

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 8, 2026

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, April 8, 2026, was called to order at 6:00 PM by the Chairman Kristen Barnes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kristen Barnes, Carlos Bratton, Kelsey Caudill, Gregory Goldstein, Marcus Oats, Willie Shelton, Jr., Maureen Siegmund

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Emilie Wolfson

CALL TO ORDER:

Ms. Barnes called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

INVOCATION:

Ms. Caudill led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mr. Bratton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:

Mr. Bratton called the roll, with all members present, and determined there was a quorum.

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATIONS:

There were no declarations of disqualifications.

Ms. Barnes asked if there were any changes to the agenda, and Mr. Zuraf responded no.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Barnes opened the Public Presentations portion of the meeting and read the procedures for speakers. With no speakers coming forward, the Chair closed the public presentations segment and proceeded to the next agenda item, turning the meeting over to Mr. Zuraf.

1. Planning and Zoning; Consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a commercial kennel in the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 28-37F (Project known as CUP24155811; Silverbrook Kennels)
Proposed Resolution R26-121 (Approval)
Proposed Resolution R26-122 (Denial)
(Time Limit: July 17, 2026)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Recommends approval of conditional use permit.

Mr. Mike Zuraf opened the agenda item by recognizing staff member Emilie Wolfson for her presentation.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

Ms. Emilie Wolfson introduced herself as the Project Manager responsible for the application and began the formal staff report. She stated that the purpose of the presentation was to review a Conditional Use Permit request for a commercial kennel in the A-1, Agricultural zoning district. The applicant, RAADX LLC, represented by Clark Leming, was seeking approval for continued kennel operations on Tax Map Parcel 28-37F, located in the Rock Hill District.

She provided background information noting that in July 30, 2011, the Board of Zoning Appeals approved a special exception for an animal behavior service operation on the property, previously known as Silverbrook Kennels. RAADX LLC purchased the property in 2022 with the intent of continuing the business and was subsequently informed that a CUP is required for a commercial kennel use in the A-1 district. The current application is intended to bring the operation into full compliance with county standards.

The subject property encompasses approximately 10.35 acres, located 830 feet north of Kellogg Mill Road, with access provided by a 40-foot private easement known as Red Fox Lane. The property is zoned A-1 and contains a pond, trailer, carport, gravel access, multiple sheds, and two metal buildings that predate Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act requirements. These existing structures will remain but will only be used for storage, with no additions or expansions.

The applicant proposes construction of a one-story, 5,000-square-foot commercial kennel building, approximately 18 feet in height, with a six-foot wood fence enclosure. The design meets all zoning requirements for setbacks, height, and floor area ratio, and the project exceeds the 80 percent open-space requirement. Sixteen parking spaces and one loading space are proposed. No impacts to wetlands, streams, RPAs, or FEMA floodplains were identified. The site is served by an existing well and proposed private drainfields and includes a 50-foot transitional buffer.

Ms. Wolfson reviewed architectural renderings provided by the applicant, noting that the building incorporates varied architectural treatments, including a sloped metal roof, covered entry, and artistic design elements that support a rural, rustic appearance. Conditions associated with the CUP require construction generally consistent with these renderings. The proposal was found consistent with the Agricultural/Rural land use designation in the Comprehensive Plan. With recommended conditions relating to screening, noise control, hours of operation, and buffering, the commercial kennel use is compatible with surrounding rural development patterns. A transportation analysis estimated that the use would generate approximately 102 vehicle trips per day, including employees and patrons. No impacts to schools, parks, or fire and rescue services are anticipated. Recommended conditions include prohibiting expansion of existing structures, construction of the new kennel in general conformance with the submitted architectural examples, limiting hours of operation to 6:00 AM through 5:00 PM with staff onsite at all times, a maximum of 50 dogs, installation of a six-foot board-on-board screening fence, and preparation of a plan for a 20-foot-wide travelway with a turnaround to Kellogg Mill Road. She clarified that a reference to a “paved” travelway in the dispatch packet was a typographical error and will be removed. The kennel must be cleaned daily with proper waste removal. Ms. Wolfson concluded that the application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, compatible with existing development patterns, and that proposed conditions sufficiently mitigate potential impacts. Staff therefore recommended approval of CUP24155811 pursuant to Resolution R26-121 and closed by offering to answer questions from the Commission.

During Commission questions to staff, Ms. Barnes thanked staff and noted that she had met with the applicant and toured the facility earlier in the week. She sought confirmation that the reference to a paved travelway would be removed from the conditions, and staff acknowledged that the correction would be

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

made. For clarity, Ms. Wolfson identified the correction as pertaining to Condition 11. Ms. Barnes then addressed Condition 8 regarding the cap on animals, observing that the draft conditions set a maximum of fifty dogs at any time, while an overnight cap of forty-two dogs had been discussed. She asked about the basis for the forty-two-dog nighttime limit and indicated that, when the applicant came forward, the Commission could consider whether the overnight cap should align with the fifty-dog maximum.

Ms. Wolfson responded that they were amenable to aligning the nighttime limit with the overall maximum, emphasizing that adequate space remained the primary consideration. Ms. Barnes further proposed adding language to the conditions regarding pet waste storage and removal. Specifically, she suggested requiring that any storage (such as a dumpster) be set back at least 200 feet from property lines, consistent with the building setback, to prevent waste storage near adjoining parcels. She also proposed adding a requirement for weekly removal of pet waste. She asked that draft language reflecting these additions be prepared for consideration at the time of a motion. Ms. Barnes confirmed with staff that the facility would be subject to the County's noise ordinance with respect to barking, similar to enforcement that would apply to any residence with continuous barking. Ms. Wolfson affirmed this understanding and also reiterated that the original concern behind the forty-two-dog overnight figure was ensuring sufficient space, and that they were comfortable with the proposed alignment provided space standards are met.

When invited to speak, the applicant's representative, Clark Leming, addressed Commissioners and introduced members of the Silverbrook Kennels team, including owner and prior manager Raymond Alexander, his wife, Adam (manager), Caitlin (assistant manager), and Dobby (training manager). Mr. Leming described Silverbrook Kennels as a long-standing, highly regarded operation and shared personal observations from visits, noting the quiet and orderly environment associated with the facility's emphasis on training. He stated that staffing includes six to eight full-time employees plus additional part-time personnel and explained that the shift toward training and longer-term stays reduces day-to-day traffic volume, as customers typically drop dogs for extended periods rather than making multiple daily trips.

Mr. Leming discussed the approximately one-third-mile segment of Red Fox Lane used to access the site from Kellogg Mill Road, acknowledging neighborhood concerns about vehicle speed and explaining measures taken by the owner, including warning or barring customers who drive too fast and posting advisory signage. He suggested that observed volumes appear lower than trip generation estimates might suggest. Addressing the proposed additions to the conditions, he affirmed that placing the waste dumpster at least 200 feet from property lines was acceptable and stated that the current location already meets that setback near the planned new building. He added that existing buildings closer to property edges would be retained for storage only and not used to house dogs, and that the new facility would be constructed to match the existing rural aesthetic.

Regarding the travelway, Mr. Leming clarified that the applicant does not have a right to pave the private access and agreed that the condition should reflect an unpaved surface. He reported that the Fire Marshal requested a 40-foot drivable width to accommodate emergency apparatus passing, and he indicated that the applicant would agree to modify the condition accordingly to provide a 40-foot unpaved drivable area within the easement, coordinated with the Fire Marshal during site plan review. He concluded by asking whether there were any additional conditions the members wished him to address. The Chair thanked staff and the applicant for the clarifications and invited the applicant forward for further questions and discussion.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

During the discussion, Ms. Barnes sought clarification on several operational conditions related to the proposed dog boarding and training facility. She first confirmed that the applicant agreed to both the 200-foot setback for pet waste storage and the requirement for weekly pickup of pet waste. Mr. Leming affirmed that these conditions were acceptable and consistent with current operations.

The conversation then shifted to the proposed limit of 42 dogs for overnight boarding. Ms. Barnes questioned the origin of that specific number. Mr. Leming responded that the number did not come from the applicant and that they preferred the same capacity for both day and overnight stays—up to 50 dogs. He noted there was no operational reason to reduce the number overnight, and Ms. Barnes agreed that 42 appeared arbitrary unless tied to a specific regulation.

Mr. Leming introduced Mr. Larry Wilford, the engineer for the project, noting his retirement and brief return to assist with the proposal. He highlighted that the application materials already include clear photos of the site, access road, and existing structures. Mr. Leming encouraged anyone unfamiliar with the facility to visit it firsthand.

Ms. Siegmund asked about the nature of the training program, specifically whether it created additional traffic or added to the dog count separate from boarding. A representative from Silverbrook explained that their training is a three-week board-and-train program. Owners visit three times: drop-off, a mid-program session, and a final pick-up. Additional sessions are only scheduled if necessary. He emphasized that all dogs on site—boarding, training, or daycare—are counted within the single 50-dog maximum, and capacity is managed by suspending daycare during peak boarding seasons.

Ms. Barnes confirmed that training dogs are included in the same 50-dog limit. She then asked how construction traffic would be managed given that several homes share the private easement on Red Fox Lane. The applicant noted there are no easement restrictions on construction use. The facility representative stated they expect construction to be limited in scope because the new building is simple, comparable to a small structure or shed, and should not generate unusually heavy or prolonged traffic. Mr. Leming added that the engineer indicated construction impacts would be similar to any typical residential or small-scale project on that road. Ms. Barnes clarified that only one new building is planned, to which the applicant agreed.

Ms. Caudill expressed appreciation for the care the facility provides and requested an overview of a typical day for dogs at the facility, indicating personal interest as a dog owner.

Mr. Raymond Alexander explained the daily routine at the kennel, beginning with the early-morning schedule. First thing each day, staff take the older dogs outside to use the exercise pens, usually in groups ranging from 2 to as many as 15 dogs. After this potty break, the dogs come back inside and are fed breakfast around 7:00 AM. Once their food has settled, staff begin outdoor play sessions, which they refer to as “care camp.” These individualized play and exercise periods occur throughout the day. Mid-morning, when breakfast has been processed, the dogs are taken out again for another bathroom break. A similar routine occurs around 2:00 PM, when all dogs are aired out while staff clean the facility, including walls and indoor areas. Dinner is intentionally served early—between 4:30 and 5:00 PM so that dogs have time to digest before their final airing around 9:00 PM. Throughout the day, any baths or extra services requested by owners are completed indoors.

Ms. Caudill asked whether there is an age cutoff for participation in doggy daycare or training. Mr. Alexander clarified that there is no age limit and no breed restrictions, emphasizing that older dogs can still learn new skills. However, the facility does have behavior-based restrictions, specifically excluding

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

dogs that are overly aggressive toward people due to the hands-on nature of the operation. He noted that while they do not accept aggressive dogs, they know of other kennels that accommodate them. The only firm requirement is that all dogs must be current on their vaccinations—rabies, distemper, parvo, Bordetella, and canine influenza—once old enough to receive them.

Mr. Shelton then asked about the kennel's waste container and whether it is sealed. A representative explained that the kennel uses a standard trash dumpster with a lid that is weighted and slanted, provided by Republic Services, which helps prevent wildlife from accessing the waste. Mr. Shelton noted the amount of waste generated by dogs and shared that he has boarded his own poodles at Silverbrook.

Mr. Oats inquired whether the planned expansion includes an on-site veterinarian. The applicant responded that while having a veterinarian on site would be ideal, it is not part of the current expansion plans. Members noted that such a change would likely require a separate category of approval.

After confirming there were no further questions for the applicant, Ms. Barnes opened the public hearing. Paul Rothenberg spoke first, identifying himself as a customer of Silverbrook Kennels. He shared that after moving to the area nine years earlier, he and his family searched extensively for a facility matching the quality they were accustomed to in Northern Virginia. He stated that Silverbrook exceeded their expectations in care, communication, and responsiveness, especially when one of their dogs became ill. Mr. Rothenberg expressed strong support for the proposed facility improvements and encouraged the Commission to vote in favor.

Joe Tolson, a resident of the Rock Hill District, addressed the Commission next. He explained that his family's property borders Red Fox Lane and expressed significant concerns about the roadway rather than the kennel business itself. He emphasized that although the easement on record is said to be 40 feet, the usable area along his property appears closer to 10 to 12 feet. His primary issues involve traffic volume and behavior, especially noting the estimate of 100 cars a day associated with doggy daycare. Mr. Tolson described ongoing problems: excessive dust, vehicles speeding, trash being thrown out, and drivers cutting through his mother's yard when passing cars meet on the narrow roadway. He noted that drivers often shine headlights into their windows early in the morning, and although he previously discussed solutions like speed bumps and fencing with the kennel operators, those steps were not implemented due to regulatory barriers. He reiterated that his concern is solely the unsafe and poorly maintained road, not the business or the dogs. He urged the Commission to address right-of-way limitations, adding that emergency vehicles could not access the full span of the claimed 40-foot easement and concluded by stressing that the road is a growing problem and needs to be accounted for in any approvals.

Mr. Davey Tolson, also from the Rock Hill District, stated that his property sits directly beside Red Fox Lane and echoed concerns about the road's condition and the volume of traffic generated by the kennel. He said vehicles travel at high speeds up and down the lane at all hours, including as late as midnight, and that commercial delivery trucks contribute to worsening potholes. These impacts are so pronounced that he and his family can hear vehicles striking potholes from inside their home. Mr. Tolson also raised concerns about a collapsed culvert pipe along the road, explaining that VDOT had previously identified it as noncompliant and requiring replacement. As a result of the collapse, cars swerve into his property to avoid the pipe, and flooding occurs during rainstorms, sending water into his yard. He stated that the kennel operators have violated their original conditional use permit (CUP) multiple times, with several complaints documented by the county. Additionally, he noted that runoff affects a nearby stream and that the Army Corps of Engineers has investigated the matter. He argued that the road cannot support further expansion and stated that county officials had once declared that no additional building would be

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

permitted off the road for this reason. He closed by expressing doubt that compliance would improve if prior violations had already occurred.

Ms. Laura Butell of the Garrisonville District spoke in support of Silverbrook Kennels and the CUP request. She stated that her family has been long-time customers of the facility for daycare, boarding, and training. She praised the kennel's staff, the quality of their services, and the personal support they provide. Ms. Butell emphasized that her three dogs, including one especially challenging case, had benefited significantly from the training program. She described Silverbrook as a trustworthy, family-owned business that provides peace of mind to dog owners by offering reliable care, safety, and affection for pets. She also noted that Stafford County needs expanded resources but should likewise support strong local businesses already serving the community. She urged the Commission to approve the request so that the kennel could continue delivering high-quality care through a modernized facility.

Mr. Jason Demerick of the Rock Hill District addressed the Commission. He clarified that his concerns were not with Silverbrook's services but with the insufficient width and condition of Red Fox Lane, which he feels cannot sustain the current or anticipated traffic. He explained that the road is so narrow that two motorists cannot pass without one driving onto someone's property. Mr. Demerick acknowledged the recent addition of gravel by Silverbrook and expressed appreciation but maintained that the road remains inadequate for the level of use it receives and will not support additional demand.

After confirming there were no further public comments, the public hearing was closed, and the applicant's representative, Mr. Leming, responded to the concerns. He first addressed the disputed 40-foot easement, explaining that the official survey confirms a full 40-foot right-of-way, even if the existing travelable surface is narrower. He acknowledged that vegetation or other obstacles might need to be cleared but emphasized that the easement has not disappeared and remains legally intact within land records. He then clarified that the business itself is not expanding and will not be taking on more dogs or generating more traffic than in past decades. The purpose of the current request, he explained, is to bring the operation into compliance after the facility unintentionally exceeded the scope of a previous special exception originally granted to a prior owner—not because the business grew, but because the permitting did not align with real operations.

Addressing comments about the culvert and road maintenance, Mr. Leming noted that the roadway serves roughly ten different property owners, all of whom share maintenance responsibility under the easement. Silverbrook, he said, has consistently been the only party performing upkeep and recently applied new gravel to improve driving conditions. He stated that potholes naturally slow traffic, though he acknowledged this is not ideal, and reiterated that the kennel is committed to cooperating with neighbors as improvements proceed. Leming also stated that once plans to widen the road move forward, the kennel will share survey details and explain where adjustments will occur—likely toward the side with an old rail fence and dense vegetation rather than toward the Tolsons' property. He closed by acknowledging the tension that often arises when a long-standing business coexists near residences but stressed that Silverbrook aims to remain a considerate neighbor while maintaining safe, functional access for its customers.

Mr. Shelton asked for clarification on the difference between the travel way and the easement. Mr. Leming responded that the travel way in use is indeed narrower than the full easement. He explained this through an analogy to his own property, where he owns a 40-foot-wide strip of land but only uses about 20 feet of it as an active roadway. While he may allow neighbors to keep fences or structures within the unused portion, doing so does not grant ownership of the land; it simply avoids conflict while retaining

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

legal rights to the full width. He emphasized that this principle applies similarly to the Red Fox Lane easement.

Ms. Barnes then noted that several Commissioners had questions but asked to begin with her own. She explained that she had personally visited the property and had observed the newly installed gravel and asked whether the gravel would reduce dust and acknowledged that all residents using the shared easement benefit from Silverbrook's investment. Mr. Leming confirmed that everyone who uses the easement benefits, and added that while gravel helps, no unpaved road is completely dust-free. He distinguished between gravel and crush-run stone, noting that while both can generate dust, well-maintained gravel sections generally produce less dust than worn, sparsely covered areas.

Ms. Barnes emphasized that the surrounding area is agricultural, characterized by dirt roads and rural activity, not a suburban subdivision. Mr. Leming agreed, describing it as an agrarian community with homes on large lots. Ms. Barnes then explained that the kennel is a by-right use, meaning it is permitted on the property. The county's role is to impose conditions that regulate how the business operates. She noted that, as of now, there are no enforceable conditions on the kennel, and that approving this Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would establish such conditions for the first time.

Ms. Barnes pointed out that these conditions will likely result in improvements, particularly to the road, because public safety officials—specifically the fire marshal—will dictate the requirements needed to ensure safe emergency access and two-way travel. Mr. Leming agreed, saying that the CUP not only allows construction of a modernized facility but also introduces enforceable standards that do not exist today. Ms. Barnes emphasized that if any condition is violated in the future, the county will have clear authority to intervene. She summarized the expected benefits: a better road, the new building sited farther back from both the road and Kellogg Mill Road, and improved noise mitigation due to updated construction standards. Mr. Leming confirmed all of these points, noting that the existing older buildings will be used only for storage and will not house dogs. Ms. Barnes then asked whether widening the easement would require extensive clearing, or whether designs could minimize impact on adjacent properties. Mr. Leming explained that the fire marshal's requirements will guide the final layout. While the full 40-foot width must be available, it may not need to be used uniformly along the entire length. The Fire Marshal had indicated that the road could widen to the full width where feasible and narrow slightly near homes so long as safety needs are still met. However, the Fire Marshal had the final authority.

Ms. Barnes clarified that the roadway is shared by multiple households, not just Silverbrook Kennels. Mr. Leming stated that there are approximately ten users of the easement, and that although all have a maintenance obligation, Silverbrook has consistently been the one performing upkeep, including the recent gravel application.

Returning to earlier public comments, Mr. Barnes asked about a fence referenced by neighbors. Mr. Leming explained that on the Tolsons' side of the road, a low wire boundary with small flags marks what they believe to be the property line, placed to prevent encroachment. On the opposite side, there is an old, deteriorated wooden fence further back from the road. He noted that it is unclear whether this older fence lies within the easement. At Ms. Barnes' request, Mr. Leming invited the engineer to the podium to provide additional clarification.

Mr. Welford stated that the fence in question appears to be located within the easement. He noted that it is a very old, broken-down, and overgrown fence, but he believes it is likely within the easement area. Ms. Barnes asked whether Mr. Welford had spoken to the neighboring property owner about the

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

possibility that the fence might need to be removed, or whether removal would be required. Mr. Leming then provided additional context, explaining the chronology of events with the Fire Marshal. He stated that the Fire Marshal allowed them to proceed with obtaining their entitlements before requiring design submissions, with the understanding that the road-related concerns would have to be addressed before final approval. Mr. Leming added that in order for the Fire Marshal to sign off on the road, the easement would need to be formally located on the ground, and any encroachments—such as the fence—would have to be evaluated and addressed. This would involve working with affected neighbors to resolve issues once the easement was accurately identified. He emphasized that trying to resolve those issues earlier in the process would have been impractical and would have caused significant delays, but that the Fire Marshal requires all such matters to be resolved before the road is opened.

Ms. Barnes then noted that the condition of the fence is a longstanding issue unrelated to the conditional use permit (CUP) or to any new improvements. Mr. Leming confirmed that nothing related to the new application has raised concerns about the fence until now. He added that although someone previously mentioned the road being too narrow, there has been no prior effort to widen the existing travelway. He noted that vehicles already slow down to pass each other, as they would on other narrow residential roads.

Ms. Barnes asked about an issue involving a pipe or culvert and whether responsibility for it rests with one parcel or all of the parcels sharing the easement. Mr. Leming asked Mr. Alexander whether he knew anything about the ditch pipes. Mr. Alexander approached the microphone and stated that in the more than ten years he has lived there, the water flow has never been correct. He agreed that the pipes have been damaged for many years, though he was never informed of any required corrective action. He expressed support for addressing the issue now if necessary and stated that he takes residents' concerns seriously. He explained that he has tried to balance speed control and dust mitigation on the gravel road: adding gravel reduces dust and potholes but can increase vehicle speed. He noted that he cannot install speed humps because he does not own the road. He said he is not neglecting the road but doing his best to balance multiple concerns.

Mr. Alexander also noted that the Fire Marshal has been helpful and is aware of the need to minimize impacts on neighbors. The Fire Marshal has discussed potential measures such as creating a pull-off area near his property to allow vehicles to pass more easily, which may reduce the amount of widening required elsewhere. He emphasized that although plans are not finalized, the intention is to incorporate neighbor concerns. He reiterated his desire to remain a good neighbor.

Mr. Shelton asked whether Mr. Alexander would be willing to work with the five households sharing the easement to address maintenance issues collaboratively, similar to how an HOA might operate. He noted that VDOT may assist with culvert replacement if the group purchases the culvert. Mr. Alexander said he is very open to working with the other homeowners and is willing to participate fully. Mr. Alexander also revisited a question about the fence mentioned earlier by Ms. Tolson. He explained that he has offered to install a six-foot fence along the relevant property line to reduce headlights shining into a neighbor's window, but he does not know the exact property boundary. He reiterated that the offer still stands.

Mr. Leming commented that communication between neighbors has historically been limited, noting that Mr. Alexander did not even know about the culvert concerns until the meeting. He encouraged greater communication rather than defaulting to filing complaints with the county. Ms. Barnes clarified that maintenance of the private access easement—including the travelway and culvert—is a shared responsibility among all parcels, which is both a benefit and a challenge of shared private access

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

easements. Mr. Leming added that the road is an old private access easement and that the historical standard was 20 feet, though modern standards are wider.

Ms. Barnes asked Mr. Alexander about the cost of the gravel he had purchased. Mr. Alexander said the specific cost did not matter, explaining that he understands he has more traffic than the neighboring residences and therefore believes he carries a larger responsibility for maintenance. He acknowledged that he does not understand everything about culverts but is willing to learn and assist however needed. Ms. Barnes asked about a stream on the property and potential Resource Protection Area (RPA) impacts. Mr. Alexander confirmed that there is a stream near the existing kennel building and that a possible RPA is shown on the Generalized Development Plan, though not yet formally verified. He stated there will be no impact to the RPA or the stream. He also stated that an existing pond, believed to be a runoff pond, will remain, and that stormwater management for the new expansion will be handled separately with a new facility.

Mr. Goldstein commended Mr. Alexander for his approach to business and community relations. He noted that the kennel appears responsible for the majority of traffic on the shared road and that it could be unfair for the neighboring residences to share equally in road maintenance costs. He asked whether Mr. Alexander would consider a formalized agreement assigning a greater proportion of maintenance responsibility to the kennel. Mr. Alexander said that in principle he is willing to do that, though he does not know how such an agreement would be structured. He also said that the stated estimate of 102 vehicle trips per day is higher than what they actually experience.

Mr. Leming clarified that the 102-trip figure is a standard reference number without adjustments for the specific type of kennel. He also noted that historically, Mr. Alexander has been the only person performing any maintenance on the road. Ms. Barnes acknowledged that she noticed the fresh gravel when she visited.

Ms. Barnes further noted that the Fire Marshal and public safety requirements ultimately dictate what is necessary to ensure the road is safe and passable. Mr. Alexander agreed that he will comply with such requirements, and Ms. Barnes confirmed that these obligations are included in the conditions.

Ms. Barnes then asked whether the road was public or private. Mr. Leming stated it was private. Ms. Caudill shared that she faced similar challenges with her own private gravel road and expressed interest in seeing a maintenance agreement that accounts for the kennel's majority usage. She also emphasized the challenges of shared access.

Mr. Oats asked about hours of operation and deliveries. Mr. Alexander clarified that the office hours listed do not reflect current practice and should be revised. Customer access typically occurs from 6:30 AM to 7 PM. Daycare drop-offs begin around 6:30 AM, and overnight staff work from 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. Mr. Oats then asked about signage. Mr. Alexander stated that a permanent 10-mph speed limit sign is posted, along with some temporary "drive slow" signs, but no other permanent signs. Ms. Barnes suggested installing a sign indicating a private drive or no public access, though VDOT rules would need to be reviewed. Mr. Leming noted that unauthorized public traffic is not currently an issue. Ms. Barnes expressed interest in discussing the possibility of adding signage such as "Private Road" or "No Through Traffic" as a potential condition, pending staff guidance.

Mr. Zuraf addressed the Chair, explaining that he was unsure whether adding a sign-related condition would be appropriate, as he did not fully understand the intent. Ms. Barnes clarified that the intent was to minimize unnecessary traffic by discouraging non-residents from entering but noted it appeared the

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

applicant and others did not believe such a measure was necessary. Mr. Alexander confirmed this, stating that only scheduled customers come down the road.

Mr. Alexander responded to earlier questions about deliveries, stating that no overnight deliveries occur, and he generally has packages delivered to his home to prevent Amazon trucks from using the driveway. Mr. Oats followed up by asking how speeding issues with customers were identified and handled. Mr. Alexander explained that a neighbor had previously brought a speeding customer to his attention; staff monitored the situation, identified the individual, and the business then instructed the customer not to return. He noted that staff regularly reminds customers to drive slowly and that signage urging slow speeds is posted. He acknowledged that the road has a downhill grade that can encourage faster driving, but they attempt to reasonably monitor and address behavior.

Mr. Oats asked whether there were outward-facing cameras on the property, suggesting such measures could deter speeding. He then asked whether relocating the facility further back on the property would reduce headlight impacts on neighboring residences. Mr. Alexander clarified that the concern about headlights relates to cars turning from Kellogg Mill Road onto Red Fox Lane, not the portion of the road nearest the kennel. Mr. Leming added that the road is straight beyond the turn and that the light concern applies only at the intersection.

Ms. Siegmund commented that signs indicating a private road may cause drivers to feel that rules no longer apply, which could encourage speeding. She expressed support for the idea of outward-facing cameras and signage indicating that drivers are on camera. Mr. Leming cautioned that because the kennel does not own the easement, placing signs along it could be presumptuous. Ms. Barnes added that the gravel road's rough condition naturally discourages speeding and that paving it could worsen speed issues. She noted that gravel can be both inconvenient and beneficial for speed control.

Ms. Siegmund asked whether other nearby properties operated agricultural-type businesses. Mr. Alexander reported that a company across from the kennel performs mulching or wood-processing activities, though less so than in the past. Ms. Barnes acknowledged that another business exists on the same easement. Mr. Leming then explained that agricultural zoning is permissive and allowed a wide variety of uses beyond traditional farming, which is no longer common in much of the county.

Ms. Barnes asked for final questions and, seeing none, transitioned the meeting. Because the matter was located in her district, she ceremonially passed the gavel to Ms. Caudill in order to make the motion. Ms. Caudill accepted and asked how Ms. Barnes wished to proceed. Ms. Barnes moved to approve CUP24155811. Mr. Bratton seconded.

Before a vote, Mr. Zuraf interjected that the motion must include additional language regarding previously discussed revisions. Ms. Barnes acknowledged this and listed the agreed-upon changes: increasing the number of permitted dogs from 42 to 50; updating the pet waste setback and weekly pickup requirement; and clarifying hours of operation. Ms. Wolfson then read the revised language for several conditions. Condition 5 would be updated so that waste must be stored at least 200 feet from the property line and picked up weekly. Condition 7, relating to customer hours of operation, would be updated to reflect 6 AM to 7 PM if consistent with current practice. Condition 6, relating to outside run times, would be updated so that no dogs are permitted in outside runs between 10 PM and 6 AM, aligning with the county noise ordinance.

Ms. Barnes also agreed to remove the sentence in Condition 8 referring to the prior nightly dog limit, since it would be superseded by the new number. Ms. Wolfson then reminded the commission of

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

Condition 11, which incorrectly referenced a paved travelway. That reference would be removed. A brief discussion followed regarding the width of the travelway. Ms. Wolfson recommended retaining the 20-foot travelway requirement because it reflects the Fire Marshal's written guidance, even though the legal easement width was 40 feet. Ms. Barnes agreed, emphasizing that the Fire Marshal ultimately determined compliance.

With all changes stated, Ms. Barnes clarified her motion to approve the CUP with the modifications described. Mr. Bratton confirmed his second. Ms. Caudill asked for further discussion. Ms. Barnes then offered remarks, stating that while agricultural-zoned areas often face challenges when a business is located on a shared private access easement, these issues are not unique to this kennel. She noted that a number of business types are permitted in A-1 zoning. She stated that, in her view, approving the CUP would improve the current situation by requiring Fire Marshal review of the easement, limiting the number of dogs to current operating levels, and constructing a new facility that complies with modern setbacks. She strongly encouraged the applicant to work collaboratively with neighbors on maintenance issues and suggested developing a plan to present to the Board of Supervisors demonstrating shared responsibility and proposed solutions regarding the fence, culvert, and other concerns.

Mr. Bratton had no comments. Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Shelton had no additional comments. Mr. Oats expressed support for the application and emphasized the importance of maintaining good neighbor relations. Ms. Caudill echoed those sentiments and encouraged ongoing cooperation. She then called for the vote, and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0. With the action completed, Ms. Caudill returned the gavel to Ms. Barnes. Ms. Barnes congratulated the applicant and proceeded to the next agenda items, noting that several cases were postponed or deferred before moving on to Unfinished and New Business, including a time-limit extension.

2. **POSTPONED:** Planning and Zoning; Consider a proposal to amend the "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036 2021 5-Year Update," adopted on November 16, 2021, as last revised (Comprehensive Plan), regarding future land use designations that would support higher density commercial development (Project known as COM24155690; Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan - Potomac Creek Campus)
Proposed Resolution R26-110 (Approval)
Proposed Resolution R26-111 (Denial)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Recommends deferral of amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan.
3. **POSTPONED:** Planning and Zoning; Consider a proposed Zoning Reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126 (Project known as RC24155947; Potomac Creek Campus)
Proposed Ordinance O26-13 (Approval)
Proposed Resolution R26-112 (Denial)
(Time Limit: July 17, 2026)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Recommends deferral of zoning reclassification.
4. **POSTPONED:** Planning and Zoning; Consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit for maximum building height of any data center building to be 70 feet, and to allow a public facility/utility, specifically an electrical substation, both in the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 28-126 (Project known as CUP25156868; Potomac Creek Campus)
Proposed Resolution R26-113 (Approval)

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

Proposed Resolution R26-114 (Denial)

(Time Limit: July 17, 2026)

BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Recommends deferral of conditional use permit.

5. **POSTPONED:** Planning and Zoning; Consider A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-2232, for the placement of a proposed public utility or public service corporation, specifically an electric substation, on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126 (Project known as COM25156869; Potomac Creek Campus)

Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-13 (Approval)

Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-14 (Denial)

(Time Limit: June 7, 2026)

BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Deferral comprehensive plan compliance review.

6. Planning and Zoning; Consider a proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 39-71A (Project known as RC24155845; Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment)

Proposed Ordinance O25-20

(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 to the May 13, 2026 meeting)

BACKGROUND REPORT: Staff recommendation to be provided at future meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

7. Planning and Zoning; Consider a request to grant a time limit extension for action for a zoning reclassification application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, "Review and requirements" for a project known as Potomac Creek Campus

Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-15 (Approval)

Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-16 (Denial)

BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Approves time limit extension.

Mr. Zuraf recognized Emilie Wolfson for the presentation.

Ms. Wolfson explained that there were two separate time extension requests and she would address them individually. She began with the request for an extension of the 12-month time limit for the pending zoning reclassification application for the Potomac Creek Campus. She noted that Section 28-162(g) of the Zoning Ordinance sets time limits for pending zoning reclassifications and requires that any application still pending after 12 months from the submittal of a complete application may only be extended upon written request by the applicant and with approval from the body currently considering the application. In this case, the Planning Commission is the first body to review the request and therefore has authority to grant the extension.

She described the application as a proposed zoning reclassification with proffers from the A-1 Agricultural district to the M-2 Heavy Industrial district for Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126, consisting of 99.34 acres. The rezoning would allow development of up to 9,797—nearly one million—square feet of

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

data center buildings along with other uses permitted in the M-2 district. The application is scheduled for a Planning Commission public hearing on April 22. It was originally filed on December 4, 2024. The Planning Commission granted a previous extension on February 11, 2026, extending the deadline to March 4. The applicant has now requested an additional extension to June 4, which falls within the allowable six-month timeframe. She stated that staff supports the resolution, believes the applicant has pursued the application diligently and in good faith, and she was available for further questions.

Ms. Barnes asked whether commissioners had questions for Ms. Wolfson. Ms. Caudill asked why the applicant was requesting another extension beyond the previous one. Ms. Wolfson explained that the original extension to March 4 had expired, requiring a new request. Ms. Caudill then asked why the application had not reached the Commission by the March 4 deadline and whether the delay was due to staff or the applicant. Ms. Wolfson clarified that the applicant chose the earlier March 4 extension date rather than the full six-month period offered, likely assuming the application would reach the Commission by then, which did not occur. She confirmed that the timing decision originated with the applicant, not staff. Ms. Caudill acknowledged the clarification and thanked her.

Ms. Barnes asked whether there were additional questions. Hearing none, she confirmed that this item pertained to the Falmouth district and that a separate motion was required. She asked Mr. Oats to make the motion. Mr. Oats moved to grant the time extension, and Mr. Shelton seconded.

Ms. Barnes noted the motion and second and asked if there was further discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously, 7–0. She thanked the Commission and moved to the next item.

8. Planning and Zoning; Consider 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 Simms Farm Data Center and Onville Village
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-19 (Approval)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-20 (Denial)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Approves time limit extensions.

Ms. Wolfson introduced the next set of time extension requests, noting that they involved two different applications. She did not repeat the zoning ordinance section previously discussed but proceeded directly to describing the applications.

She explained that the first set involved one project with two associated applications for the Simms Farm project: RC25156309, a zoning reclassification request, and CUP25156309, a conditional use permit. The proposed zoning reclassification would change a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 60-37 from the A-1, Agricultural zoning district to the M-2, Heavy Industrial district to allow development of approximately 1.1 million square feet of data center uses and related infrastructure. The property consists of 204.71 acres, located along the south side of Kings Highway, across from the intersection with Caisson Road, within the George Washington Election District. The concurrent conditional use permit request is for development of a public utility facility. The 12-month timeline for these applications was March 26, and the applicant has requested an extension to September 26, 2026.

She then described the final time extension request, a zoning reclassification application for Onville Village, RC25156324, located in the Griffis-Widewater District. The proposal seeks to reclassify Tax Map Parcels 20-70, 20-73E, 20-86C, 20-86E, and 20-86F from the R-1, Suburban Residential district

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

and B-2, Urban Commercial district to the R-3, Urban Residential-High Density district to allow development of up to 57 multi-family condominium units. The 8.37-acre property is located along both sides of Onville Road near its intersection with Evans Lane. Staff supports adoption of the resolution and believes the applicants have diligently pursued their applications in good faith. She invited any specific questions.

Ms. Barnes asked why the Simms Farm and Onville Village items were being considered together and whether they involved the same applicant. Ms. Wolfson stated they were not the same applicant. She explained that item number 7 had been removed earlier when the Potomac Creek Campus item was on the agenda, and staff wanted to keep those separate. Since those items were postponed, the Simms Farm and Onville Village requests appeared together.

Ms. Barnes asked whether commissioners had questions for staff. Hearing none, she brought the matter back to the Commission and asked for a motion.

Mr. Bratton made a motion to extend the applications, and Mr. Shelton seconded. Ms. Barnes noted the motion and second and asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously, 7–0.

Ms. Barnes thanked Ms. Wolfson and proceeded to the next agenda item, the Planning Director's Report, beginning with the Pipeline Report. She invited Mr. Zuraf to present.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

9. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf presented the Project Pipeline Report, noting that it includes upcoming Planning Commission meetings and the items scheduled for consideration. He highlighted that the next meeting would have a busy agenda and advised the Commission to be prepared. He also reminded the Commission that a separate work session is scheduled for 5:00 p.m. prior to the next regular meeting to discuss efforts to amend the Comprehensive Plan regarding electric transmission lines.

Ms. Barnes asked whether the work session would be held in the chambers and confirmed that work sessions are open to the public. Mr. Zuraf stated that while the work session is open, the Commission will also enter into a closed session related to the topic. He confirmed the meeting would take place in the chambers.

Ms. Barnes acknowledged the clarification and thanked him.

Ms. Siegmund expressed appreciation for the addition of a key in the report, noting that it helped her better understand the abbreviations.

Ms. Barnes asked for the County Attorney's Report.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian stated she had no report.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

Ms. Barnes thanked Ms. Lucian, and moved on to Committee Reports. She asked Ms. Caudill to give a report.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

10. Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update Subcommittee
Next Meeting – Thursday, April 15, 2026 @ 5:30 PM, ABC Conference Room

Ms. Caudill stated they had not had a meeting since their last one a couple weeks ago, and their next meeting would be April 15th at 5:30 PM in the ABC Conference Room. She encouraged the public to join, and the Commissioners as well.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ms. Barnes delivered the Chairman's Report, stating that she had no formal report but offered thanks to staff for preparing the agenda and all the projects presented for consideration that evening. She noted that the information provided to the Commission was thorough and appreciated.

OTHER BUSINESS

11. New TRC Submissions
- [26157076](#) – ESTATES AT ALCOTTI RUN
 - A construction plan for 43 single-family residential lots located southwest of Spotted Traven Road, between Sousa Lane and Alcott Run, on TM #s 16-34, 16-34A, 16-35A, zoned A-1, consisting of 255.63 acres, within the Hartwood Election District.
 - [26157050](#) – CHECKERS WARRENTON RD
 - A major site plan for the Checkers located east of Warrenton Road, between McLane Drive and South Gateway Drive, on TM # 45-19B, zoned B-2, consisting of 0.44 acres, within the George Washington Election District.

Under Other Business, Ms. Barnes reviewed new TRC submissions. She mentioned the Estates at Alcott Run and noted she had not heard that one before. She observed that the project is located in the Hartwood Election District, correcting herself after briefly referencing the George Washington Election District due to skipping a page. She then identified the Checkers Warrenton submission as being in the George Washington Election District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Barnes stated that there were no minutes to approve for the evening.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:40 PM, Chairman Barnes adjourned the April 8, 2026, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.