

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 13, 2026

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, May 13, 2026, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Planning Commission Chair Kristen Barnes, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Emilie Wolfson, Jasmine Bridges, Ramin Sadiq, Calvin Dixon, Virginia Adams

CALL TO ORDER:

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

INVOCATION:

Mr. Shelton led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Ms. Siegmund 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.

REQUEST FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION:

Mr. Shelton moved to allow Ms. Caudill to participate remotely. Mr. Bratton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATIONS:

There were no declarations of disqualifications.

Mr. Zuraf provided a change to the agenda item order, recommending that they move Item 13 before the public hearings, stating that the item is a time-limit extension related to the public hearing for Stafford Technology Campus.

Mr. Shelton moved to adjust the agenda to hear Item 13 before the public hearings. Mr. Oats seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

Ms. Barnes opened the Public Presentations portion of the meeting and read the procedures for speakers.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Samuel Chenkin, City of Fredericksburg, said he was tired of deferring discussion of data centers, and the Commission as well as the companies behind these were very aware of how unpopular they are among Stafford County; it was time to settle it with a vote. He stated that he came across an article from Lake Tahoe, which stated that nearly 50,000 residents there were going to lose their electricity due to Envy Energy pulling all their power supply from Liberty Utilities, with termination to happen within a year. He stated that this was because Envy wanted to power data centers in the Reno, Tahoe area of Nevada. Mr. Chenkin said he did not want this happening for anybody in Stafford or the rest of the world, country, or state. He said investing in data centers set a very bad precedent, and unfortunately Virginia and numerous localities had already done that. He stated that the location of the Accokeek data center was awful—right there between I-95 and Route 1, two of the most important highways running through the County and even the country as a whole. He said he did not want to keep wasting his time coming out here as he had other things he needed to do, but he wanted to express his disapproval of the Accokeek Center, and the proposed Potomac Creek location was not as bad, but the fact that it was damaging the environment was not good either.

Ms. Alyson Azzara, George Washington District, said that although data centers are described as not using public water or drawing from rivers and wells, they still do because much of the water is not returned to the system. She said nearly 1,000 acres of proposed deforestation would disrupt the hydrologic cycle, noting that forests support transpiration, filtration, groundwater recharge, erosion control, cooling, temperature moderation, and flood protection. She stated that clearing and regrading large areas increases runoff from pavement and rooftops, overwhelms creeks and low-lying areas, reduces filtration and aquifer recharge, and increases untreated and chemical runoff. She said it also destroys soils, insects, habitats, and other biotic and abiotic systems, displacing animals and encouraging pests. Ms. Azzara stated that 60–80% of cooling water evaporates, requiring a continuous diversion of reuse water and contributing to a negative county water balance. She said Stafford's groundwater and streamflow are already under emergency drought conditions, the Rappahannock is unusually low, wells have dried up, including hers, and diverting water to data centers will worsen the problem. She said proffers are needed to address these impacts and talks about the water cycle and a full analysis of what is actually going to happen.

Ms. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, and so I would like to talk about the Kraken Loop or North Anna to Bristers. Ms. Lewis said she appreciated officials attending Delegate Stacey Carroll's town hall and hearing residents' concerns firsthand. She stated that the County had drafted a comp plan amendment to help protect residents from Dominion's proposal and said she hoped it would be approved. She said she did not live in Kraken Loop but lived near an ongoing 230 kV line upgrade that had damaged roads and created disruption behind her home. She said the upgrade had turned two small power lines into large structures and stated that a proposed 500 kV line at Kraken Loop would be far worse. Ms. Lewis said she supported any effort to slow Dominion's project. She stated that she had seen information about data-center water use during construction and said that large-scale site disturbance across 500 acres and 23 buildings would require significant water use that should be considered in project review. Ms. Lewis said aquifer recharge and wetlands were important and stated that buying water credits did not make harmful impacts acceptable. She said she was proud of Stafford County and the Planning Commission and appreciated their efforts to protect residents.

Ms. Abby Carter, Falmouth District, said when researching data center water use and types of cooling, it's important to look at the types of water used as well as the cooling type for the individual data centers. Ms. Carter said two types of water can be used: fresh potable water, and reuse or treated municipal water. She said that Stafford Technology Center is in an agreement with Stafford County to have the Purple Pipe in their 24-plus data center buildings off Eskimo Hill. She said there are several types of cooling

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

that require water: evaporative, which is air that's passed through water soaked medium, or a heat exchanger; chilled water cooling, circulated water through pipes, also the closed loop system is as it's known; direct to chip, where coolant circulates directly over CPUs and GPUs; and immersion cooling, where entire servers are immersed in the coolant. She noted that some of these are less water hungry than others, but they all require water.

Ms. Carter said Stafford had not required developers to specify cooling types, likely because many facilities were speculative and lacked end users. She said water alone was a poor heat-transfer medium and all cooling types required chemical additives such as glycols, dielectric fluids, corrosion inhibitors, biocides, dispersants, and PFAS. Ms. Carter said these chemicals were discharged during full or partial system recharges, Stafford County's capacity to treat wastewater from these centers should be determined rather than allowing discharge into the environment, noting that total water use could not be known without knowing the cooling system. She stated that the Environmental and Energy Study Institute reported that Northern Virginia had more than 300 operational data centers across Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William, and Fauquier, and said they consumed nearly two billion gallons of water in 2023, a 63% increase from 2019.

Mr. J.W. Swain, Washington District, said he had recently watched *Erin Brockovich* and that story about pollution. Mr. Swain said hexavalent chromate had caused cancer in California and stated that it came from cooling towers. He said similar cooling towers were being proposed in the county and stated that there would be many of them, not just one. He said the cooling towers would release many chemicals, including amines, which he stated were nitrogen-based compounds. Mr. Swain said he had worked as a chemist at a chemical plant with many cooling towers and stated that special procedures were required to manage tower mist. He said mist released into the air would settle onto the ground and stated that this was how hexavalent chromate had been dispersed in California.

Mr. Swain said the chemicals included amines, acids, and biocides such as chlorinated compounds used to control algae and microbes. He stated that because the system used evaporative cooling, a substantial share of those chemicals would return to the atmosphere. Mr. Swain said the ground around the 22 or 23 tall buildings and rooftop cooling towers could be affected by a wide dispersing cloud. He stated that limited information was available because the chemistry was still relatively new, and long-term medical and health effects might become clearer only after many years. Mr. Swain said DEQ had told him it evaluated emissions by allowable atmospheric limits rather than health impacts, and no agency appeared to assess the health effects of emissions from generators, cooling towers, and similar sources before permitting. He said DEQ could review problems after they occurred, but current law did not allow projects to be denied based solely on projected air emissions. He said as a chemist, he found the prospect of concentrating 20, 30, or even 100 cooling towers in one area deeply concerning.

Ms. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said a new meeting appeared at 12:30 PM without notice, and a transportation impact fee posting had been created at 10:49 AM the same day. She stated that the meeting was not posted on the calendar, and the public would not have received notice without alerting staff and pressing responsible parties to add it. Ms. Maxson said the Eon Road Tech Park Generalized Development Plan link under Eon Road Tech Park RC returned a 404 error and should have been available on April 20. She said the portal listed April 20, 2026, a Parks and Recreation date of January 9, 2026, at 9:00 AM, and a corrupt portal window date of May 5, 2026. She stated that using an unreferenced date violated the bylaws and placed the document four months ahead and could produce a back-reference loop. Ms. Maxson said the January 28, 2026 agenda was a snow-canceled packet agenda totaling 1,509 pages. She stated that it contained new TRC submissions, a major plan for storage and access road with Pond 1 and 2 for STC, the Potomac Creek pump station, and Attain at Stafford—and

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

that information never reached the public because the meeting was canceled. She said the public lost advance notice needed for current meetings. Ms. Maxson stated that the Potomac Creek data center pond sewer sharing from STC to the Attain facilities plan was publicly described as a “pond” in Item 5 of the impact analysis on Page 332. She said a Commissioner had stated that there was “a lot of paper shuffling, refer to stormwater management facility Pond 2, Attain at Stafford.”

Mr. Vick Islandfield, Aquia District, said he would touch on two of the massive energy and resource topics they have been dealing with routinely. Mr. Islandfield said a single 300-megawatt data center could consume up to three million gallons of water per day when all projected uses were combined. He stated that without a closed-loop system, as Ms. Azzara had discussed earlier, the county could overdraw its aquifer and rivers. He said the recent low water levels on the Rappahannock showed how serious those concerns were. He said the Rappahannock and Potomac were near 10-year flow-rate lows and stated that the county should require closed-loop cooling systems. Mr. Islandfield said those systems were already in use at data centers around the country and stated that the technology was neither novel nor prohibitively expensive. He said closed-loop cooling would protect water resources and stated that the county should consider only data centers that used it. Mr. Islandfield said Dominion Energy was a regulated for-profit company and stated that the state guaranteed profits of up to 9.7%. He said Dominion had little incentive to limit costs for bringing data centers online because its profitability would not change. Mr. Islandfield stated that the county should support Senate Bill 253 and House Bill 1393 so data centers would pay for their own transmission lines and generation infrastructure. He said new generation would likely rely on gas or coal rather than nuclear and stated that this would add pollution. He said that, according to county documentation, a fully built Stafford Technology Campus would consume 9.6 million megawatts per year, about four times Stafford County’s current use. He stated that residents were currently bearing those infrastructure costs and said data centers should pay their own energy bills instead.

13. Planning and Zoning; Consider a request to grant a time limit extension for a Zoning Reclassification and Proffer Amendment Application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, "Review and requirements," for a project known as Stafford Technology Campus
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-31 (Approval)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-32 (Denial)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Approves time limit extension.

Mr. Sadiq said he would present the time extension request for Stafford Technology Campus. Mr. Sadiq said the proposal had two parts: a zoning reclassification from A-1 Agricultural and M-1 Light Industrial to M-2 Heavy Industrial with proffers, and a proffer amendment revising the existing proffers adopted under Ordinance O24-20 to permit a data center campus. He stated that Ordinance Code Section 28-162G allowed a pending zoning reclassification application to be extended beyond 12 months from the date a complete application was submitted only by the applicant’s written request and with approval by either the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sadiq said this application was deemed complete on May 28, 2025, and the current timeline would lapse on May 28, 2026. He said the extension request was received on March 23, 2026 for six months through November 28, 2026. Mr. Sadiq said staff generally supported adoption of Resolution PCR-26-31 to extend the timeline for the subject application. He stated that staff believed the applicant had diligently pursued the application in good faith and said the requested extension would give the Commission adequate time to consider it.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Oats moved to recommend approval of PCR-26-31. Mr. Shelton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 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 O26-25 (Approval)
Proposed Resolution R26-175 (Denial)
(Time Limit: Waived) (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 to May 13, 2026)
BACKGROUND REPORT: Recommends approval of proffer amendment.

Mr. Zuraf stated that this request was a zoning reclassification proffer amendment for Potomac Church Technology Center, a request to amend proffered conditions related specifically to potable water use on this site—a single parcel approximately 50 acres in the Falmouth District, with Amazon Data Services as the applicant. Mr. Zuraf said the site was on the east side of Old Potomac Church Road across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard; the property is zoned B-2 Urban Commercial and had been rezoned in 2009 from A-1 to B-2 for a contemplated development as a medical office park. Mr. Zuraf said the medical office park never happened, and in 2023, the B-2 proffers were amended to allow data centers on the property. He noted that the data center development was underway, and an occupancy permit had just been issued for the first building. Mr. Zuraf reported that the current proffers allowed the first building to use potable water for cooling until reuse lines, or “purple pipe,” became available to the site. He noted that the applicant had to construct the reuse line improvements under the proffers and a water infrastructure agreement that is in place.

Mr. Zuraf referenced the general development plan established with the proffer amendment, and the approved site plan and current construction work conformed to that plan. He pointed out on the left side of the screen the first building that had just been completed. Mr. Zuraf said the public hearings were originally held in June and July of 2025, and the application was placed on hold in August. He said the original proffer amendment would have added a 217,000-gallons-per-day potable-water usage limitation, which would be consistent with the limitations in the water infrastructure agreement the applicant has with the county. He said the applicant had also requested up to 113,000 gallons per day of additional potable water, phased based on completion milestones for the reuse system, and the request would have allowed the second building to obtain an occupancy permit before reuse-system completion—which is a prohibition under the current proffers. He said they also added a proffer to construct a new county utilities maintenance facility in an amount not to exceed \$30 million. Mr. Zuraf said the Planning Commission had expressed concern at that time about insufficient assurances regarding the timing of reuse-system completion.

Mr. Zuraf reported that since last summer, the applicant had made several modifications to the proposed proffer amendments after working with utilities staff, and the slide presented summarized the new requests. He noted that the additional 113,000 gallons per day of potable water and associated reuse phasing were no longer part of the proposed amendments, nor was the proffer regarding site acquisition and construction of the county maintenance facility. Mr. Zuraf stated that the 217,000-gallons-per-day potable-water allowance remained and was consistent with the water sewer agreement, and the amended proffers would allow occupancy of the second data center building before reuse-system completion. He said the permitted potable water would be shared between the two buildings rather than assigned only to

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

the first building. Mr. Zuraf stated that under the amended proffers, the 217,000-gallons-per-day limit could be used for no more than 24 months after issuance of the occupancy permit for the second building, so the reuse infrastructure must be completed within two years after occupancy of the second building. Mr. Zuraf stated that the amended proffers would require bonds for the Level One reuse upgrades projected to be posted before issuance of an occupancy permit for the second data center building.

Mr. Zuraf reported that the developer and county had entered into a water infrastructure agreement that outlined the requirements, obligations, and timelines for completion of the reuse-system improvements. He said the proposed proffers would remove the current restriction that prohibited the second data center building until reuse water was available. Mr. Zuraf stated that the water infrastructure agreement would need to be updated should the proffer amendment be approved. He said the Utilities Department had reviewed the proposed proffers and was generally fine with the proposed changes, with its only comment concerning Proffer 4B; they are requesting that the required completion of the reuse infrastructure be adjusted from September 2028 to May 2028 so the system would be ready for summer 2028.

Mr. Zuraf stated that the proffer amendment was not expected to affect any other public facilities. He stated that staff recommended approval of the proffer amendment and said the Utilities Department would support additional proffer commitments regarding the timing of the reuse system.

Ms. Siegmund asked what would constitute an emergency that would allow reuse of potable water with an emergency “through no fault of their own,” as she did not know when, if, or how that would happen.

Mr. Chris Edwards, Chief Operations Officer, Utilities, said they just in the last year adopted a drought emergency ordinance, which has different levels. He said an emergency is defined in the drought ordinance, so anytime the county goes to that level, the applicant would be restricted from using water.

Ms. Barnes asked if there is a cap on use during an “emergency.”

Mr. Edwards responded that there’s not a cap; it’s discontinued use during the emergency.

Ms. Siegmund said she had hoped that the WIA would have been part of their packet, but it says “except and only as provided under the WIA, the applicant may use temporary potable water in the event of emergencies when the infrastructure improvements are not available to either or both data center buildings.” She said she doesn’t know what that is because in the event of a drought, they are not going to be able to get water—but neither is anyone else.

Mr. Edwards explained that the way they wrote the ordinance, and also stated in both WIAs, is that anytime they hit that emergency level, they have the ability to restrict commercial usage or any unnecessary commercial usage. He said that would give the county the ability to restrict them in a drought or water emergency to ensure that residents or other primary commercial uses still have water. He said staff worked with the County Attorney’s Office to make sure that was in the drought ordinance when they prepared it last year.

Ms. Siegmund said this is saying that they can use water in the event of an emergency, so she didn’t know what that emergency would be that would allow them to reestablish use of potable water. She said this is in the redline is new language, which is why she was trying to understand what type of emergency that would be.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Edwards said he did not think there would be an emergency where they would have to go from reuse water back to potable water; if the reuse system ever goes down, the county provides assurance that they would put that system back within 24 hours, so there wouldn't be a way to actually physically reconnect back to the potable water system.

Ms. Barnes commented that she is also very confused, because if it is actually written in the proffers that they can connect during an emergency and it's unnecessary, she wasn't sure why that was in there.

Mr. Edwards said he would let the applicant explain that, but from staff's perspective, there is no way to go from reuse water to potable water within 24 hours. He stated that once they disconnect their main meter that feeds their system, it's not possible to reconnect that, although they may be able to draw some potable water for the rest of the building.

Ms. Barnes said the information states that once they're disconnected, they can't get potable water for that mass use, so if they cannot use it, she did not see any reason to have it as a proffer.

Mr. Oats said his question is about the timeline; once occupancy begins, the clock starts for 24 months, and he asked what assurances they have from a county perspective to make sure that happens.

Mr. Edwards said once the water meter is removed, they don't have the ability to draw water any longer. He noted that several other jurisdictions in the area have put the same restriction in that once the 24-month period hits, they will have to discontinue the use of water either voluntarily or by the county removing the water meter from the site. He said in addition, a new addition to the proffers is the fact they actually have to bond all of the improvements—so if the reuse facility is not finished, the county will have that bond available to finish off the reuse system.

Mr. Shelton asked him to clarify the removal of the proffer for the site acquisition and the construction of the maintenance building, because he recalled that as part of the current WIA.

Mr. Edwards explained that it was actually part of the STC WIA, and this was going to replace that but staff elected not to do that; that will still be paid for by the data centers, it's just through the STC WSA.

Mr. Shelton asked if that's a partnership or if it would be the sole responsibility of STC.

Mr. Edwards said the funding will be from STC, and the county will actually execute that as a project—which is something they have already started.

Ms. Siegmund said the original WIA allowed for the 217,000 gallons per day of potable water and an additional 113,000 of potable water, but they're removing that additional 113,000 and she wondered if that was reducing the county's obligation to provide water.

Mr. Edwards said it was actually keeping the obligation the same; the way the WSA is currently written allows them to use up to 217,000 gallons for building one, and this just allows them to distribute the same 217,000 gallons amongst the two buildings.

Ms. Siegmund asked if the additional 113,000 was because of the second building, and they're not asking for that anymore.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Edwards confirmed that it was because they were adding on the second building, and one of the changes is the removal of the 113,000 gallons.

Ms. Siegmund asked if the proffer regarding site acquisition and construction pertained to the offsite easement no longer proposed.

Mr. Edwards said that was the same question Mr. Shelton had asked.

Mr. Oats said there had been some conversations about the easements and the purple pipe, and he asked if all of those had been worked out.

Mr. Edwards explained that there are two sections of projects: one is increasing the water to the site, which is the potable water, and they've worked their way through the easements there. He said they are still working their way through the purple pipe easements, which is going to be a relatively involved process, but STC is getting all of those and not Potomac Church.

Ms. Barnes asked Mr. Edwards to explain for the public the difference between a water infrastructure agreement and a water services agreement.

Mr. Edwards said they have been calling it a water services agreement for most of the time, but they started to realize that's the same nomenclature used for a lot of the other major connections, so they changed it to water infrastructure agreement—and it includes a lot of infrastructure that they're building.

Ms. Barnes said to Ms. Siegmund's point, they did not have access to the WIA and are making decisions about a lot of things they don't understand, which is challenging. She suggested that they have access to it going forward so they can gain a full understanding, including attaching them to the agenda.

She also said it looks as though the \$30 million for the new wastewater treatment facility has been removed from the old proffers.

Mr. Edwards confirmed that was the case, stating that they are going to fall back to the STC in the WIA, in which the applicant agreed to provide the funding, with the county moving forward with the actual construction. He added that it is there in the agreement.

Ms. Barnes clarified that while they are removing the second building water requirement, they are still allowed 217,000 gallons per day—but now it is across both buildings—so they are not actually increasing water use.

Mr. Edwards confirmed this and noted that this came before the Stafford Technology Campus rezoning, and part of that proffer is that they agreed to build it if it does not get completed under this agreement, so there are two or three additional safeguards not available when they wrote that.

Ms. Barnes asked what's to prevent Potomac Church from at the end saying they can't do it and the STC is on the hook.

Mr. Edwards responded that they have the bonds that could be used to construct this.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Caudill asked during the drought conditions or emergency demand events, where industrial cooling water usage would rank in priority compared to residential and public safety needs.

Mr. Edwards explained that once they hit an emergency status as part of the drought ordinance, any commercial water usage that was not absolutely necessary would have to discontinue—and the data center cooling would be part of that. He said that would be one of the first commercial usages under an emergency that would actually stop usage; that would still allow public safety to use water for fire fighting fires and would still allow residents to use water on an emergency basis.

Ms. Siegmund said the middle of the paragraph states, “The infrastructure completion date will automatically extend by the number of days to said completion date if not caused by the applicant.” She said that means if there’s a delay, they continue at the 217,000 per day, and if they’re delayed a week, their use is extended by a week—but to her that feels like the county is taking on all the cost of that risk, because it is 217,000 gallons of water per day for weather delays, shipping delays, material availability delays, and things that aren’t the county’s fault either.

Mr. Edwards said the way it was originally written, the intent is any delays by the county to slow the project and was meant to add time back for the applicant to complete the project. He stated that the applicants are responsible for the construction of the system, and any shipping delays are part of their construction and would be excluded.

Ms. Caudill said that throughout this, it says the applicant is funding a lot of the portions of the infrastructure, and she asked if staff quantified any long-term operational maintenance or expansion costs that could shift onto staff or taxpayers eventually.

Mr. Edwards responded that they recently had their budget and rates approved, and that was part of the reuse rates approved. He said they have added a charge that recovers any ongoing maintenance and any system operations maintenance costs. He said that is covered 100% by the reuse water user fee, which is entirely separate from the water and sewer user fee paid by the residents.

Mr. Shelton said Mr. Zuraf had mentioned that an occupancy permit has been issued for building one, and he asked if they are using potable water now.

Mr. Edwards confirmed that they are using potable water and have three water meters; the largest one is being used for industrial cooling. He said his office has been following that every day, and they’re using about 20,000 gallons per day. He said some of the county’s largest commercial users use about 300,000 gallons per day, but they will see how that increases as time moves on.

Ms. Barnes asked if the two-year timeline is the one they wanted to up to May of 2028.

Mr. Edwards responded that the applicant had requested May of 2027, and they have asked for it to be extended to September 2028, to help with some of the construction timelines and ensure there is adequate time to complete all the improvements.

Ms. Barnes asked what happens if they are not up and running after two years and using reuse water and are still using potable.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Edwards said this is similar to Mr. Oats' question, and several other localities have employed the strategy of disconnecting the industrial cooling meter from the ground, which would discontinue their usage—so that is their leverage.

Ms. Barnes invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Charlie Payne, representing the applicant, addressed the Commission and stated that the project was approved in 2023. He said that Amazon had been in Virginia since 2006 and moved its headquarters here in 2018. He stated that Amazon's first data center was in Virginia and opened in 2006. He said that Amazon had since employed 8,000 full-time Virginia employees and has paid over \$334 million in business and personal property taxes in 2022, investing more than \$51.9 billion in the Commonwealth, including \$8.2 billion in total gross domestic product through 2022. He said that Amazon later announced plans to invest \$35 billion and create 1,000 new jobs in Virginia. He stated that this region was a benefactor of that investment, and the total investment would exceed \$35 billion.

Mr. Payne stated that community members had raised concerns about the challenges associated with new investment, and those concerns were fair. He stated that his client was committed to Stafford County and to being a strong corporate citizen. He said that the first building had opened, and projects of this scale required time before revenue, buildings, and jobs became visible. He said that as Mr. Edwards noted, Amazon was paying for all design and construction costs for the reuse infrastructure and more.

Mr. Payne stated that confusion between the WIA and WSA involved crossover infrastructure investment. He said the Stack project would involve the WSA, while Amazon's project involved a WIA. He stated that Amazon was primarily paying roughly \$160 million as its fair share to upgrade the Aquia treatment plant for the reuse system and extend reuse to the site. He said that Amazon was also paying for the design. He stated that the WIA made Amazon responsible for every penny of the work until the utility was turned over to the county as a public utility, and they bill users for that use. Mr. Payne stated that Amazon had spent \$687 million in data center infrastructure in Stafford. He said that the first building was open. He stated that the project had added at least 900 full-time equivalent jobs in the local economy and contributed over \$228 million to the gross domestic product in Stafford.

Mr. Payne stated that the original rezoning occurred in 2023. He said that 510,000 square feet was a fairly small campus for a data center, although Stafford had few facilities this large. He stated that the request was for a minor proffer amendment. He said that when the original approval passed, the WIA had not yet been approved by the county; this proffer amendment incorporated the WIA into the proffers to ensure consistency. He said that the second part of the request changed nothing from the original county approval except that the amount of water remained the same. Mr. Payne stated that 217,000 gallons represented peak-period usage. He said that this amount did not apply every day or 365 days a year. He stated that peak water usage typically occurred about 4% of the year when ambient air was too hot to cool the chillers and servers without water, and this usage was typically not on a 24-hour cycling period. He stated that the amount of water remained the same as the temporary amount previously reviewed with utilities.

Mr. Payne stated that under the original proffers, the second building could not receive a certificate of occupancy or open until the reuse system connected to it. He said that the second building was already under construction and would be completed before the reuse system was extended. He stated that the request was to allow the second building, which was already under construction and would be completed prior to the reuse system being extended. He said they were not asking for additional water, as the two

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

buildings together would use 217,000 gallons at peak period. Mr. Payne stated that the WIA was being integrated into the proffer to create consistency. He said that the WIA governed emergency usage and situations in which the reuse system was unavailable. He stated that delays not caused by the applicant extend the connection timeline. He said that under the WIA, a force majeure event or is related to construction, that would be up to the applicant; if the county caused it, they could add another day to their usage. He stated that the proffer capped potable water use past 24 months after the COO for the second building was issued. Mr. Payne stated that each building represented about a billion-dollar investment, and Amazon was committed to preventing delays that would exhaust the timeline.

Mr. Payne stated that this was the county's first project of this nature and its first reuse system. He said that there was no reuse system in Northern Virginia and that facilities there used potable water for cooling if they lacked a closed-loop system. He stated that the county required potable water to be used only temporarily to bring the buildings online and generate revenue. He said that the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors had a \$2.9 billion budget in revenue, and \$1.3 billion came from data centers, covering the county's entire operating costs. He stated that such projects benefited communities while still requiring mitigation for impacts and power concerns. He said that this project used reuse water, which was wastewater, rather than potable water for cooling, and the county controlled that system 100%.

Mr. Payne reiterated that this request was for a minor proffer amendment. He said that the amendment would allow the second building to open without using more water and would cap the time limit.

Ms. Barnes noted that the language says, "Except only as provided under the WIA, the applicant may utilize temporary potable water in the event of emergencies when the infrastructure improvements are not available to either or both." Ms. Barnes said this pertains not necessarily 10 years from now, but when the infrastructure improvements are being built, if there's a delay, that's when the emergency provision is enacted. She clarified that they were not talking about a situation down the line when there was some kind of a massive drought.

Mr. Payne said there are two different things, and one of them is a potential delay caused by the county that delays the construction schedule for the connection. He said at one time, there was an assumption that there could be a reconnection to potable water if the reuse system was shut down, not at the fault of the property owner. He reminded them that the reuse system is going to be owned and controlled by the county; the applicant does not control or own it. He clarified that if it is not the fault of the property owner or the user, they could reconnect to potable water on a temporary basis—but subject to the WIA, meaning subject to county approval. He said that Mr. Edwards has indicated there is no way they could reconnect, so it's really a moot point.

Ms. Siegmund said her concern is that there is no way to do it, but this is new language says, "except and only as provided in the WIA," and it was confusing to include it if it is irrelevant—and it seems to have just been added.

Mr. Payne said he is okay with removing that sentence. He said he did want to make it very clear that they can extend the timeline to connect if it's at the fault of the county, which they are not anticipating.

Ms. Siegmund said she is all for the county being responsible for what they need to be responsible for, and the applicant being responsible for what they are.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Payne said that may be leftover language from previous drafts, and the reason why they delayed it is because they were waiting for the first building to get further along and then have their final design for the second building. He said they stopped it so they could make sure they didn't need that extra 113,000 gallons. He said they have now reevaluated and have been able to determine they know what they need, and that's why the 217,000 will work for both buildings.

Ms. Barnes asked why they didn't go with the original agreement—the bottom line with the original agreement of the county building the purple pipe, then getting a second building.

Mr. Payne said it's because they are going to have a building done before the purple pipe is here, and that's revenue to the county. He said they want to operate, and they have customers who want us to be operating.

Ms. Barnes asked if that was not a known commodity on the front end of this, back in 2023.

Mr. Payne responded that the applicant anticipated moving a lot faster than they have been. He said this is all new to both sides, and this is a massive construction and infrastructure project. He stated that the county has done a great job catching up to the applicant's speed in regards to what is needed, but he wants the community to be assured that the applicant is in a good place on the construction side of this. He said they can't start construction until the design work is done, but they have opened one building, and the second one will be done in July of 2027—so they are looking at a little more than a year maximum that they would need the potable water, if necessary. He said he felt very confident that the reuse system is going to be in place, and they will see the Stack presentation later about how much progress they are making on the reuse system as well as the county CIP water systems and sewer systems that the developers are paying for.

Ms. Caudill asked about the increase from 113,000 to 217,000 gallons per day of potable water.

Mr. Payne stated that the initial approval for temporary potable water for the project was always 217,000 gallons and was anticipated to apply only to the first building. He said that, when the applicant came forward with the proffer amendment in 2025, the applicant believed additional water would be needed and that the additional water would have come from the project Stack is building, which is the new water infrastructure bringing water from Lake Mooney to the center of the county. Mr. Payne stated that the applicant planned to tie into that infrastructure as the additional water source so the applicant could open building two. He said that since that time, the applicant determined that the originally approved 217,000 gallons could be used for both buildings. Mr. Payne stated that the applicant paused the matter during the prior year while evaluating the design of the second building as it came online and determining whether the 217,000 gallons originally approved could support both buildings. He said that the matter had previously been deferred at a Planning Commission meeting and that the pause occurred around July. Mr. Payne stated that the applicant no longer needed the additional 113,000 gallons.

Mr. Payne clarified that they want to be able to utilize 217,000 gallons, and the reason they have to reserve 217,000 is to address that peak period. He explained that consumer power bill increases are based on peak periods—how much power usage is being utilized and bought during the coldest and the hottest times—and the same applies here, with about 4% of the year hitting that peak period.

Ms. Caudill asked why the requirement was changed from the actual infrastructure completion to simply posting bonds.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Edwards explained that part of the reason that they're going for this proffer amendment is to be able to open the second building prior to the purple pipe being finished, so one of the things they wanted as a county is to make sure they had as many protections as they could. He said that STC has occurred and is one of the backups; they will construct it if Potomac Church or Potomac AWS does not finish it. He said additionally, having the bond gives the county the option to build it, and 24-month provision offers an extra layer of protection so they can actually discontinue water.

Ms. Barnes asked if the STC had a timeline or if the clock would start over.

Mr. Edwards explained that with the STC water infrastructure agreement, they actually cannot get OPs for their buildings until the first five—there's different phases of construction, so it's like 25, 50, 75, 100 percent—so they get an additional building. He said the rest of the 23 buildings can only be put on reuse water, so until the reuse system is done, they are capped at five buildings.

Mr. Payne noted that it doesn't extend Stack's project, and the WSA ensures there were milestones before you go to the next building and reuse extension.

Mr. Oats revisited some of the major points: One building expands to two; the same 217,000 gallons per day will be used; the timeline is 24 months; the county has the bond as an insurance; the applicant anticipates the building being built by May of 2027; the applicant is okay scratching the language regarding emergency use; the purple pipe timeline is 24 months; and the proffer is now consistent with the current WIA.

Mr. Payne confirmed those points and said the purple pipe is anticipated by September 2028.

Ms. Barnes noted that this is also dependent on the wastewater treatment facility.

Mr. Payne said the county is actually done with their end, which was the design work, and the applicant is getting ready to start construction. He noted that they have to bring it to a level one at the Aquia wastewater treatment plant; Amazon is constructing and paying for that, then extending that reuse system to Old Potomac Church.

Mr. Edwards clarified that as part of the proffers and the WIA, the county had to complete design and has done so; it's done with the site plan process, so a lot of the permitting is ready to go, and construction should be right after that.

Mr. Shelton asked if the contracting officer representative (COR) is the county, or if it is Amazon.

Mr. Edwards confirmed that Amazon (AWS) has hired a contractor to complete the project, and the county has hired an engineer to have oversight.

Ms. Siegmund asked if the limit is actually 217,000 a day, or is it 79,079,000 a year cumulative that can be used on different days.

Mr. Edwards explained that the hotter it gets, the more water they will need to use.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Siegmund said this reflected her concern, because when it was hot out, everybody else was going to need it. She asked if they could physically go over that.

Mr. Edwards stated that the cap is 217,000 per day, with no carryover.

Ms. Siegmund asked if they can physically exceed that volume and pay a fine or higher rate, or if it cuts off.

Mr. Edwards responded that the county has ways to restrict water flow, so the goal is to stop at 217,000.

Ms. Barnes opened the public hearing for this agenda item.

Ms. Alyson Azzara, George Washington District, said she wanted to address several details from the presentation. Ms. Azzara stated that the county appeared to be authorizing potable water use for a much longer period because the original arrangement tied use to the first building and the installation of the purple pipe, while the revised arrangement would allow use until the second building is completed and for an additional 24 months. She said that the 217,000 total peak and the estimate of about 4% did not align with her understanding that passive cooling systems work only between about 60 and 80 degrees and depend on humidity. Ms. Azzara stated that average temperatures are already sometimes above 80 degrees before summer, and her chart on deforestation showed increasing numbers of above-average days in Virginia and the Richmond area. She said that hotter conditions, including regular 90- and 100-degree days in Stafford, indicated the system would need more water and that 4% represented only a handful of days. Ms. Azzara stated that the math did not work for her, and the actual system performance, temperature ranges, and humidity levels required closer scrutiny before much more water is pulled in. She said that using more potable water for cooling over a four-year period would mean substantially more water use. Ms. Azzara stated that the purple pipe should be implemented before the second occupational permit is offered and at the same time, and the change felt like a bait-and-switch.

Ms. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, addressed the Commission. Ms. Lewis said she supported getting the second building up and running as soon as possible for the obvious tax revenue it would generate, and she said she appreciated the Commission's questions because they matched the issues she had written down. She stated that she agreed with Ms. Azzara and that, based on her research for Accokeek, free cooling could not operate 96% of the year. Ms. Lewis said she did not have the data with her because it was in her Accokeek file, but the figure was not 4% of the year by any stretch of the imagination. She said the 24 months did not align with a projected purple pipe date of September 2028 when it was already May 2026, and September 2028 was more than 24 months away. Ms. Lewis said she wanted the project up and running because it would help the financial bottom line and reflected the number one reason the county had decided to have data centers. She stated that, despite appreciating the effort to qualify and quantify the information, the figure was not 4%, and she hoped they realized that.

Ms. Connie Barrow, Rock Hill District, said she was not an expert in this but did have quite a few questions. Ms. Barrow said that agreements and acronyms should be provided to decision-makers and the public so they understand what is under consideration; the WIA, the water infrastructure agreement, would have been useful to both groups. She said that the unresolved bottom-line issue was why the original requirement tied the OP for the second building to occupancy only after reuse water was available to the site. Ms. Barrow stated that this issue was not just about Potomac Church because any change would set a precedent for every case that follows. She said the matter should be viewed from the big picture rather than in a microscope. Ms. Barrow stated that although it was important to get the

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

project moving, removing the county's stick or leverage would diminish what remained on the county's end. She said that money was not leverage for AWS because bonds would not make a difference to its bottom line. Ms. Barrow stated that getting the building going would provide AWS major motivation, and the county should not let go of its power, the rope, or the leverage.

Ms. Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District, said that Proffer Ordinance 26-25 identified Potomac Church Tech Center as Aquia District when it is in Falmouth, and this mislabeling could affect sewer, water reuse, [SCANDA] allocations, and water change tables on Page 77 of the agenda and may have been absorbed by the FY27 budget and utility tables. She said that the staff and applicant referenced a "doomsday scenario" yet didn't define it, and that the project had shifted from Old Potomac Church to Amazon Data Services and Potomac Church Tech Center, which Page 15 of the agenda described as having positive impacts. Ms. Maxson stated that the amendments and ordinances appeared tied to multiple case files concerning the project. She said that Amazon laid off 16,000 workers across the country on January 28, 2026. She stated that she had been told Amazon had transferred to Stack, while the December 2, 2025 statement said, "What we know is Stack is a new proposed element of development control to replace Amazon," even though the presentation described them as separate entities. Ms. Maxson said that the financial impact analysis on page 11 was out of date. She stated that the bonds raised questions about whether taxpayers were at risk and whether developers were at risk. Ms. Maxson said that the scope and triggers in the amendment justifications of ordinance 26-25 bundled with ordinance 25-20 as Amendment 7 PC packet were difficult for the public to understand. She stated that Exhibit A through K was empty and did not reflect what was in the system; pages 16 through 25 of the agenda were empty and did not reflect the references in the bulk of the agenda; and infrastructure requirements were constantly changing without full disclosure to the public. Ms. Maxson said that the applicant dated June 3, 2025 on Page 95 under Ordinance 25-20 showed a new roads concept on Page 98 and utilities unknown to the public. She stated that the matter was far too much for the public to understand.

Kevin French, George Washington District, said he had learned a lot tonight. Mr. French said he appreciated the Commissioners, the staff, and the applicant for clarifying many issues, but his initial review left him confused and concerned, and some of that remains. He said proffers are important and this proffer appeared to contain errors, confusing language, and vague references to generic emergencies rather than a county-declared emergency under a particular ordinance. Mr. French said the document's use of the term emergency, without identifying the relevant authority, raised concerns about its legal weight. He stated that the document still referred to reconnection even though staff had said reconnection was not possible, and he had not heard clarity about why the document still contained that language or who would rely on it during an emergency. Mr. French stated that the proffer also relied on the county for condemnation regarding easements, and the Commission should understand the progress or issues involving easements and condemnations for the project, including whether any related provision appeared in another proffer such as STC with the other \$30 million obligation for the relocation of the general maintenance facility. He said the process would benefit from a change log explaining what had changed in a proffer, why it had been included, and the impact of the change. He said WIAs are a critical part of the document and should be included in the application package for full understanding.

Ms. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District, said she wanted to speak to a few provisions in the proposed proffer. Ms. Sanzero said the proposed proffer, on its face, committed to a finite term of temporary potable water service ending either 24 months after the second data center certificate of occupancy or upon the infrastructure completion date, but hitched to that is an emergency clause that altered the endpoint. She said the applicant could continue to use temporary potable water "in the event of

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

emergencies when the infrastructure improvements are not available,” and none of the operative terms in that sentence were defined, including emergency, not available, and at no fault of the applicant. Ms. Sanzero said the undefined language left unclear whether not available meant wholly unavailable, partially unavailable, reduced pressure, or inadequate capacity, and she stated that the proffer did not specify how fault would be determined or by whom. She said the ultimate authority was the water infrastructure agreement, which was not included in the materials before the Commission, and she stated that the Commission was being asked to recommend approval of language governed by a document it had not read. Ms. Sanzero said she had identified clauses she viewed as legally unclear and stated that the matter needed to be cleared up. She said the proffer language also contained an unresolved fragment, “the earlier of 30 (30:”, that did not connect to the rest of the sentence, and the document had not been meaningfully or carefully prepared. Ms. Sanzero said the emergency clause did not function as an emergency mechanism in any ordinary sense and in plain reading, it functioned as a contingency rollback under which potable water service continued so long as the infrastructure improvements were “not available” on undefined terms. She said a seemingly finite term was attached to an open-ended clause governed by a document the Commission had not seen, and these were not minor ambiguities. Ms. Sanzero said she was not trying to stall the project in perpetuity, but the Commission needed to do quality work it could stand by and avoid plausible deniability. She said these ambiguities were the mechanism by which the emergency clause operated and must be addressed before the language could move forward. Ms. Sanzero said the Commission should require that the terms be defined, the drafting errors be corrected, and the water infrastructure agreement be made available and reviewed so that the priority of residential users in a true emergency use is addressed before the language is recommended to the Board of Supervisors. She stated that the project shouldn’t be stalled, but it had to be done right.

Mr. Cade Hilldruth, Hartwood District, said he would like to step back from the specific points of concern offered and speak to the shape these modifications taken together suggest. Mr. Hilldruth said the theme of the evening was confusion over clarity and terms. He stated that taken as a whole, the proposed changes showed a pattern in which a prior commitment that potable water could not be reconnected once reuse water began had been reversed, while the Commission was being asked to trust the feasibility of reconnection rather than the binding legal language. Mr. Hilldruth said potable water was now not only possible but required in emergency conditions, and the term “emergency” remained undefined, with no clarity about who would declare one or what limits would apply. He said Mr. Edwards had referenced a draft ordinance defining emergency conditions, and the record did not establish whether it was active, when it took effect, or what definition it contained. Mr. Hilldruth said the referenced WIA agreement was not in the materials before the Commission, the public, or the county, and the county was also obligated to secure easements by condemnation if necessary to build the dependent infrastructure.

Mr. Hilldruth said these changes moved in one worrisome direction by shifting risk, cost, and obligation away from the applicant and toward the county and its residents. Mr. Hilldruth stated that the applicant was seeking release from substantial commitments while gaining new entitlements, including a contractual claim on potable water that every other resident of the county also depends on. He said the request resembled “retrading” in real estate, where a party returns after the counterparty is committed to seek more favorable terms than originally agreed upon. Mr. Hilldruth stated that such requests are sometimes warranted by genuinely changed circumstances, but more often reflect a shift in the balance of power. He said the applicant knew the county was no longer in a position to walk away because the project was approved and entitlements were granted, and the modifications arose precisely when the applicant held the upper hand. Mr. Hilldruth said retraders are viewed with caution because, regardless of the reason offered, the move itself is a giveaway. He stated that a commitment that can be revisited the moment leverage shifts was never truly a commitment but an opening position. Mr. Hilldruth said he understood and supported the desire to make the project operational and unlock its tax revenue, but he

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

stated that the proffers, as written, were not ready to be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. He said the Commission should defer action until the unanswered questions were resolved on the record.

Mr. Payne said he always appreciated comments from the community. He stated that there was a bit of misunderstanding, but he was glad people wanted the project to move forward. He said the project should move forward because it would benefit the county. Mr. Payne stated that Stafford County needs new revenue, and this project would help provide it, as reflected in their budget sessions over the past couple of months. He said the applicant agreed to remove the exception language, which dated back to 2025, when the applicant believed reconnection was possible and there was internal agreement on that point. Mr. Payne said now that reconnection is understood to be unavailable, the applicant is willing to remove the exception language.

Mr. Oats said he wanted to make sure that the public understands what is meant by the “exception language,” and asked if what they are talking about is the emergency language.

Mr. Payne clarified that it says, “except and only as provided in the WIA, the applicant may utilize temporary potable water in the event of emergencies when the infrastructure improvements, meaning the reuse system, are not available to either or to both data center buildings constructed on the property and no fault of the applicant.”

Mr. Payne said the applicant is removing that language because they previously understood that reconnection might be possible. He stated that once the infrastructure is built and turned over to the county, the applicant no longer controls it. Mr. Payne said the language was included because a county issue affecting that infrastructure could leave the applicant without an operating system; he learned only today that reconnection would not be possible. Mr. Payne said the WIA was incorporated to ensure compatibility with the proffers and address when potable water may be used, how long it may be used, the county’s control over the process, and who must pay for it. Mr. Payne said the applicant pays, so that request is reasonable. Mr. Payne said the parties had anticipated that the design and construction process would move faster, acknowledging that permits and site reviews took a long time. Mr. Payne said the proffer amendment would allow the second building to open, benefit the county and the applicant, and remain subject to a cap. He stated that if the building is completed in May 2027, the 24-month period would expire in May 2029, but the applicant conservatively anticipates completing the reuse system in September 2028. He stated that community concern about potable water usage is appropriate.

Mr. Shelton asked if the applicant would be amicable to adding the drought language under the emergency clause.

Mr. Payne responded that it is an ordinance, so they can’t supersede that. He suggested including in the proffer statement that the subject utility section would be subject to the county’s drought ordinance or whatever the ordinance is.

Ms. Barnes asked if they take the language out down to that emergency option, it would be a moot point.

Mr. Payne responded that it wouldn’t be, because the way the language is written in the WIA and the proffer statement, they get day-to-day extensions if it’s not the applicant’s fault and is the county’s fault. He said if there’s an emergency situation, the WIA does address force majeure events; he said a drought could fall under that, but the county has a policy in place that dictates.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Edwards said as part of the Utilities Ordinance, Chapter 25, they updated and adopted a new drought ordinance. He said they could just reference that, which would clear things up a lot.

Mr. Payne said this would be redundant, but he is okay with it as long as it doesn't delay this going forward. He pointed out that the WIA says they have to follow applicable law of the county and the state and the feds, so if the county ordinance says they have to follow a certain drought ordinance process, the WIA—which is incorporated in the proffers—requires them to follow that.

Ms. Caudill noted that someone in the audience had referred to this as a draft ordinance, and she asked Mr. Edwards if it had been adopted yet.

Mr. Edwards responded that the drought ordinance was adopted last year as part of the utility ordinance.

He stated that proffers are intended to be regulations or development regulations above and beyond what already exists; typically, when they are reviewing proffer statements from applicants, if there's something that's already in existing codes, they discourage that because it is redundant.

Mr. Payne said under the WIA, applicable law means “all laws, statutes, rules, regulations, ordinances, codes, judgments, orders, approvals, tariffs, decrees, and other pronouncements having the effect of law of any government authority,” with the government authority in this context being Stafford County. He said he wanted to let Mr. Shelton know that this is in the WIA, which is incorporated into the proffers.

Ms. Siegmund said there was a concern brought up about condemnation as it pertains to easements, and with the school construction, they have had to do similar things to get connected. She said on Page 10 of the markup, under E, offsite easements, it says that the applicant might request the county's assistance for the condemnation for easements for the reuse water infrastructure. She stated that AWS is building the reuse water infrastructure but then will convey it back to the county, and because it is not going to be Amazon's to use, they might require county assistance in using condemnation because it's for a public project, not because the county is helping the applicant out for something they will control as a corporate entity.

Mr. Payne clarified that this is deemed a public project, and it's not unusual for the private sector to build a public project, then turn it over to the county. He said there are times when they must exercise due diligence and good faith to acquire the right-of-way; typically, they are not going through someone's front yard and instead are looking for public areas. Mr. Payne said if they get to a point where they can't get the right-of-way, they can go to the county; it's not a requirement that the county agrees to it, but they can request condemnation to extend the public utility.

Ms. Barnes asked if by opening up the second building before the purple pipe, they are extending the timeline of their ability to use potable water by a couple of years.

Mr. Payne responded no, because they are not up and running—and it's taken them this long to get to their first building. He said the way the proffers are currently written, the second building could not come online until the purple pipe was extended.

She asked if they let that building come online before the purple pipe, whether they are extending the timeline of the use of potable water. She said it sounds like they let that second building open up, and now they've got two buildings using potable water and potentially two more years of using potable water.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

She asked if they are using more water over the long haul because they are allowing that second building to open up and use potable water.

Mr. Payne responded that if they went to the max amount of time, there could be some additional time period—but this all goes to how they evaluated this in the first place in terms of how much water could be set aside for temporary use until the reuse system was built. He said Utilities took a very conservative estimate of what amount of water they were comfortable with on a temporary basis being utilized, and this facility is not using peak period water 100% of the year—it's about 4% of the year.

Ms. Barnes asked where he got that.

Mr. Payne said that is Amazon's average water usage, and sometimes the water issue gets overexaggerated. He said Northern Virginia uses potable water; some data centers use potable water and have been using it for years for cooling, and in Prince William County, that's about 3% of the water system. He noted that they don't use a lot of water for domestic use—less than an office—because they don't have a lot of employees. He emphasized that the amount of water that AWS is asking the county to set aside for peak period usage is a pretty conservative number, with a very short period of time for usage. He noted that the county did their evaluation on why they thought that that was an appropriate number, and his understanding is that's a very conservative number.

Ms. Barnes said she was asking where he got the 4%.

Mr. Payne responded that it is Amazon's average of water usage during peak periods, and he confirmed that this is for Virginia. He said he heard from the audience about whether these facilities are efficient enough, and this is a brand-new, technologically advanced facility. He said there have been 300 data centers in Northern Virginia built since 2000, and he did not think it was fair to utilize that average compared to what they are building today, which is a much more efficient building and facility that uses less water during peak periods.

Ms. Barnes said her concern still stands, as they are going to be extending the period of time of potable water use. She said if they are capping it at 217,000 for both buildings, they've got to push that date out a little further to get the purple pipe because they already have the second building up and running.

Mr. Payne responded that it may extend a bit further than initially anticipated, but AWS did not anticipate having the delays they have right now, and the second building on the way is going to open before that purple pipe's in place. He said he didn't see any reason why that can't proceed and open, which is a benefit to the taxpayers of Stafford County. He added that it is a benefit to the customers, and there is a cap on the amount of water that can be used for the time period. He added that there are guardrails here, and this is a conservative amount of water.

Mr. Oats stated that he would like to confirm an accurate comparative analysis for other major commercial businesses in the county, as he heard during the public hearing that there were those in the county currently using 300,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Edwards confirmed that there were businesses that used a large sum of water on a daily basis.

Ms. Siegmund said the applicant was concerned about the extension of the 217,000 for longer—but she was under the impression that the original language would have been 217,000 for longer, but with the

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

additional 113,000. She said originally it was thought to be longer because it was two buildings, but in addition to that would be 113,000, and that's less than what they walked into the meeting with.

Mr. Payne apologized for the confusion and said that the second building under the current proffers can't come online until the reuse system is there, adding that 217,000 was always the cap on temporary water—and they know that can be used for both buildings. He said building number two is going to be done sooner rather than later, and they would like to modify it so they can open up building two but still keep the cap in place to allow time to extend the reuse system.

Ms. Barnes said she remembered the first meeting with Stack and Peterson back in 2022 and would like very much to keep the first agreement—which is a hard line in the sand that the applicant doesn't get certain things until that building is built, but she is not sure that is necessarily practical at this point. She added that she is still concerned they will be using more potable water over the long term, but there may be savings in the long run with the water being capped at 217,000.

Mr. Payne stated that this is not a "retrade," as was previously asserted; AWA is spending \$160 million to build this infrastructure, and it's going to be county infrastructure as well as billing AWS for reuse water for the system that they built. He added that they are paying for the potable water and using a conservative number so they can get the second building open, so it's a benefit to the county. Mr. Payne said these buildings together are anticipated to gross about \$10 million a year in additional tax revenue to the county, so he thinks that is a reasonable request.

Ms. Barnes said the 4% figure cited and maximum usage of 217,000 is based on past usage of environs to the north of Stafford that are using evaporative systems, and she asked if anyone had ever discussed putting that into a proffer. She said Mother Nature laughs when she thinks they've got it figured out.

Mr. Edwards said when Utilities did the analysis, they used a range of April–November for the 217,000 per day. He said they did not worry about whether that was 4% of the time, they just made sure to be as conservative as possible and have enough water for 217,000 every day for that period of April to November. He said that staff feels very comfortable that they have adequate water supplies for the 217,000 plus the additional water at STC.

There being no further questions for the applicant or staff, Ms. Barnes brought the matter before the Commission.

Ms. Lucian said if they were okay with the strikethrough version of the proffer, she would recommend making a motion to accept the new proffers.

Mr. Oats moved to accept the new proffers. Mr. Shelton seconded the motion.

Ms. Barnes clarified that this is a motion to accept the deletion of the proffers regarding the emergency language.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Zuraf said the motion was not registered properly in the system and suggested that it be redone.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026***

Mr. Oats moved to approve Ordinance O26-25.

Mr. Shelton seconded the motion.

Mr. Shelton commented that this is a win-win for the citizens as well as the county.

Ms. Barnes commented that there are a few things in this that she would have liked to have be different, but it is a “six of one, half dozen of another” situation as far as the water usage. She said pulling the emergency water usage out makes her feel better about this, and she did not know how much more clarification or firmness they can get in terms of nailing down Amazon on exactly how much water they will use and how many hot days there will be.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

2. Planning and Zoning; Consider a proposed Zoning Reclassification, with proffers, from the B-3, Office Zoning District to the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 38-831 (Project known as RC23155357; GDC Corporate Office (aka Venture Business Park))
Proposed Ordinance O26-24 (Approval)
Proposed Resolution R26-174 (Denial)
(Time Limit: August 21, 2026)
Background Summary: Recommends Approval Of Zoning Reclassification.

Ms. Bridges reported that this application requests a zoning reclassification with proffers from B-3 office zoning district to M-1 light industrial zoning district. Ms. Bridges stated that the request applies to Tax Map Parcel 38-83L, a 21.46-acre property located in the Falmouth District. She said the applicant is 55 Venture Drive LLC, and Hirschler will present on the applicant’s behalf. She stated that the site is located at the end of Venture Drive, approximately 1,500 feet east of Wyche Road and I-95, just south of Hospital Boulevard; access to the property is provided from Venture Drive. She said the property is currently developed as a semi-truck parking lot within the Courthouse TDA along Richmond Highway, and the site was originally zoned M-1 but was reclassified to B-3 in 2008 as part of the Courthouse redevelopment project when it was part of Tax Map Parcel 29-93C. Ms. Bridges noted that surrounding properties include B-3, B-2, R-4, and A-1 zones that include office, industrial, storage, residential, and agricultural uses; all surrounding properties are also located in the Courthouse TDA, with comprehensive plan designations that include business and industry, mixed use, commercial retail, and suburban.

Ms. Bridges referenced an aerial view of the existing site conditions, which includes semi-truck storage, office trailers, and a gravel drive. She said the site is surrounded by wooded areas, and the project is currently under a stop-work order for noncompliance with the approved development plan as identified by environmental inspections. Ms. Bridges stated that the applicant has proffered that they will address and resolve the environmental issues that led to the stop-work order, and no new construction permits may be issued for the property until these issues are resolved except for permits necessary to correct the environmental violations.

Ms. Bridges reported that the applicant is proposing redevelopment of the 21.46-acre property with 20,000 square feet of one-story building for warehouse and flex-office uses. She stated that the building will include approximately 16,000 square feet of warehouse space and 4,000 square feet of flex-office space. Ms. Bridges stated that the GDP also includes a 100,000-square-foot gravel storage yard with 101 parking spaces that include truck parking, standard spaces, and ADA-accessible spaces, along with a

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

designated loading area. She said site design elements include landscaping, a secured and screened storage area with fencing, trees, and a trash enclosure. She stated that buffering on the site is provided through a 50-foot Type C transitional buffer along the southwest property line and an additional Type C buffer along portions of the eastern boundary adjacent to agricultural zoning.

Ms. Bridges stated that stormwater is managed through a shared BMP pond located on the southeast portion of the property, and the site will be served by public water and sewer with required utility extensions. She said the GDP also includes a conceptual monument sign measuring 11 feet wide and 7 feet tall displaying the GDC corporate offices logo. She stated that the proposed operating hours for the site are 5 AM to 7 PM Monday through Saturday, with no proffers restricting the hours of operation. She said the property is located within the Courthouse TDA and the urban services area, where higher-density mixed-use development is encouraged. She stated that TDAs are intended to support significant redevelopment with a variety of uses, while the USA promotes compact growth and the efficient provision of public services such as utilities, schools, and transit. She said that overall, staff finds the project to be consistent with the county's comprehensive plan and supportive of Objective 2.2, which directs growth into the USA.

Ms. Bridges referenced a rendering of the proposed building and said the county's neighborhood design standard plan does not include standards for industrial uses; however, the proffers for this project require high-quality building façades. Ms. Bridges stated that this includes one primary material such as precast concrete, glass, or metal panels, along with two secondary materials such as cement and gypsum-reinforced fiber concrete. She said that overall, the project is expected to generate moderate traffic, including 39.6 trips during the AM peak hours and 43.6 trips during the PM peak hours, for a total of 196.4 trips on an average weekday. She stated that the project is not expected to impact schools or parks and will be served by Stafford Fire and Rescue Station No. 2. Ms. Bridges stated that overall, the proposed proffers require the property to conform to their approved GDP and limit the site to specific M-1 industrial uses. She said the project will also be kept at 999 average daily vehicle trips; in addition, the applicant will provide a land dedication and a \$50,000 contribution toward county transportation improvements.

Ms. Bridges stated that staff finds several positives associated with the site, including consistency with the comprehensive plan, compatibility with the surrounding commercial and industrial uses, limits on future land uses, the \$50,000 contribution, a traffic cap with required compliance monitoring, and a dedication of 2.614 acres of right-of-way along Venture Drive for future road improvements. She stated that staff finds no apparent negative features of the project and concludes that the project is consistent with the development recommendations of the comprehensive plan. She said based on these findings, staff supports the request and recommends approval of the application with proffers pursuant to Ordinance O26-24.

Ms. Barnes asked if the issues that caused the stop-work order in the first place have been resolved.

Ms. Bridges responded that based on discussions with environmental inspections, this occurred in March 2024. She stated that the developer was severely out of compliance with the approved plans, and the phase one erosion and sediment controls were never installed. She stated that instead, the developer started using the property as a dumping ground for the spoils from the I-95 interchange project; as a result, the material had to be removed and the approved plan had to be followed or revised. Ms. Bridges stated that this was proffered to cover the county's concerns and compliance was expected, but this information had been updated recently by the environmental inspectors.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Barnes stated that she was a little confused, as the applicant and not staff had proffered the cleanup—which had not yet happened.

Ms. Bridges stated that this was correct.

Ms. Barnes stated that if the reclassification were approved, the county would need oversight to ensure the issue did not happen again.

Ms. Bridges said as far as the project was concerned at that time, all that could be done was to proffer that the applicant bring it into compliance.

Ms. Barnes stated that this was something the county would have to watch.

Mr. Zuraf stated that adding this into the proffers would provide extra enforcement and additional strength to ensure the issue was resolved. He said that if they moved forward and nothing happened, it would become a zoning violation with legal consequences.

Ms. Barnes asked for confirmation that everything would stop.

Mr. Zuraf stated that the county could help enforce compliance and move the matter forward, and this action would also help the applicant move forward with site plans, which would ensure that the details and the design of the repair met all county standards.

Ms. Barnes stated that as the permitting process continued, there would be continuous inspections from planning and zoning and probably environmental staff as well.

Staff confirmed this.

Ms. Caudill said she was confirming that the zoning was going from B-1 to M-1, even though it had been that previously and was now returning to that designation.

Ms. Bridges responded that in 2008, it went from R-1 to B-3 without proffers, and it was now going from B-3 to M-1.

Ms. Caudill stated that the district uses and standards were constantly being updated, and the Commission had just received an update, and she asked whether M-1 allowed for data centers or substations.

Mr. Zuraf stated that M-1 did not allow for those uses.

Ms. Barnes asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Payne stated that the applicant, GDC Contractors, was proposing to relocate its headquarters from Prince William County to this site and stated that the company was a general contractor as well as having a hauling business. He stated that a 20,000-square-foot facility and a 100,000-square-foot storage yard and parking yard were proposed, and the project was office flex—with this area planned for business

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

and industry. He said that all the surrounding uses are industrial and stated that, along Wyche Road, the surrounding area is industrial, and the DHL center is located there.

Mr. Payne explained that regarding the violation, when the applicant acquired the property, they had located some materials and some storage and vehicles there. He said when a complaint was received, the county inspected the site and informed the applicant they could not continue operating in that manner. He said they were seeking the zoning change so the use would be consistent with what is on the site or intended to be on the site, and nothing is operating on the site today. He said that they worked with the county attorney's office, the zoning office, and the environmental department office; they made some quick fixes to the erosion concerns, and work was stopped. He said they cannot move forward to undertake the necessary stormwater management system and erosion control system because they need to get the property rezoned first, since the site plan cannot be approved. He said they submitted a site plan that includes the infrastructure improvements to correct the issue, but it can't be approved until the zoning is approved. Mr. Payne stated that although there is a pending violation, he did not want anyone to think there was an ongoing environmental erosion issue because they had addressed that.

Mr. Payne said that the major fix will require zoning approval before construction can start on the site and stated that, as he noted, the property is being rezoned from B-3 to M-1. He said in 2008, the county rezoned the property with the expectation that the area would one day support hotels and retail. He said that the area instead is where industrial uses are located, and the county has changed its comprehensive plan to reflect that. He stated that the site layout provided by staff shows a 20,000-square-foot building with a 100,000-square-foot storage yard and access off Venture Drive. Mr. Payne stated that they are dedicating right-of-way on Venture Drive and improving it; the county will eventually look to extend that road to Route 1, and GDC has dedicated right-of-way for that purpose.

Mr. Payne stated that restrictions on permitted uses are included in their proffers. He said that they also have enhanced architectural designs, which he would show later with their building materials, and they will have to remove the existing structures. Mr. Payne stated that they have capped the trips at 999, and the project did not require a TIA, noting that they will pave and extend Venture Drive. Mr. Payne stated that they are dedicating well over 2.6 acres on the frontage along Venture and contributing \$50,000 for regional road improvements. He presented the elevations and the fiscal impact numbers, stating that the relocation would bring \$17.5 million in annual revenue and about 100 new jobs. He said that the company is active in Prince William County and has 40 years in the business.

Ms. Barnes thanked the applicant and opened the public hearing.

Ms. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, stated that 100 jobs had been referenced, but those 100 jobs already appear to exist in Prince William County, and she did not know whether the project would bring new jobs to Stafford County. Ms. Lewis stated that the hours of operation beginning at 5 a.m. raised concerns about noise, and although the site is in an industrial area, sound travels. She stated that while knocking on doors for the Accokeek Center at Big Spring, residents near the Choice Waste business on McKittrick at the corner of Eskimo Hill and McKittrick hear garbage trucks every morning. Ms. Lewis stated that she was not opposed to the project but did not fully understand it, and she felt that some claims about how much the county would gain from the project need further scrutiny.

Ms. Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District, stated that no zoning reclassification code is attached to the application; see Page 270, and no section identifies the legal code to apply to the application Ordinance O26-24. She said that the application page numbers are inconsistent, and the appropriate location of

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

drain ways, floodplains, and wetlands is marked “not applicable” in the application; see Page 287. She said that neighboring properties are not listed in the application, and this does not ensure the neighbors are notified during the life of the application. Ms. Maxson stated that the application states that encouraged use includes, without limitation, a data center; see Page 219, which refers to vacant property southeast of the project—with that specific property not identified; see Page 221 should be reviewed. Ms. Maxson stated that Exhibit A, B and A and B is empty. She said that Pages 22 and 23 should be reviewed and stated that the servability Page 232 is questionable upon reading, containing “bully words.” She said that there is a stop-work order on the project, dated June 26, 2025. Ms. Maxson stated that 38-38L is 30 acres as defined in Stafford County records; however, metes and bounds states it is 21.46 acres; see Page 243. Ms. Maxson said the study does not fit with the comprehensive plan; see Plat 3 on Page 238 out of 905 pages. She said the boundary shows a boot, and where the heel is, the 15th sanitary sewer easement exists out of the property. She said that the pond in the agenda is not located on the southeast edge of the property and is not shared with an adjacent parcel. She stated that TM 38-83L is not zoned A-1. Ms. Maxson said there are lots of typo on Page 208; the picture of the pond shown during the hearing depicts southeast, and a north arrow is needed on these plats to correct confusion. Ms. Maxson stated that Ordinance O8-01 does not include 38-38L, and including an attachment is questionable without a reason for its inclusion; see Page 293. Ms. Maxson stated that a senior engineer developer states, “Not sure what the hell any of this means,” as appears on Page 250, and this was forwarded to the Department of Utilities on December 10, 2025.

Mr. Payne said he sometimes wondered about the meaning of the materials and thanked the community for their comments.

Mr. Payne stated that regarding the hours of operation, the goal was to get the trucks out early, which was beneficial for local commuters and stated that the interstate is located very near the intersection of Wyche Road. Mr. Payne stated that there is an animal shelter nearby and significant noise and activity in that industrial area, which is the reason for the hours of operation. He said there had been a question about the number of employees, and some would commute in, which is not unusual in Stafford County, as many blue-collar workers do. Mr. Payne stated that those employees would be buying gas, buying food, and utilizing services—and they would therefore be spending dollars in Stafford County.

Ms. Barnes asked for clarification about the pond direction.

Mr. Payne said they will fix the compass on the map.

Ms. Barnes said as far as noise impacts on neighboring properties, there was no residential use anywhere around the site.

Ms. Siegmund said she wanted to make sure she was following the discussion. She said that there was a stop-work order letter sent in 2023 for a business that existed and was essentially operational in Stafford County except for the stop-work order. She stated that the stop-work order letter provided that they could not do anything until they were compliant, and the only zoning approvals or permits they could obtain were those allowed to bring them into compliance. Ms. Siegmund stated that this action did not do anything new or extra; it was to bring them into compliance.

Mr. Payne stated that they were stuck. He said it did not make sense to submit a site plan under the current zoning when it would not be the actual use. He said they needed to get it rezoned and stated that

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

once it was rezoned, the current site plan would be approved because it would be applicable to the use that was going to be on the site.

Ms. Siegmund stated that this was the business that they had already been operating under improper zoning.

Mr. Payne confirmed that this was correct.

Ms. Siegmund stated that this was not even a new change, and it was literally to bring them into compliance.

Mr. Payne stated that the only way to do that was through the zoning.

Ms. Siegmund stated that she understood.

Mr. Payne stated that they had been working with the county attorney's office.

Ms. Siegmund stated that she believed that and was just seeking confirmation.

Mr. Payne stated that he wanted to make sure she understood what they were doing.

Ms. Barnes stated that since the Commission was considering a reclassification without a GDP, she wondered if there were specific things they had proffered for that specific parcel because it opened up to a lot of M-1 uses and stated that she wanted that clarified for the public.

Mr. Payne stated that data centers were not allowed under M-1. He said that notwithstanding anything to the contrary under the proffers, the project was intended to be a contractor's office, and the following principal uses were prohibited: non-commercial automotive repair, rental, and sale; aquaculture; commercial kennels; convenience center; hotel; maintenance rental repair modular units designed for temporary office or classrooms; public parking lot; railroad sidings; restaurants without drive-throughs; veterinary clinics; adult businesses; private airport uses; boat sales; clinic medical or dental use; place of worship; school; truck stop; and vehicle fuel cells. He added that what was left was basically a contractor's office.

Ms. Barnes stated that there would be no veterinary clinic next to the animal shelter.

Ms. Caudill stated that the presentation referenced hours of operation from 5 AM to 7 PM Monday through Saturday, and she asked whether the applicant would be willing to formally proffer operational limitations for those hours.

Mr. Payne confirmed the applicant was willing to do that.

Mr. Oats stated that he would take anything the applicant was willing to offer.

Ms. Barnes said this was the right answer.

Mr. Oats agreed.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Barnes said when a motion was made, the hours of operation would need to be added to the proffers.

Mr. Oats moved to add a proffer of the hours 5 AM to 7 PM, Monday through Saturday.

Ms. Caudill seconded the motion.

Ms. Lucian said as a point of clarification, the motion was technically to accept the proffer as long as the applicant was willing to provide it, which the applicant had stated they were.

Mr. Oats restated his motion to accept the proffer from the applicant.

Ms. Caudill seconded the motion. She thanked the applicant and Mr. Payne.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Oats also thanked the applicant.

Mr. Oats moved to approve O26-24.

Mr. Shelton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

RECESS:

The Commission recessed its meeting at 8:40 PM and reconvened at 8:49 PM.

3. Planning and Zoning; Consider a proposed Zoning Reclassification, with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural, and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts to the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-122, 38-122A, 38-123A, 38-29, and 38-30. The Application also includes proposed amendments to the existing proffers approved on September 17, 2024, by Ordinance O24-20 applicable on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-124, 38-124A, 38-124B, 38-29A and 38-29B (Project known as RC25156486; Stafford Technology Campus). The listed tax map parcels have been further subdivided to also include Tax Map Parcels No. 38-29A, 38-29B, 38-124E, 38-124F, 38-124G, 38-124H, 38-1-124J, And 38-1-124K.

Proposed Ordinance O26-22 (Approval)

Proposed Resolution R26-162 (Denial)

(Time Limit: August 21, 2026)

Background Summary: Recommends approval of zoning reclassification with proffers.

Mr. Zuraf recognized Mr. Sadiq to provide the staff presentation.

Mr. Sadiq stated that he was presenting the Stafford Technology Campus (STC) project on behalf of the Planning and Zoning Department. He said that the request had two sections: a zoning reclassification from A-1, Agricultural and M-1, Light Industrial to M-2, Heavy Industrial with proffers for the reclassification property, and a proffer amendment revising existing proffers adopted under Ordinance O24-20 for the proffer amendment property. Mr. Sadiq said all were to permit a data center campus.

Mr. Sadiq said that the reclassification property consists of 34.94 acres, including parcels 38-122, 38-122A, 38-123A, 38-29, and 38-30; the proffer amendment property consists of 503.84 acres, including

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

parcels 38-124, 38-124A, 38-124B, 38-24A, and 38-29B, all located in the Falmouth District. He stated that the applicant and owners are SINBS 07 entities and VEPCO, and the agent is Charlie Payne from Hirschler. He said that according to approved Ordinance O25-29R, the application falls within the scope of approved grandfathering language and can proceed under the requirements of the prior zoning ordinance.

Mr. Sadiq stated that the slide presented shows the location and zoning of the project, located along the east side of Richmond Highway south of State Shop Road and east and west of Eskimo Hill Road. He stated that the diagonal red-hatch pattern identifies the reclassification property, which is currently zoned A-1 and M-1, while the proffer amendment property has been zoned M-2 since September 2024 by Ordinance O24-20, which was the original Stafford Technology Campus.

Mr. Sadiq stated that the surrounding zoning districts consist of A-1, B-1, and M-1 to the north; A-1, B-2, and M-1 to the south; A-1 and M-2 to the east; and A-1 and M-1 to the west. He said that in looking at the existing conditions, the reclassification property is undeveloped and wooded. He stated that the proffer amendment property has undergone grading and leveling for the STC development. He said a high-voltage transmission line and easement bisect the site, and the topography includes sloping terrain—with several streams, wetlands, and resource protection buffer areas across the site.

Mr. Sadiq said general surrounding uses include residential and undeveloped uses to the north and south, the former landfill and corrections facility to the east, and industrial auto salvage yard and undeveloped lands to the west. He said that two additional data center rezoning applications are currently pending to the south, highlighted in orange-dashed lines, which consist of parcels 38, 126, 125, 130, and 138. Mr. Sadiq stated that the slide presented shows existing pictures of the site. He said that one view showed the north view from the transmission line, showing the existing campus, and another showed the southeastern view of the site from the intersection of Richmond Highway and Sage Lane. He stated that under the comprehensive plan future land use, the site is designated within the Central Stafford targeted development area (TDA), under the 2024 approval. He said the project area lies within the Urban Service Area, with resource protection area zones.

Mr. Sadiq reported that the site also lies within the airport impact overlay district for Stafford Regional Airport, specifically in the AP-2 (approach), transitional (T), and horizontal (H) turning zones. He said the plan evaluates land use compatibility and identifies uses as compatible, requiring additional review, or not compatible for each zone. He said that data centers require additional review in the AP-2 and T zones and are compatible in the H3 zone. He stated that electric substations, which are vertical infrastructure, are not compatible and require additional review in the H3 zone. Mr. Sadiq said the applicant provided federal aviation letters confirming that a 65-foot height is acceptable for parcel 38-29. He said that the slide showed the Central Stafford TDA future land use, and this site is designated for business and industry uses.

Mr. Sadiq said the slide showed the approved GDP, starting with the buildings and uses, and the proposed GDP maintains 23 data center buildings and is consistent with the approved floor area ratio and the trip generation for the proposed GDP. He said that the approved buildings on the proffer amendment property were already approved through Ordinance 24-20; key revisions include reorganizing the buildings throughout the campus and removing one building from north of the western substation. Mr. Sadiq stated that the revisions include adding a new 65-foot two-story building on parcel 38-29. He said that the revisions also add details on the dedication of parcels 38-122 and 122A for a future fire station site. He stated that building heights range from 105 feet, 45 feet, and 65 feet, depending on the building type. He

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

said that although a new building is added on parcel 38-29, the total number of data center buildings in the proposed STC remains 23. Mr. Sadiq referenced a slide showing the proposed GDP and highlighted the changes mentioned.

Mr. Sadiq said that regarding access and circulation, the site is bisected by Eskimo Hill Road. He stated that the revised plan adds more internal access points and updates access to the southeast building, and the new building on parcel 38-29 receives its own road connection. He stated that parcel 38-123A supports the expanded road network. Mr. Sadiq showed another slide with the approved GDP, noting that the dashed red lines show the addition of the proposed reclassification property, with changes to the internal access points shown in red circles.

Mr. Sadiq stated that regarding buffering, landscaping, and open space, no changes are proposed to the approved building setbacks for the structures located within the proffer amendment area. He said that there are no changes to the approved buffers. He stated that for the new building on parcel 38-29, fencing and buffers are aligned with the approved eastern and northern sides. Mr. Sadiq stated that overall, the proposal maintains the 63 acres of tree preservation area, and the additional parcel 38-30 will further support the tree preservation area on the west. He said that the slide showed the proposed GDP, with the red circles showing the additional internal access point mentioned.

Mr. Sadiq said the applicant also provided multiple sideline sections and seasonal perspectives from Richmond Highway and the western industrial area. He said the slide presented showed sections through the proposed building on parcel 38-29. He said that the left section looks west toward Richmond Highway, and the right section looks south toward the industrial areas. He referenced slides showing the viewshed analysis as perspective views, with one showing the existing condition looking from the west side of the campus. He said that one view showed the existing summer condition and that the proposed building could be seen on the back side of the trees; another view showed the winter condition of that specific area. Mr. Sadiq said another perspective showed the existing condition looking from Richmond Highway close to the intersection with Sage Lane to the campus. He stated that the perspective also showed the proposed condition from Richmond Highway in both the summer and winter seasons, with the building on parcel 38-29 visible.

Mr. Sadiq stated that generally, the proposed proffer amendment would revise and update several items. He said that the revisions include administrative updates to the owners, boundaries, and GDP dates as part of the application; other key highlights of the proffer amendment include adding a 65-foot building height cap for parcel 38-29, revising the utility proffers so they are now combined into a single Proffer 19, referencing the executed water service agreement approved and executed in April 2025. Mr. Sadiq stated that a new proposed Proffer 27 addresses private road maintenance and stipulates that all private roads on the site will be privately maintained. He said that another revision to previously numbered Proffer 36, now Proffer 35, sets a 12-month deadline to dedicate a four-acre site for a future fire station area. He noted that the slide provided the details of these revisions to the proffers.

Mr. Sadiq stated that the staff report evaluates public facilities impacts and other factors associated with the project. He said there are no anticipated impacts to transportation, schools, parks, recreational space, and public safety, and the use is expected to have little to no impact on current levels of service. He stated that regarding transportation, a TIA was not required because the project remains consistent with the approved 5.8 million square feet and the total trip generation of 4,356 vehicles per day. He said that regarding noise, the applicant submitted an acoustical evaluation study for the application that confirms compliance with all approved and amended noise proffers; the table on the slide is part of that study and

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

highlights those issues. He said that in relation to economic development, no changes are proposed to the previously approved fiscal impact analysis from March 2025.

Mr. Sadiq referenced the slide listing staff's findings and said there are multiple positives listed, highlighting that the key ones are the approved technology campus and the consistency with the business and industrial land use. He stated that the proposed reclassification and proffer amendment maintain the approved FAR and trip generation levels. Mr. Sadiq stated that the acoustic evaluation report confirms compliance with the previous ordinance requirements, and the proposed 65-foot height meets the M-2 zoning standards. He said that no apparent negative impacts were noted, and staff supports the project and recommends approval of the application pursuant to Ordinance O26-22.

Mr. Sadiq stated that this concluded his presentation and he would be happy to address any questions.

Mr. Oats said that he had more of a comment. He said that the slide stated there were "no impacts" and referenced vehicle trips per day and no significant impacts. He stated that for the public's concern, more traffic is always a significant impact.

Mr. Sadiq stated that this was part of the approved TIA, and there is no addition on top of that, which was approved in 2023.

Ms. Siegmund stated that they seemed to gloss over the Eskimo Hill Road realignment, which would take place beforehand.

Mr. Sadiq explained that this is part of the approved transportation proffers and stated that there is no change to those proffers.

Ms. Siegmund stated that this was new to her because she was new to the Commission and acknowledged that it was not new to the project. She said that she was excited about that change and said she was looking forward to the improvement for the area.

Ms. Barnes stated that the new building for the reclassification was on parcel 38-29, asking whether it fell under the grandfathered 2023 performance standards or under the new 2025 standards passed the previous year.

Mr. Sadiq responded that it falls under the previous ordinance.

Ms. Barnes asked why that was the case. She said if it was a new reclassification and considered separately from STC because it was a new reclassification, she wondered why it was not under the current performance standards.

Mr. Sadiq stated that he would refer that to Mr. Zuraf because he had not been involved in the grandfathering language discussion.

Mr. Zuraf explained that several parcels were involved in the reclassification, including these parcels, and they were working under the limitations established under the 2024 approval.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Barnes stated that she was asking whether there was anything significant about this new reclassification, specifically the building on Route 1, including the view behind Adventure Brewing. She clarified that she was asking whether anything about the new building and this reclassification would differ from the current performance standards. She stated that she was asking whether the noise standards were any different from the 2025 standards, given that the project was falling under the 2023 standards. She said the building height of 65 feet would not need a CUP, but she asked if the new standards would apply to that building even though it was falling under the 2023 standards.

Mr. Zuraf stated that he would want to look at setbacks and perhaps some of the noise standards, but he would want to compare the proffers to the current regulations and stated that he did not have that answer at the moment.

Ms. Barnes said her only concern was that they had a brand new building and a reclassification. She stated that setbacks and noise standards had been changed for a reason, specifically to provide better setbacks and better noise restrictions, and this new building would not fall under that. She stated that she was asking whether this was to simplify the process and keep everything under one set of rules rather than create a separate set of rules for one single building.

Mr. Zuraf responded that the big change and new regulations would have been the increased setbacks with land adjacent to residential—and they do not have that here.

Ms. Barnes asked if the setbacks there were any different than they would be under the 2025 standards, given that the site appeared to be adjacent to business and industry uses.

Mr. Zuraf stated that this was what he needed to review and compare and stated that he would have to look at the regulations to see how they applied in this situation.

Ms. Barnes stated that as far as the connections, the additional connections being added to the project were all internal connections, and no connections were being added to the surrounding area; it was still Eskimo Hill, and they would not be adding any new roads into the community.

Mr. Sadiq said VDOT and the county's CIP team had already reviewed that and stated that they approved.

Ms. Barnes asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Payne stated that regarding the new parcel, there were actually four new parcels involved. He said two of the parcels are part of the dedication for the fire station where the new building is located. He said that even though some acreage was being added to assist with design, layout, and operations, the project still had the same number of buildings and the same amount of square footage—and none of those elements were changing. He said that regarding application of the new ordinance, the entire application is grandfathered under the language passed in December of 2025 because the application was pending when the October 21, 2025 ordinance was passed. Mr. Payne stated that in December of 2025, the Board of Supervisors voted to grandfather this in. Mr. Payne stated that the entire application includes both the proffer amendment and the specific reclassification, which amended the proffer by inserting that acreage into the project. He said that it is being handled under the umbrella of the proffer amendment rather than as a separate rezoning.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Payne noted that a proffer amendment is not, by itself, technically a reclassification, although it can include reclassification components. He said that the current action takes the originally approved proffers and properties and adds a new property, and that part of that process includes reclassifying the property from M-1 to M-2. Mr. Payne stated that under the current ordinance, there is no separate commercial or industrial setback requirement beyond the underlying M-2 zoning ordinance. He said that the required setbacks relate to schools, assisted living, and residential uses.

Mr. Payne stated that the height of the building has been limited to 65 feet, which is consistent, and the noise standard remains 55 dBA with an additional three-decibel reduction for low-frequency tones. Mr. Payne stated that nothing about those standards had changed and was also in the ordinance. He said they also provided the DVC analysis and the viewshed analysis. Mr. Payne stated that under this proffer amendment, the studies are required for 5 years rather than 10 years, but still must occur before site plan approval, 6 months after the CO, and once every 5 years thereafter. He said that this was the primary difference in doing the noise studies.

Mr. Payne stated that the project was originally approved in September 2024 and included a rezoning from A-1 to M-2, 5.8 million square feet, and six electric substations. He said that it also included major transportation and utility commitments, and none of those elements had changed. Mr. Payne stated that the relocation of Eskimo Hill Road and the related transportation triggers remain unchanged, and there is no new traffic associated with this project.

Mr. Payne stated that the first building is under construction, and a topping event was held the previous Friday; this was a major milestone for the project. Mr. Payne stated that major grading on the west and south campuses was substantially complete and that work was transitioning to the final building pad construction. Mr. Payne stated that construction on the proffered connector or link road, which is Sage Road to Route 1, began following site plan approval in late April. Mr. Payne stated that the offsite bridging and water and sewer projects include numerous county CIP projects that had been on the books since 2018 and are now being paid for by this project at approximately \$58 million to \$60 million.

Mr. Payne stated that easements are being negotiated and site plans have been issued for the American Legion Road improvements. He said that utility construction permits have been issued and that crews are repairing jack-and-bore crossings beneath I-95 to extend the water line. He stated that the bridging sewer installation is active near Yellow Finch Road with approximately 1,000 feet of pipe installed. Mr. Payne stated that work will continue along Cranes Corner Road, and construction of the Centerport booster pump station is advancing, including grading and foundation work, with county permits approved and subdivision review ongoing.

Mr. Payne stated that the construction and phase realignment of the connector road is underway in accordance with the approved site plan. He said that traffic is anticipated to shift to the new connector road early next year, when final improvements to Eskimo Hill Road are completed. He noted that there is a construction mitigation plan to address rerouting for current users of Eskimo Hill Road and surrounding neighbors. Mr. Payne stated that full roadway improvements and reopenings are anticipated in 2027 to support Dominion Energy upgrades on the Route 1 distribution system and allow initial building energization and substantial completion this summer. He said that Dominion Energy has commenced construction of the substation and power infrastructure on the site.

Mr. Payne referenced a slide showing the utility infrastructure improvements and their locations. He stated that the infrastructure package is significant, including the extension of reused water to the site,

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

the American Legion water main project, and the elevated reclaimed water storage tank project. Mr. Payne stated that the project also includes the approximate Centerport water pump station location and the future Potomac Creek sanitary sewer pump station, with all of this captured in the WSA and to be designed and paid for by the applicant.

Mr. Payne stated that STC's current properties consist of 503 acres and stated that the additional parcels include the dedication for the fire station. Mr. Payne stated that in addition to the four-plus-acre dedication for the fire station, the proffers also include a \$1.5 million cash contribution toward the fire station. He said that the rezoning request for the additional property currently zoned under A-1 and M-1-2 does not increase the maximum data center yield. He stated that the project was noted in 2025 as the county's second-highest real estate taxpayers; the property closed at \$3.4 million and is expected to generate another \$3.5 million this year.

Ms. Barnes stated that the proposed fire station area was inside the tree preservation area.

Mr. Payne stated that the circle only marked part of the area and stated that the parcel extends to the full 40 acres of the county parcel.

Ms. Barnes stated that she was confirming that the 63 acres did not include that area.

Mr. Payne stated that it did not and stated that this was new acreage. He said that the area to the left is the fire station location, and another area would be used as a laydown yard for staging and construction. He stated that it is not part of the tree preservation area, and nothing else would be developed on it. He confirmed that it would be cleared because it was needed for staging.

Ms. Barnes asked if the 63 acres would still remain unchanged.

Mr. Payne stated that the 63 acres had not changed and stated that the new acreage might add additional preserved acreage once the calculations were completed. He said that the site contains over 50% open space. He stated that the closest point, or pinch point, is a 117-foot setback from the corner building to the former prison building. He said that the 728-foot and 828-foot setbacks to the south, those properties are themselves subject to a rezoning for data centers. He stated that the historic resource area shown on the plan is being preserved and will not be disturbed.

Mr. Shelton asked if the TIA and 4,300 trips per day were primarily predicated on the amount of square footage.

Mr. Payne stated that this was correct and said the TIA triggers improvements once thresholds are reached.

Ms. Barnes said that one of the things she initially liked about the project was the trees and stated that the data centers had been set significantly back from Route 1. She asked why a building was now being added right behind Adventure Brewing and next to Route 1 on 38-29.

Mr. Payne stated that they believed it was an appropriate location for the building, and after the original rezoning, the project entered the design stage. He said pursuant to the design stage and tenant requirements, this building location seemed logical.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Barnes asked why it was not included originally.

Mr. Payne clarified that the applicant did not own the land at the time, and it helps with their access, entryway, security, and guard station.

Ms. Caudill said she had reviewed Ordinance O25-29R and stated that the language refers to “approval from the Board of Supervisors or site plan approval on or before October 21, 2025.” She said if this matter is a reclassification, she did not know whether the ordinance specifically addressed that point, as it says if it was approved on or before that date.

Mr. Payne said he did not have the resolution in front of him but believed it also addressed related applications, and that’s why it was grandfathered in.

Ms. Barnes said she was looking ahead to the reclassifications to the south and asked whether those would be considered in the same way.

Mr. Payne stated that the language states, “Data center projects receiving reclassification or conditional use permit approvals from the Board of Supervisors or site plan approval on or before October 21, 2025 are allowed to continue with their existing and future applications and development plans directly attributable to the approved project under the data center zoning ordinance regulation in place when the project was approved, so long as the project is diligently pursued until the applications or plans expire pursuant to deadlines imposed by Stafford County or state law.”

Ms. Barnes stated that in this case, it was falling under the umbrella that this was a related application under the original STC approval.

Mr. Payne said it was being incorporated into a proffer amendment of proffers approved prior to October 21, 2025.

Ms. Barnes stated that she was asking whether that approach could be expected for other directly related applications.

Mr. Payne stated that there were only two—the Amazon project and this one—that had pending proffer amendments.

Ms. Barnes opened the public hearing.

Ms. Alyson Azzara, George Washington District, stated that the sound study lacks sufficient detail and methodological specificity to appropriately evaluate whether the findings are truly representative of expected conditions when the development is complete. She stated that no ambient noise measurements were taken and said that there is therefore no baseline for current noise levels. She stated that the ordinance requires pre-development and post-development studies and said that because this study is model-based, there should be more receiver locations to provide higher resolution. She stated that there was no explanation for why only six receiver locations were used, stating that the placement of those locations may have been selected to meet ordinance requirements rather than reflecting true expected conditions. She stated that the study provides specific modeled numbers, including values for R-4 and R-2, but said that it does not identify model sensitivity or a margin of error. She stated that, if the margin of error were 3, some modeled locations could exceed the listed residential or agricultural limits. She

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

said that many housing communities and homes appear to be within the area of influence and stated that, even if some locations do not rise to 55 dB, the sound would still affect the surrounding soundscape. She stated that the R-2 location is classified as industrial but includes businesses such as a dog boarding kennel, a boxing club serving children, a dance school, a Germanna Community College campus, and a microbrewery. She said that an industrial 69 dB level in those areas would be very loud. She stated that the proffer excludes generator testing and substation operation from the modeled limits and said that the study therefore only models building operations such as blowers and cooling systems. She stated that none of the noise from 519 generators or the substation equipment on the 50 acres would be covered under the modeled limits because those components were proffered out. She said that she believed this should be corrected and stated that the applicant should proffer a 55 dB noise limit for the entire perimeter, including generators and substation operations.

Ms. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, said she wanted to continue the discussion about the purple pipe because the earlier explanation was confusing. She stated that STC is paying for the work and carrying it out, but that it will affect Potomac Church and related matters. She said that several people, including Commissioners, had raised the issue of condemnation. She stated that county staff told the Board of Supervisors during its retreat earlier this year that 15 properties did not have easements and that condemnation would be required, and the Supervisors were upset by that information. She stated that she remained concerned and said that this could delay Potomac Church because the county would be responsible for condemnation and eminent domain. She stated that she wanted to know what was happening with this, whether the necessary easements had been secured, and whether the county would have to use eminent domain. She said another concern involved the statement on the slide that there would be no impact because there were no light impacts. She stated that she believes there will be lighting impacts, especially if the building near the security station is illuminated, and said that such lights are bright and operate all night from sundown to sunrise.

Ms. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District, stated that STC's return to the Commission provides an opportunity to review its approval process in light of what is now known. She said when STC was approved, the applicant successfully proffered the substations and generators out of any noise standard, meaning those components would operate without an enforceable noise limit—and this was presumably done because those components will not be compliant with the 55 dBA limit, which should give the Commission pause. She stated that the county's 2025 noise ordinance provides that "all mechanical equipment shall include noise mitigation measures" and that "any noise emanating from operation of the facility shall be limited to a maximum of 55 dBA." She said that the ordinance contemplates the whole facility rather than a facility with its loudest sources excluded by proffer. She stated that as a result, noise from the STC campus will only be partially measured and partially enforced because the substations and generators are exempt. She said that the location should therefore be expected to exceed 55 dBA on a regular basis and stated that nothing can or will be done about it under the current approval. She stated that the proffer also permits noise spikes of up to 15 dBA above the limit, up to 70 dBA, so long as the average remains within the stated threshold, which permits required measurements to be taken in summer, when ambient noise is loudest. She stated that this is contrary to industry practice and county staff recommendations. She said that even 55 dBA is not a generous limit and stated that exempting substations and generators from that standard deserves scrutiny. She stated that this is what happens when domain knowledge is lacking at the moment of negotiation and said that the county is now learning in hindsight what it did not know at the time. She stated that STC led the way in laying down best practices, and what they proffered out sure speaks volumes. She said they can't fix this now, but that doesn't mean it can't be addressed in the future.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Ms. Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District, stated that the ordinances were not specified in the materials clearly, and the materials presented to the public differed from what appeared in the agenda. She said she did not understand why resolutions and ordinances were not shown clearly at the time of voting and said her view, this creates the potential for mismatches and undermines the process. She stated that the public cannot easily follow what is happening or how documents are being matched and considered, and said that she found the process unacceptable. She stated that revised Proffer 8-C adds “high albedo” language on page 301 of 905, and she did not understand what that term meant. She stated that there was substantial information blocked out and unreadable. She stated that she was asking whether the agenda had changed at the last minute in ways the public could not read. She said that owner changes to the properties were dated February 27, 2025 and stated that the proffer language had changed from properties to land. She stated that the language says the proffers “shall run with the land and be binding upon all future assignees, successors, and leases,” and said that she wanted to know who would be leasing. She stated that this appeared to reflect a commercial effort. She said that, if the owner is the Stafford County Board of Supervisors and Stafford is crossed out, that wording was unclear to her. She stated that she wanted to know whether USA meant United States of America or urban service area and said that she wanted clarification on the definition of land in the proffer and why the wording changed from property to land, Page 356 of 905.

There being no further speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing and asked if the applicant wished to address any concerns.

Mr. Payne stated that he appreciated the community concerns and stated that no one who lives or operates a business near the site had appeared that evening to criticize either the original approval or the proffer amendment. He stated that the site is particularly suitable for a data center because it adjoins a former jail, a landfill, an industrial park, and Route 1. He said that there is some housing to the north, but the tree preservation area will be maintained there and those houses are at least 1,000 feet away from the location. He stated that the exemptions for generator testing and substation facilities were, at the time of approval, consistent with industry norms and said that testing generators and maintaining substations are necessary components of a functioning facility. He stated that he was not aware of a location outside the industrial zoning district that limits the noise of a power or electric substation facility. He said that taken as a whole, the project is consistent with the current ordinance and stated that it was grandfathered because the Board thought that was appropriate. He stated that scrutiny of projects is important but said that projects of this nature rarely receive credit for their fiscal impacts. He stated that at full build-out of 5.8 million square feet, the project could generate approximately \$168 million to \$180 million in annual gross revenues for the county. He said that this would provide substantial revenue without traffic burdens or major adverse effects on county services. He stated that the project also includes major infrastructure investment and said that the applicant is building, paying for, and financing infrastructure that has been on the county’s books since 2018. He stated that those costs could rise from \$50 million to \$60 million to \$100 million over time, and the purpose is to bring water to central Stafford. He stated that projects of this nature deserve occasional recognition for their benefits and said that he believed this project is a great project and opportunity for Stafford County. He stated that nothing had been concealed from the county or the public, and the project was undertaken for the benefit of Stafford County as an economic development effort. He stated that the county had been trying to recruit projects like this for many years, and he was very excited about it.

Ms. Barnes asked if anything in the new proffer amendment or reclassification could retroactively address concerns about the sound studies or whether the discussion instead reflected broader differences between the 2023 and 2025 sound performance standards.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026***

Mr. Payne stated that site plans had already been approved and that pre-development sound modeling had been required for those site plans. He stated that additional modeling must occur six months after a certificate of occupancy and once every five years thereafter, and no one should think the project was avoiding a noise analysis.

Mr. Zuraf stated that he did not have an answer on the spot and would need to look further into the issue, particularly the differences between the current regulations and what had been required in the past.

Mr. Payne stated that the new building is not near residential uses and that nothing in the new ordinance prohibits its location. He said that he was not aware of anything in the current ordinance that imposed a particular noise standard based on adjacency to commercial uses, and the studies and analysis provided were relevant to the new building and were found to be compliant. He said that the rest of the project is grandfathered and follows a very low DBA standard that is consistent with the county's current ordinance.

Ms. Barnes stated that although some members might wish they could revisit aspects of the review, that was not what the Commission was doing that evening.

Mr. Payne stated that even if the new parcel or new building were evaluated separately, it would still be very consistent with the current ordinance aside from the shorter duration of required noise studies. He said that under the original proposal, the standard remained 55 dBA with the discreet tone reduction and stated that this had not changed.

Mr. Zuraf stated that he believed the original proposal required the higher standard when the use was adjacent to industrial property.

Ms. Caudill asked whether the acoustic model had been done for worst-case operations, including generator testing, cooling systems, substations, or similar components, or whether it had only been prepared for a base scenario.

Mr. Payne stated that the study focused on the new building, which has generators but no substation. He said that he believed substations were not included in the analysis because of the grandfathered proffers and stated that to the best of his recollection, generators were also not tested in that analysis because they were exempt under the prior approval.

Ms. Caudill stated that she had another question for staff, in thinking ahead to the Board of Supervisors. She asked whether anyone within county administration, such as the budget or finance staff, had confirmed the financial numbers that had been presented.

Mr. Sadiq stated that the fiscal impact analysis was part of the previous approval, but finance and budget staff had not approved them.

Mr. Oats moved to recommend approval of proposed Ordinance O26-22.

Mr. Shelton seconded the motion.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Mr. Shelton stated that he viewed the request as a continuation of what had already been approved in 2025, and he felt it was commendable.

Ms. Barnes stated that there are times when some aspects of a project might inspire a wish for a redo, but that was not what the Commission was doing that evening. She said that the matter before them involved specific actions, and she did not believe they could change the overall nature of the project. She stated that she would support the motion.

Ms. Siegmund stated that she also wanted to note a positive aspect of the project, and she was very pleased to see more than 60 acres of untouched forest land, a level of preservation that she had not expected to see in a data center application. She stated that the preserved trees provide an existing buffer on the side where residential use exists and said that she was also grateful for the land dedication for the fire station. She stated that the reworking of Eskimo Hill Road would also be positive.

The motion passed 5-1, with Ms. Caudill dissenting.

4. COM24155690; Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan – Potomac Creek Campus – A proposal to amend the “Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036 2021 5-Year Update,” adopted on November 16, 2021, as last revised, regarding future land use designations that would support higher density commercial development. The proposed amendment would modify Chapter 3.0, “The Land Use Plan,” to amend the maps entitled Figure 3.1, “Urban Services Areas,” Figure 3.6, “Future Land Use,” and Figure 3.13, “Central Stafford Targeted Development Area” (collectively, the Maps). The proposed changes would amend the Maps by changing the future land use designation for Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126 (Property) from Agricultural/Rural to the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area, with a land use designation of Business and Industry, and amending the boundary of the Urban Services Area to incorporate the Property into the Urban Services Area. The Property consists of approximately 99.34 acres, located south of Eskimo Hill Road and approximately 1,300 feet east of the terminus of Potomac Creek Drive, within the Falmouth Election District. Please note that this application was previously advertised for the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. However, the public hearing for such application will not occur on April 8, 2026 and will take place on April 22, 2026. **(History – Deferred at the April 22, 2026 meeting to the May 27, 2026 meeting)**
5. RC24155947; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Creek Campus – 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 (Property), to allow for development of a data center campus. The Property consists of approximately consisting of 99.34 acres, located south of Eskimo Hill Road and approximately 1,300 feet east of the terminus of Potomac Creek Drive, within the Falmouth Election District. Please note that this application was previously advertised for the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. However, the public hearing for such application did not occur on April 8, 2026 and will take place on April 22, 2026. **(Time Limit: July 17, 2026) (History – Deferred at the April 22, 2026 meeting to the May 27, 2026 meeting)**
6. COM25156869; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Potomac Creek Campus – A request to review compliance with the “Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036 2021 5-Year Update,” adopted on November 16, 2021, as last revised, in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-2232, for the placement of a proposed public utility or public service corporation,

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

specifically an electric substation, on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126 (Property). The Property consists of approximately 99.34 acres, located south of Eskimo Hill Road and approximately 1,300 feet east of the terminus of Potomac Creek Drive, within the Falmouth Election District. Please note that this application was previously advertised for the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. However, the public hearing for such application did not occur on April 8, 2026 and will take place on April 22, 2026. **(Time Limit: June 7, 2026) (History – Deferred at the April 22, 2026 meeting to the May 27, 2026 meeting)**

7. CUP25156868; Conditional Use Permit – Potomac Creek Campus – A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to exceed the maximum height limitation for data center buildings, with a height of up to seventy (70) feet, and to allow a public facility/utility, specifically an electrical substation, in the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 38-126 (Property). The Property consists of approximately 99.34 acres, located south of Eskimo Hill Road and approximately 1,300 feet east of the terminus of Potomac Creek Drive, within the Falmouth Election District. Please note that this application was previously advertised for the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. However, the public hearing for such application did not occur on April 8, 2026 and will take place on April 22, 2026. **(Time Limit: July 17, 2026) (History – Deferred at the April 22, 2026 meeting to the May 27, 2026 meeting)**
8. COM25156846; Amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan – Accokeek Center – A proposal to amend the “Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036 2021 5-Year Update,” adopted on November 16, 2021, as last revised, regarding future land use designations that would support higher density commercial development on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-96, 38-74A, 38-45, 38-45H, 38-45I, 38-45L, 38-44A, and 38-73 (Property). The proposed amendment would modify Chapter 3.0, “The Land Use Plan,” to amend the map entitled Figure 3.13, “Central Stafford Targeted Development Area” by changing the future land use designation for the Property from Mixed Use – Commercial/Residential Agricultural/Rural to Business and Industry, within the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area. The Property consists of approximately 120.88 acres, located along the west side of Richmond Highway and approximately 2,500 feet north of the intersection with Eskimo Hill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(History - Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**
9. RC24155981; Zoning Reclassification – Accokeek Center – A proposed zoning reclassification with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural, A-2, Rural Residential, and B-3, Office Zoning Districts to the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-44A, 38-45, 38-45H, 38-45I, 38-45L, 38-73, 38-74A, and 38-96 (Property), consisting of approximately 120.88 acres, to allow for development of a data center campus. The Property is located along the west side of Richmond Highway and approximately 2,500 feet north of the intersection with Eskimo Hill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: July 31, 2026) (History - Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**
10. COM25156541; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Accokeek Center – A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-2232, for placement of a proposed public utility or public service corporation, specifically an electric substation, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-44A, 38-45, 38-45H, 38-45I, 38-45L, 38-73, 38-74A, and 38-96 (Property), located along the west side of Richmond Highway and approximately 2,500 feet north of the intersection with Eskimo Hill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: June 21, 2026) (History - Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

11. CUP25156540; Conditional Use Permit – Accokeek Center – A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a public utility, specifically an electrical substation, in the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. Tax Map Parcel Nos. 38-44A, 38-45, 38-45H, 38-45I, 38-45L, 38-73, 38-74A, and 38-96 (Property). The Property consists of approximately 120.88 acres, located along the west side of Richmond Highway and approximately 2,500 feet north of the intersection with Eskimo Hill Road, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: July 31, 2026) (History - Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

12. Planning and Zoning; Consider a Waiver of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding Lot Frontage, Dedication of Streets, and Adoption of State Highway Department Standards for a Minor Subdivision on Tax Map Parcel No. 56-59D (Project known as WAI25156311; Tough Builders Division Waiver)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-23 (Approve)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution Pcr26-24 (Deny)
(Time Limit: July 12, 2026)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Approves Waiver.

Mr. Zuraf stated that Mr. Dixon would present Item 12.

Mr. Dixon stated that he was presenting item 12, the Tough Builders Division Waiver for a private access easement. He said this waiver request concerned Section 22-144A for lot frontage, Section 22-179 for dedication of streets, and Section 22-186 for adoption of VDOT standards. He said that the property is located on Tax Map 56-59D, contains approximately 19.85 acres, and is located in the George Washington District. He stated that the applicant is Roger K. Bohr of Bohr Design LLC, and the owners are Hector and Annabelle Vasquez. He said the applicant and owner were unable to attend the meeting, and he would answer questions at the end of the presentation.

Mr. Dixon reported that the existing parcel is located just south of Belle Plains Road on the east side of Newton Road and west of Sandy Ridge Road. Mr. Dixon stated that the house shown on the parcel will remain. He said that all land to the west of the property is zoned A-2 and that the current property and all land to the east are zoned A-1.

Mr. Dixon stated that the slide showed the proposed plat for the minor subdivision and said that the property is flipped on the plat, with north located at the bottom of the screen. He stated that the two red lines show the new property lines that would create Lot 1 and Lot 2. He said that the yellow line shows the proposed 50-foot access easement for the new lots and that the orange highlight identifies Dobson Lane, the existing 20-foot easement that would provide access to the two new lots.

Mr. Dixon stated that Tax Map 56-59D is approximately 2,110 feet from the nearest state-maintained road, or about 0.48 miles. He said that Section 22-144A requires lots to face an existing state-maintained street, except in a family subdivision, and stated that Lots 1 and 2 would front on a street that does not meet those state highway standards. Mr. Dixon stated that Section 22-179 requires streets to be dedicated to public use on the final plat unless otherwise specified. He said that the waiver request would allow

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

the private street serving the new lots on the east side of the property to remain private rather than being dedicated for public use. He stated that Section 22-186 adopts VDOT standards for minor subdivisions and related street requirements.

Mr. Dixon stated that the waiver would allow the lots shown on the plat to be served by a private street instead of meeting full VDOT standards. He said that the applicant formally requested that the Planning Commission consider waivers from County Code Sections 22-144A, 22-179, and 22-186.

Mr. Dixon stated that in the applicant's request letter, Mr. Bohr states that the minimum requirements would impose an unreasonable burden on the subdivider, and granting the waivers would have no substantial adverse effect on future residents of the proposed subdivision or adjoining property owners; the property owners along the private roads already contribute to road maintenance. Mr. Dixon stated that two additional lot owners would also become responsible under the existing maintenance agreement for owners off Dodson Lane. He said that Section 22-241, Authority to Grant, specifies the following: where permitted, one or more of the minimum requirements established under this chapter may be waived by the Planning Commission on 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; the granting of such a waiver would have no substantial adverse effect on the future residents of the proposed subdivision, nor upon any property adjoining in such.

Ms. Siegmund asked whether the applicant had specified the nature of the unreasonable burden and whether it was fiscal or access related.

Mr. Dixon responded that the burden is access related because bringing the street up to VDOT standards would be difficult given that the property is more than 2,000 feet from the nearest state-maintained road.

Ms. Barnes stated that the purported unreasonable burden appeared to be that the applicant wanted to build three houses but can only build two.

Mr. Dixon stated that this was correct, and the existing house would remain while two additional lots would be created.

Ms. Barnes stated that she viewed the unreasonable burden as the applicant's desire to have one more house than he can have as it currently stands—he can only build one more house; he can't build two more houses. She said he wants to subdivide it and make it into three separate lots; as of right now, he really can't do that, he can only subdivide it and make two lots.

Mr. Dixon stated that the applicant has the acreage for the two lots.

Ms. Barnes said he doesn't have the frontage to do that, but he can subdivide it and build the extra house without any action, because it would be a private access easement. She asked whether the applicant could build anything further on the property without the waivers.

Mr. Zuraf stated that the private access easement was off a public street, so even one additional lot would require these waivers.

Ms. Barnes stated that she was confirming that nothing else could be built on the property as it currently stands.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026***

Staff confirmed that this was correct.

Ms. Caudill asked whether the applicant had ever been told to contact the Planning Commissioner for that district.

Mr. Dixon stated that he did not believe so, and the project had been underway for some time. He said that he would need to review emails to determine what had been recommended.

Ms. Caudill stated that during her three years on the Commission, she had usually received communication from both staff and the applicant on matters in her district and that the applicant was typically present.

EXTENSION OF MEETING

Ms. Barnes stated that the Commission needed a motion to continue the meeting past 10:00 PM.

Ms. Caudill moved to allow continuation of the meeting past 10:00 PM.

Ms. Siegmund seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Caudill stated that in her experience, applicants usually reached out directly to the Planning Commissioner for their district, and she had not heard from this applicant.

Mr. Dixon stated that he would need to check the record and could reach out to the applicant to verify whether he had attempted contact.

Ms. Caudill asked if they had to do a public hearing on this.

Ms. Barnes confirmed that they did not.

Ms. Caudill moved to defer the matter so that she could speak with the applicant when they come back to the Commission.

Mr. Zuraf stated that because the matter was not a public hearing, it could be deferred to the next meeting.

Ms. Caudill agreed to defer to the next meeting if the agenda was not already too full.

Ms. Barnes clarified that the deferral would be to the next meeting on May 27.

Ms. Caudill stated that she wanted staff to ask the applicant to speak with her if possible before the next meeting.

Mr. Shelton seconded the motion, which passed 4-2 (Mr. Oats and Ms. Siegmund opposed).

13. *Planning and Zoning; Consider a request to grant a time limit extension for a Zoning Reclassification and Proffer Amendment Application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, "Review and requirements," for a project known as Stafford Technology Campus
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-31 (Approval)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-32 (Denial)*

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026***

BACKGROUND SUMMARY: *Approves time limit extension.*

Moved to before Public Hearing item number 1 for discussion.

14. Planning and Zoning; Consider a request to grant time limit extensions for action on multiple Conditional Use Permit Applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-185, "ConditionaL use permits," for Greenlaw Solar and Greenlaw BESS
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-29 (Approval)
Proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR26-30 (Denial)
BACKGROUND SUMMARY: Approves time limit extensions.

Ms. Emilie Wolfson stated that this matter was another time extension, and the request was to extend the applicable 12-month timeframe for pending conditional use permit applications known as Greenlaw Solar, CUP2515629, and Greenlaw BESS, CUP25156270. She stated that one conditional use permit is for a specific solar generator solar energy facility within the A-1, Agricultural zoning district, and the other is for a battery energy storage facility within the Agricultural zoning district on a portion of Tax Map Parcel 58-42. She said that both applications were originally filed and deemed complete on April 25 of last year and stated that the request for an extension was received prior to April 25 of this year. She stated that the applicant was requesting a time extension to October 25 for both projects.

Mr. Shelton asked if BESS was lithium ion energy storage.

Ms. Wolfson stated that she did not know whether it was lithium-ion, but such systems are typically lithium-ion.

Ms. Caudill moved to recommend approval of PCR26-29 to grant a time-limit extension.

Ms. Siegmund seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

15. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf stated that the regular project pipeline report had been updated, and the Commission would see the cases in the queue for the next few meetings.

16. Board of Supervisors Resolution R26-159, referring to the Planning Commission specific amendments to the Comprehensive Plan concerning the process and routing of transmission lines throughout the county
(Time Limit: June 27, 2026)
(Authorize For Public Hearing By: May 27, 2026)
(Potential Public Hearing Date: June 24, 2026)

Mr. Zuraf reported that this is a referral from the Board of Supervisors concerning amendments to the comprehensive plan related to the process and routing of power lines through the county. He stated that this resolution included specific language, and there were two series of policies: one providing general guidelines for the siting and placement of high-voltage electric transmission lines, and how it would apply based on land uses that might be affected by the lines; and one specifically addressing the North

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026

Anna to Bristers high-voltage transmission line project with recommendations for how it should be routed through the county.

Mr. Zuraf said that this was a referral from the Board in which the Commission would need to hold a hearing and provide an up-or-down vote. He stated that there was a 60-day time limit for comp plan amendments referred to the Commission, and that would be June 27. He suggested that the Commission initiate a public hearing for June 10, the first available meeting date, at which staff would bring forward a background report.

Mr. Shelton moved to set a public hearing on June 10 for the comprehensive plan amendment.

Ms. Caudill seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

There was no report.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

17. Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update Subcommittee
Next Meeting – Thursday, May 21, 2026 @ 5:30 PM, ABC Conference Room

Ms. Caudill reported that the subcommittee met on April 30 at 5:30 PM and reviewed Chapter 4 with Matthew Lehane. She said that it was a very good session with many questions, staff was present to help, and that all Planning Commissioners except one attended along with members of the public. She stated that the next meeting would be May 21 at 5:30 PM in the ABC Conference Room and said that Chapter 6 and possibly Chapter 7 would be reviewed.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ms. Barnes thanked everyone tonight for their professionalism, which was a great example of them voting differently and discussing issues in a professional manner. She also thanked staff, particularly Mr. Zuraf, adding that she is glad to see this project going forward, regardless of how she voted.

OTHER BUSINESS

18. New TRC Submissions
- [26157101](#) – CENTRAL STAFFORD COMM CTR GDC STORAGE YARD
 - A major grading plan for an outdoor contractor storage yard located on the east side of Kelvic Way, between Big Spring Lane and McKittrick Drive, on TM # 38-102A, zoned M-1, consisting of 5 acres, within the Falmouth Election District.

Ms. Barnes said there were new TRC submissions including Central Stafford Community Center and the GDC storage yard in the Falmouth District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19. February 11, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2026***

Mr. Shelton moved to approve the minutes of February 11, 2026. Mr. Oats seconded the motion, which passed 5-0-1, with Ms. Siegmund abstaining, as she was not present at the meeting.

20. February 25, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton moved to approve the minutes of February 25, 2026. Ms. Caudill seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

21. March 11, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton moved to approve the minutes of March 11, 2026. Mr. Oats seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

22. March 25, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes_DRAFT

Mr. Shelton moved to approve the minutes of February 25, 2026. Mr. Oats seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:13 PM, Chairman Barnes adjourned the May 13, 2026, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.