you have an agreement with the treasurer, then you can proceed. So basically, some agreement that those payments will be made. And so this modification would be consistent with what's allowed and permitted in the state code.

Mr. Apicella: And the Board's referral doesn't allow us to make any changes?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So is there a motion to put this item to a public hearing at the December 10 meeting?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to put this item to a public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: This just gives you the timelines, but we can do it at our December 10 meeting. Okay, are you good with that?

Mr. Shelton: I'm good.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Barnes: Second.

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

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Ms. Evans: Aye.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Ms. Sellers: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. Next item.

13. Board of Supervisors Resolution R25-220, referring to the Planning Commission Proposed Resolution R25-221, to amend the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan, specifically a new plan

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

element entitled "Stafford County Water, Sewer, And Reclaimed Water System Master Plan."
(Time Limit: January 5, 2026)
(Authorize For Public Hearing By: November 12, 2025)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: December 10, 2025)

Mr. Zuraf: Item 13. This is another referral to amend the County Comprehensive Plan to adopt a revised new Stafford County Water and Sewer and Reclaim Water System Master Plan. So the water and sewer master plan that we have, it basically is adopted and updated occasionally, to follow along with the Comprehensive Plan, and the utilities department has developed amendments to follow some of the latest standards, but also they incorporated the reclaimed water kind of systems now that are going to be coming online and related to the data centers that have been approved. And so their plan includes that, and this has a shorter time limit for for review by the Planning Commission, and would actually have to be authorized tonight for the December 10 Planning Commission public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: And again, just for context, I know there were some concern raised by the public. This is not an item where, based on the Board's referral that we can change. We can either recommend approval or denial, but we can't make any modifications.

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Ms. Barnes, you had a question.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah. It does sound like the community has some pretty legitimate questions and concerns about this particular one. Who came up with, I mean, where did this come from? Who basically wrote this resolution and the new language to add it to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Zuraf: This is coming from the utilities department.

Ms. Barnes: Do we know who the utilities... I'm getting into some iffy territory here. Did they do it by themselves? Do we know? I mean, because I've got some concerns about this. And so basically, we can take a look at this one, and it's either a yay or a nay. What is the term? I want to consider the source on this, and I don't know what the source is. Is it the planning? Is it the utilities department? Is it the utilities department and all, what's the word I'm looking for, all participants in that particular..

Mr. Apicella: Stakeholders?

Ms. Barnes: Stakeholders, that's the word. Thank you. I'm getting tired. All the stakeholders. I'd like to consider the source on this. Is there any way we can do that?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, Utilities Department would be here to present and explain the, you know, how this all came about, and who prepared, they had help from a consultant in preparing this and so they can talk about all those details.

Ms. Barnes: And this will be a public hearing so the folks that were here tonight, I think we had three or four, they will be able to come back and raise those questions again.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

Mr. Apicella: And we have a full copy of it in our package, so we have plenty of time to take a look at it before the December meeting. All right, is there a motion to put this item to the December 10 meeting for a public hearing?

Mr. Shelton: Motion.

Ms. Evans: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Thank you very much. All right. All those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Ms. Evans: Aye.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Ms. Sellers: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. Last item, no, not the last item.

14. Board of Supervisors referred to the Planning Commission Proposed Ordinance O25-29(R) and authorized a Joint Public Hearing on Tuesday, December 2, 2025, at 6:30 PM regarding grandfathering data center projects that received official Reclassification, CUP, and/or Site Plan approval by the County on or before October 21, 2025.

Mr. Zuraf: Item 14. So. This is just the Board referral to the Planning Commission, which you've received notice about this that there will be a another joint public hearing that is scheduled for December, 2, 6:30. This basically is re-ordaining the data center ordinance O25-29 to include provision that would allow for grandfathering of specific data center projects that had already received approval via either reclassification, use permit or site plan approval.

Ms. Sellers: Is this the only thing on that agenda, or are we going to be here till two in the morning?

Mr. Apicella: I have made a request that we go on the front end, not on the back end, so hopefully this as positively received.

Mr. Zuraf: As of earlier today, I did see the draft agenda, and this is the only public hearing for that night.

Ms. Sellers: And there's not like, look, they've gotten us twice where we have sat here for hours. So that's my only thing, like, I don't want to be here till two in the morning. It was a great time, but, I mean, I would prefer...

Mr. Zuraf: I'll put in a word.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Alright. So we don't need to take a vote. We just need a consensus and we're good with the...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, and I've heard that we have more than a quorum that can be present for this meeting.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Yes, Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Can you tell me how many are we looking at as far as this? I know we're getting a little bit ahead of this, but how many should we like, if we get asked questions, what/who are we talking about here? Which five?

Mr. Zuraf: Five projects. The Potomac Church Tech Center, Stafford Technology Campus, Cranes Corner, Pemberton, Vantage Melrod, and then any related site plans associated with those projects.

Ms. Caudill: What was the one before Vantage Melrod, what was the name of that?

Mr. Zuraf: Pemberton.

Ms. Caudill: Pemberton, okay, and that's the only ones we're talking about for this?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct?

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: One last item that's not listed out. I just want to give the Commission a heads up on the Comprehensive Plan. The last update to the Comprehensive Plan occurred in 2021.

Mr. Apicella: I think Ms. Barnes just agreed to steer it, the whole effort.

Mr. Zuraf: So the next five-year update is due to be considered in 2026 and so we as staff are going to just basically be working out a kind of potential schedule and framework for how the Commission may want to address this issue in the next year.

Ms. Barnes: How extensive is it?

Mr. Zuraf: That is up to the Commission.

Mr. Apicella: And the Board, right? The Board will give direction.

Ms. Barnes: Because last time it was mostly just updating.

Mr. Zuraf: So, so what we, you know, well, we'll identify maybe things that need to be looked at. And yeah, it's basically, it's required by state code as a review. And so how extensive that is, that's up to the Commission and Board. Our intent is to provide the Commission a framework for you all to kind of consider the issue, and in the meantime, then also in January, we'll plan to try to go to the Board and give them a basically the same information and see what what feedback they have as well.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, do you remember how long it took us last time, was it like maybe eight or nine months? It was a better part of a year, meeting every other week.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it did begin at basically at the beginning of the year, and it concluded pretty much in September/ October.

Ms. Sellers: Can we make sure everybody tells us what buildings that they're choosing, that they're preparing to build, and what properties are under contract so we know where things are going like now? Like a fire station and a school, so if the schools are listening, like we don't just show up with three schools that have the capacity of five that would be really helpful.

Mr. Zuraf: So with all that good news, that concludes my remarks.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Ms. Lucian. County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: I have no report.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Okay, I'll just be real brief. I want to wish everybody a Happy Thanksgiving. If you don't know it, you might be able to see the Northern Lights tonight. And the last thing is, I want to congratulate all candidates who were elected or reelected to the School Board and Board of Supervisors, including our very own, Ms. Kecia Evans. Congratulations. All right, last item on the agenda, approval of minutes. Is there a motion to approve the August 27th?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

15. New TRC Submissions - *NONE*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

16. August 27, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Ms. Sellers: So moved.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All in favor say aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Ms. Evans: Aye.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Ms. Sellers: Aye.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Aye. That motion carries unanimously. All in favor of the September 24, 2025 minutes?

17. September 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton: Motion.

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: All in favor say aye.

Ms. Barnes: Aye.

Ms. Evans: Aye.

Ms. Caudill: Aye.

Mr. Shelton: Aye.

Ms. Sellers: Aye.

Mr. Apicella: Aye. Opposed? That motion carries unanimously. We are hereby adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:23 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the November 12, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.