

1 Minutes of the Work Session of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico, Virginia, held in
2 the County Manager's Conference Room of the County Administration Building, Parham and
3 Hungary Spring Roads at 6:00 p.m. August 14, 2003.

4
5 Members Present: Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C., Chairperson, Varina
6 Mrs. Lisa D. Ware, C.P.C., Vice-Chairperson, Tuckahoe
7 Mr. Allen Taylor, P.E., C.P.C., Three Chopt
8 Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Fairfield
9 Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Brookland
10 Mr. John R. Marlles, AICP, Director of Planning, Secretary

11
12 Others Absent: Mr. Richard W. Glover, Board of Supervisors, Brookland

13
14 Others Present: Mr. Randall R. Silber – Assistant Director of Planning
15 Mr. Ralph J. Emerson, Principal Planner
16 Mr. Mark Bittner, County Planner
17 Ms. Debra Ripley, Recording Secretary
18

19 **Unless otherwise indicated, Mr. Glover abstained from voting on all zoning cases.**

20
21 Mr. Jernigan - I would like to call this meeting to order on the Scott Road Study. At this
22 time I will turn the program over to Joe Emerson. John Marlles, excuse me.

23
24 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission we had a work session on the
25 Scott Road Land Use Study. You might recall we did have a work session on this item back on May
26 28th. There were a number of questions that came up at that session and staff in the interim, I
27 believe, did send you a package that included some information to respond to those questions that
28 came up at the work session as well as some additional alternatives for you to consider. I think
29 also since that time we did the tour and presentation by Dave O'Kelly on the Office Service District.
30 For some of our newer members of the Commission maybe they have a better understanding of
31 that district and what its requirements are.

32
33 Tonight Mr. Emerson is going to update you with his presentation as well as presenting perhaps a
34 new alternative to consider. With that I'm going to turn it over to Joe and let him get started.

35
36 Mr. Emerson - Thank you, Mr. Marlles, Mr. Chairman. As you know our subject tonight is
37 the Scott Road Small Area Land Use Study.

38
39 To begin with we would like to go through a chronology for you just to refresh everybody of the
40 history of this study. The process originally began on March 28, 2002 with the submittal of
41 rezoning case C-25C-02. That was a residential rezoning request in an area targeted for economic
42 development. I'm sure all of you recall that. The case prompted the Scott Road land use study,
43 which was completed in July of 2002. It included a Recommended Land Use Plan for the study
44 area. The primary concept of this Recommended Plan is to enhance this area's viability as an
45 economic development site.

46
47 C-25C-02 was ultimately denied, partially because of the recommendations of the Scott Road
48 Study.

49
50 A 2010 Comprehensive Land Use Plan amendment was initiated based on the Scott Road
51 Recommended Land Use Plan. On April 28, 2003 that plan was presented in a public meeting at
52 the North Park Library.

54 On May 28th of this year, the Planning Commission held a work session to consider this study, as
55 Mr. Marlles mentioned earlier, and on July 23rd received a presentation on the Office/Service zoning
56 category.

57
58 There were several issues raised on the May 28th work session that the Commission requested that
59 the staff look into: (1) was the demand for office space; (2) was a direct access from Interstate 295
60 into the study area, and (3) the primary question was the potential for more Office/Service
61 development.

62
63 In response to those questions, staff did compile considerable information that was distributed to
64 the Commission on July 15th. Based on that information we thought we would briefly go through
65 that one more time for you.

66
67 The slide you see here (referring to slide) reflects some of the information again that you received
68 in your package. You did receive a series of spreadsheets that dealt with vacant office space and
69 vacant property. The spreadsheets were not in a format that we could easily total, but as I am
70 sure you recall there is quite a bit of vacant office space in the area. The property west of I-95,
71 this slide depicts property that are zoned O-1, O-2 and O-3 (referring to slide). This GIS generated
72 information reflects 97 parcels; totaling 461 acres of undeveloped O-1, O-2 and O-3 zoned
73 properties.

74
75 The next map displays properties designated Office on the 2010 Plan west of I-95. Again, this GIS
76 generated information reflects 197 parcels totaling 572 acres.

77
78 One thing I would point out to you as you review this information, you will notice that in the
79 western end of the county the availability of large sites for new office park development is limited.

80
81 The Scott Road Study Area is one of the remaining large-site opportunities available for
82 development in the west end of the county.

83
84 The next slide shows information that staff discovered regarding potential access to 295. As you
85 know this area has been subject to previous economic development interest, primarily Capital One.
86 Access to the site via 295 has been discussed in those various venues regarding Capital One as a
87 means to maximize the economic potential of this area. It was also a concern you raised at your
88 May 28th work session. Conceptual Plans relating to the Capital One proposal were produced
89 reflecting direct access to I-295. Again, you did receive copies of those plans in your package.

90
91 The slide you see here (referring to slide) was produced by VHB Engineering Firm. The plan shows
92 ingress and egress to the site from eastbound I-295. It should be noted that access to I-295 is
93 conceptual only and to staffs knowledge has never been submitted for approval to VDOT or the
94 Federal Highway Administration. In the event that a large user was interested in the site again,
95 certainly access to 295 would be something that we need to reconsider, but at this time there exist
96 no access planned or otherwise to 295 from the site.

97
98 This slide shows some information regarding recent rezonings in the area (referring to slide). Staff,
99 as you know, from reviewing your package researched the proffers in the cases in the area. This
100 relates to the Daniel rezoning that rezoned property at Parham and St. Charles Roads to O-3C
101 Office. The site is represented by the darker area on the slide (referring to slide). The proffered
102 conditions approved for this site include the dedication of an 80' right-of-way through the property
103 that would become St. Charles Road. The green arrow (referring to slide) shows where this road
104 could be located based on the proffer requirements. The alignment proposed by the VHB
105 Engineering Firm at the May 28th work session is also shown. The proposed alignment is just

106 beyond the allowable alignment area based on the proffers from the Daniels case. To comply with
107 the proffers governing this site, it would have to be moved to the east.

108

109 In your package you received several alternatives and you see them displayed on the screen at this
110 time (referring to slide). The plans reflected a progressive series of proposals beginning with less
111 intense plans with number 1 (referring to slide) and moving to more intense land use patterns
112 through alternative 3 (referring to slide).

113

114 Giving consideration to the comments of the Commission and further examination of the alternative
115 land use plans that we forwarded to you, and internal staff discussions, staff now recommends the
116 new land use plan displayed here (referring to slide), which was also handled out to you prior to
117 beginning this discussion. The plan reflects a mix of O/S and Office along the north side of Parham
118 Road and SR1 along the south side of Parham Road. Staff feels this proposal provides a balance
119 between additional office/service development north of Parham Road and additional residential
120 development south of Parham Road. South of Parham Road the property is already zoned
121 residential and you do have a case currently submitted requesting a rezoning on that property.
122 Also, there is one parcel of A1 that would go to residential in that proposal if it's deemed
123 acceptable. This slide is to remind you briefly of the differences between Office and OS when
124 reviewing all the alternatives you need to keep those in mind.

125

126 Now, along with your map you received a matrix or chart showing you the differences between the
127 uses of the Office category and the OS category. That is a little more detailed than what I plan on
128 going through with you right now.

129

130 O-1 allows strictly office uses, such as medical offices, childcare centers, and artist studios. O-2
131 allows O-1 uses and business offices, banks, funeral homes, and laboratories. O-3 allows O-1 and
132 O-2 uses, as well as printing, publishing and engraving, radio and television broadcasting, and retail
133 and service businesses in buildings greater than 50,000 square feet.

134

135 O/S allows a greater variety of uses, while allowing similar uses as O-1, O-2, and O-3. In addition
136 to those similar uses, in O/S you are allowed data processing, warehouses, distribution centers, and
137 light manufacturing and light industrial uses. Warehousing, service, and retail uses can only
138 comprise 40% of the building's square footage in an O/S category, unless increased to 60%, for
139 example, with a PUP.

140

141 To give you an idea of the schedule that you would follow, or would be suggested by staff, in the
142 event that you find our proposal acceptable would be that the Commission would need to schedule
143 a Public Hearing. Staff is prepared to present this at your September 24th meeting, if this is
144 acceptable to the Commission. Following that hearing would be a work session with the Board of
145 Supervisors, which of course would be scheduled by the Board, along with a Public Hearing by the
146 Board of Supervisors.

147

148 With that Mr. Chairman I have nothing further to add unless you have questions and we will be
149 happy to respond.

150

151 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Emerson. Are there any questions from the panel? Are
152 there any questions from the audience? By the way I want to thank you all for being here, I
153 started a little abruptly. We were trying to get going, but I apologize, we are glad to have you with
154 us. Do any of you gentlemen have a question? We don't have any questions, Mr. Emerson. I
155 thank you, sir.

156

157 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, would the Commission like to, does the Commission concur
158 with the staffs recommendation to hold, to schedule a Public Hearing?

159
160 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, sir.
161
162 Mr. Vanarsdall - You are saying the 24th, but we already have it marked on here. When do
163 you want to have it on, what time of day, before or after? Doesn't matter to me, I just want...
164
165 Mr. Emerson - It is up to the Commission.
166
167 Mr. Jernigan - I would think after the regular hearing.
168
169 Mr. Vanarsdall - After the regular hearing.
170
171 Mr. Marlles - After the regular hearing, that is fine.
172
173 Mr. Vanarsdall - That is fine. I don't have any objections myself.
174
175 Mr. Jernigan - Ernie, do you want to make a motion?
176
177 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that we hold a Public Hearing on September 24th after the regular
178 POD meeting on the Scott Road Study.
179
180 Ms. Ware - Second.
181
182 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and a second by Ms. Ware to have
183 the Public Hearing on September 24th. All in favor say aye. Opposed. The ayes have it. The
184 motion is passed.
185
186 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Marlles, we originally had Pump Road there. Did we change that?
187
188 Mr. Sibling - No. We haven't changed that. I think Church and Pump are still
189 scheduled for the same day.
190
191 Mr. Marlles - Yes.
192
193 Mr. Emerson - That's a work session I believe.
194
195 Mr. Silber - That is the work session. This would be a public hearing on Scott Road.
196
197 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay.
198
199 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any other business to conduct? Okay, this meeting is adjourned.
200 Thank you.
201
202 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The shortest one you've ever had.
203
204
205
206

E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C., Chairman
207
208
209

John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary
210