

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico,
2 Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building, Parham and Hungary
3 Spring Roads at 7:00 p.m., May 12, 2005, Display Notice having been published in the Richmond
4 Times-Dispatch on April 21, 2005 and April 28, 2005.

5
6 Members Present: Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairperson, Brookland
7 Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Vice Chairman, Fairfield
8 Mr. Tommy Branin, Three Chopt
9 Ms. Bonnie-Leigh Jones, Tuckahoe
10 Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C., Varina
11 Mr. David A. Kaechele, Board of Supervisors, Three Chopt
12 Mr. Randall R. Silber, Director of Planning, Secretary
13

14 Others Present: Mr. Ralph J. Emerson, Assistant Director of Planning
15 Ms. Jean Moore, Principal Planner
16 Mrs. Leslie News, Principal Planner
17 Mr. James Strauss, County Planner
18 Mr. Lee Tyson, County Planner
19 Ms. Rosemary Deemer, County Planner
20 Mr. Thomas Coleman, County Planner
21 Mr. Seth Humphreys, County Planner
22 Ms. Debra Ripley, Recording Secretary
23

24 **Unless otherwise indicated, Mr. Kaechele abstained from voting on all zoning cases.**

25
26 Mr. Vanarsdall - The Planning Commission will now come to order. Good evening,
27 everyone, fellow Commissioners, staff members, Mr. Kaechele, Assistant Director Joe Emerson
28 and Randy Silber, our Director.
29

30 Good evening, everyone. I believe Ms. Meredith Bonny is over there from *The Richmond-Times*
31 *Dispatch*. We are glad to have you, Meredith. You ran everybody else off, and you've got the
32 whole section tonight. With that said, I will turn the meeting over to our Secretary, Mr. Silber.
33

34 Mr. Silber - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that. We do have all of the
35 members of the Commission present tonight, so we can conduct business. The first item on the
36 agenda would be to handle any withdrawals or deferrals that are on the agenda. I am not aware
37 of any withdrawals tonight, but there are several deferrals and, Ms. Moore, if you can walk us
38 through those I would appreciate that.
39

40 Ms. Moore - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Actually, we have two deferrals, which is
41 unlike our other agenda. These are two deferral requests by the applicant. The first is in the
42 Three Chopt District. It is on page 3 of your agenda.
43

44 **C-7C-05 Gloria Freye for Fidelity Properties, Ltd.:** Request to conditionally
45 rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-3C One Family Residence District (Conditional), R-5AC
46 General Residence District (Conditional), RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional), and
47 O-1C Office District (Conditional), Parcels 745-764-1645, 745-764-2159, 745-764-1031, 745-764-
48 6608, 745-764-7122, 745-764-7834, 746-763-2482, 746-763-2896, 746-763-1769, 746-764-
49 3818, containing 23.162 acres (R-3C - 6.187 acres; R-5AC - 6.186 acres; RTHC 8.794 acres; and
50 O-1C - 1.995 acres), located on the south line of Dublin Road between Belfast and Glasgow
51 Roads, and along the east line of Glasgow Road to its intersection with Dublin Road (McDonald's
52 Small Farms). The applicant proposes a residential and office development with density in the R-
53 3C District not to exceed 2.2 dwelling units per acre; a maximum density of 4.36 units per acre in

54 the R-5AC District; and a maximum density of 6 units per acre in the RTHC District. The R-3
55 District allows a minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet, an equivalent of 3.96 units per acre; the
56 R-5A District allows a minimum lot size of 5,625 square feet, an equivalent of 7.74 units per acre;
57 and the maximum density allowed in the RTH District is nine (9) units per acre. The office use
58 will be controlled by proffered conditions and zoning ordinance regulations. The Land Use Plan
59 recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre.

60
61 Ms. Moore - This deferral is requested to the June 9, 2005 meeting.

62
63 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferment of C-7C-05 in the
64 Three Chopt District? No opposition.

65
66 Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve deferral of C-7C-05 to the June 9,
67 2005 meeting.

68
69 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chair.

70
71 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say
72 aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

73
74 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-7C-05, Gloria Freye for
75 Fidelity Properties, Ltd., to its meeting on June 9, 2005.

76
77 Ms. Moore - The second item is a companion case. It is on page 4 of your agenda.

78
79 **C-8C-05 Gloria Freye for Fidelity Properties, Ltd.:** Request to conditionally
80 rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to RTHC (0.701 acre) Residential Townhouse District
81 (Conditional) and O-1C (3.839 acres) Office District (Conditional), Parcel 746-764-5580,
82 containing 4.54 acres, located on the west line of Sadler Road approximately 290 feet south of
83 Wonder Lane. The applicant proposes a townhouse development not to exceed six (6) units per
84 acre and office. The maximum density allowed in the RTH District is nine (9) units per acre. The
85 uses will be controlled by proffered conditions and zoning ordinance regulations. The Land Use
86 Plan recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre.

87
88 Ms. Moore - The deferral is requested to the June 9, 2005 meeting.

89
90 Mr. Vanarsdall - This is sort of a companion case, isn't it?

91
92 Ms. Moore - Yes, sir.

93
94 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral of Case C-8C-05
95 in the Three Chopt District? No opposition. Mr. Branin.

96
97 Mr. Branin - I recommend that Case C-8C-05 be deferred to the June 9, 2005
98 meeting at the applicant's request.

99
100 Mr. Archer - Second.

101
102 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor say
103 aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is passed.

104
105 At the applicant's request, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-8C-05, Gloria Freye for
106 Fidelity Properties, Ltd., to its meeting on June 9, 2005.

107
108 Ms. Moore - That concludes the requests from applicants unless there are any others
109 from the Commission.

110
111 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, ma'am. I have one. Mr. Chairman, it is on page 2, Case C-18C-05.

112
113 **C-18C-05 James Theobald for Attack Properties, Inc.:** Request to conditionally
114 rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-2AC One Family Residence District (Conditional) and B-
115 2C Business District (Conditional), Parcels 833-686-7681, 830-681-3665, 829-681-6852, 832-688-
116 9219 and 833-682-5297, containing approximately 597.8 acres (R-2AC – 569.6 ac.; B-2C – 28.2
117 ac.), located along the north line of New Market (State Route 5) and Long Bridge Roads between
118 the east line of Turner Road and the west line of Yahley Mill Road. The applicant proposes a
119 single family residential subdivision with a maximum density of 1.2 lots per acre on the proposed
120 R-2AC portion of the site and neighborhood retail on the proposed B-2C acreage. The R-2A
121 District allows a minimum lot size of 13,500 square feet, an equivalent of 3.23 units per acre.
122 The uses will be controlled by proffered conditions and zoning ordinance regulations. The Land
123 Use Plan recommends Prime Agriculture and Environmental Protection Area. The site is in the
124 Airport Safety Overlay District.

125
126 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferment of Case C-18C-
127 05? No opposition.

128
129 Mr. Jernigan - With that Mr. Chairman I would like to move deferral of Case C-18C-05,
130 Attack Properties, to June 9, 2005, by request of the Commission.

131
132 Mr. Archer - Second.

133
134 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor
135 say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

136
137 The Planning Commission deferred Case C-18C-05, James Theobald for Attack Properties, Inc., to
138 its meeting on June 9, 2005.

139
140 Mr. Vanarsdall - Does anybody else have a deferral?

141
142 Mr. Silber - If there are no other deferrals, we will move on to the first item on the
143 agenda.

144
145 **LANDSCAPE PLAN (Deferred from the April 27, 2005, Meeting)**

146
LP/POD-84-04 **McKinney & Company for Highwoods Properties LLC:** Request
Highwoods Plaza – for approval of a phase one landscape plan, as required by Chapter
Phase One 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The
1.0-acre site is located at the southwest corner of Cox Road and
Sadler Place on parcels 750-766-3162, 750-765-0494 and 749-765-
7952. The zoning is UMUC (Urban Mixed Use) District (Conditional).
(Three Chopt)

147
148 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any opposition to Highwoods Plaza – Phase One? Good evening, Mr.
149 Strauss.

150
151 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Commission may recall that
152 the Highwoods Plaza project was rezoned to the UMU District last March and as part of that

153 rezoning, the applicant proffered to submit a supplemental landscape plan for the existing buffer
154 along the western property line adjacent to the Saddlebrook and Cedars neighborhoods. You will
155 see from the aerial photo, that buffer is only a Phase 1 buffer and runs parallel to Highwoods
156 Parkway, which is a private road serving the development. The applicant submitted the
157 landscape plan as required by the proffer and subsequently a meeting was held with the
158 neighborhood to discuss supplemental plantings in the existing buffer. What staff heard at that
159 meeting was the neighborhood wanted more Leyland Cyprus and more plants in certain areas,
160 and the applicant has complied by submitting a revised plan, which Leslie just handed out. By
161 my count, that revised plan added some 37 Leyland Cyprus trees as well as additional evergreen
162 shrubs. At this point, some of the neighbors still have concerns. We have several neighbors
163 here tonight. They are not in opposition, but they would like to make a statement. We do have
164 a consensus, however, that it is best to go forward with this Phase 1 buffer plan and get the
165 planting installed. The proffer requires that they install them as soon as possible this planting
166 season. It is worth noting the applicant will be filing a revised POD to implement the Phase 2
167 portion of the UMU project. You will have another opportunity to look at the landscaping in the
168 future as part of that project as the project develops further. So, it is our current understanding
169 that the engineering plans, as soon as they are filed, will not impact this existing buffer and the
170 proffer does require that this additional planting be installed as soon as possible after the
171 Commission approves this plan. With that, I will be happy to answer any additional questions
172 you have, and we have Mr. Stacey Burcin here tonight from McKinney Company, as well.

173
174 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions of Mr. Strauss by Commission members?

175
176 Mr. Kaechele - You indicated there was a meeting of the representatives of the
177 neighborhood?

178
179 Mr. Strauss - Yes, sir. That meeting took place I think it was April 13, and we had a
180 meeting out at the site, and walked the site with the neighbors. Stacy was there and the
181 Highwoods folks were there and several of the neighbors were there.

182
183 Mr. Kaechele - And that plan was revised?

184
185 Mr. Strauss - That plan was revised after that and resubmitted.

186
187 Mr. Kaechele - And you intend to do some planting right away in the Spring?

188
189 Mr. Strauss - Yes, that is what the proffer requires that the applicant do.

190
191 Mr. Jernigan - Jim, did you say you say you added 37 Leyland Cyprus over the original
192 plan?

193
194 Mr. Strauss - Some shrubs were switched out to some trees, that the neighbors were
195 not familiar with. We have a total of some additional 37 Leylands. I would like to add that after
196 talking to some of the neighbors in the lobby tonight, the eastern portion of the property right
197 here, the neighbors are thinking about having us not use all Leylands near the Walters lot and
198 having a mix of Cryptomeria and other evergreens in addition to Leylands. They don't want to
199 use all Leylands, that is why. So, I'd just like to add that and Stacy is in agreement with that,
200 and we are going to add one more Cryptomeria in that location as well.

201
202 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right Thank you. I guess we had better hear from the opposition. Do
203 we have more than one person who wants to speak tonight in opposition? OK.

204

205 Mr. Burcin - Noting that this Commission has a busy agenda tonight and that there is
206 no opposition, I will just be here to answer any questions you would have.

207
208 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good enough. Thank you, Stacy. All right. Come on down, sir.

209
210 Mr. Blankinship - Good evening. My name is Terry Blankinship. I live at 4508 Cedar Forest
211 Road. I am authorized to represent both of these, Cedars Homeowners Association and
212 Saddlebrook Homeowners Association, which are the two neighborhoods that directly adjoin this
213 particular project. We have met with the developer and the County. We have offered input. We
214 have offered suggestions. The developer has responded to it. The reason that we come up and
215 offer some type of caution to it is the fact that the construction plans haven't been filed yet.
216 Some of the neighbors are concerned about where the roadways will come out, where the lights
217 are going to shine in the houses. We are not sure whether the buffer is going to be thick
218 enough, depending on the grade, so we are going to hold reservations as far as our final
219 endorsement of the project, but those reservations are not enough to defer or to debate or to
220 hold up this particular project. The neighbors have discussed it. We agree this is a very good
221 initial start and they have responded well. They have increased their planting, but we still have
222 several issues that need to be resolved, which we are discussing with the neighborhood. There
223 is a 15 foot buffer on the other side of the fence, which belongs to Highwood Properties where
224 no trees are going in, so we still have to resolve that. We still have to take a look to make sure
225 that the lighting is adequate and that no spots come up that may need to be covered with
226 landscaping once the lighting is submitted, so for tonight's purposes, I would recommend that we
227 approve this project with the condition that we will get another pass at this one when the final
228 construction phase and final landscape plan is put together.

229
230 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anybody else? All right. Mr. Branin.

231
232 Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of LP/POD-84-04, Highwoods Plaza,
233 Phase 1, with the annotations on the plans recommended by the staff.

234
235 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

236
237 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor
238 say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

239
240 The Planning Commission approved LP/POD-84-04, Highwoods Plaza, Phase 1, subject to the
241 annotations on the plans.

242
243 **VARINA:**
244 **P-4-05 Burrell Saunders for Jason Vickers-Smith:** Request for a Provisional
245 Use Permit under Sections 24-32(dd)(2)(e), 24-32.1(u), 24-34(d), 24-34.1(b)(2), and 24-122.1 of
246 Chapter 24 of the County Code in order to increase the building height limitations in Land Bay 4B
247 of the proposed Rocketts Landing Urban Mixed Use District, on Parcels 797-713-5542 and 797-
248 713-4210, containing approximately 9.98 acres, located between Old Osborne Turnpike on the
249 east, the James River on the west, and the city/county boundary on the north. The existing
250 zoning is UMUC Urban Mixed Use (Conditional). The Land Use Plan recommends Urban Mixed
251 Use.

252
253 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to P-4-05, Burrell Sanders for
254 Jason Vickers-Smith, Rocketts Landing? No opposition.

255

256 Mr. Tyson - Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kaechele, Mr. Secretary and members of
257 the Commission

258

259 The subject property is located on New Market Road (Route 5), in an area zoned for Urban Mixed
260 Use. The applicant has submitted this Provisional Use Permit to increase the permitted height of
261 buildings on the site to 100', except for townhouses, which would have a height limit of 50'.

262

263 The Land Use Plan recommends Urban Mixed Use for the site. The proposed uses are consistent
264 with the designations of the Land Use Plan, and the uses are permitted by right on the property,
265 but are subject to a height limitation of 60' for principal structures, except for townhouses, which
266 have a height limitation of 35'.

267

268 The applicant has submitted a view-shed analysis and diagram outlining exactly what buildings
269 will be covered by this provisional use permit. The new condominium buildings, which are 13A
270 and 15E, have a proposed height of 92 feet each. Structure 12B, which is a parking structure
271 and 12C, which is a new apartment building, have proposed heights of 62 feet each. Buildings
272 13B, C, D, 14B, C, E and F, and 15 A, B and C are all townhouse buildings and all located to the
273 interior of the site. They have a proposed height of between 36 and 47 feet respectively.
274 Buildings near Route 5 may still have a somewhat restricted view; however, the shorter buildings
275 must be adjacent to Route 5 in order to maintain the pedestrian scale and historical context of
276 their original use.

277

278 The Division of Fire has expressed a concern about their ability to provide adequate fire
279 protection to the high-rise buildings given their current configuration and equipment. Staff
280 encourages the applicant and the Division of Fire to continue those discussions and staff
281 recommends that the Planning Commission forward application P-04-05 to the Board of
282 Supervisors with a recommendation for approval.

283

284 This concludes my presentation, I would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

285

286 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Tyson? Thank you. Is the applicant here?

287

288 Mr. Axselle - Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, my name is Bill
289 Axselle. I am here on behalf of Rocket's Landing. Only one or two short thoughts to supplement
290 the staff report and the report by Mr. Tyson. As you know, this is a fairly well planned and
291 designed concept, and a lot of attention has been given by the developer and also by the staff
292 for the location and the placement of the buildings and the height of the building, to both
293 accommodate the Route 5 side of river, the river side, and, of course, to allow the view sheds to
294 the river to the maximum extent possible, and so we hope that you would approve this. I can go
295 through the details, but I think they have been worked through with the staff in that respect. I
296 will be glad to respond to any questions you may have.

297

298 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Axselle, I had one question, and Mr. Tyson would like to know, also.
299 We didn't have a topo from the side that shows the grade of the land going down. How far, if
300 this building is going to be 92 feet, do you know how far above Route 5 it would sit?

301

302 Mr. Axselle - This is a non-topo and non-engineering answer, but from looking at the
303 property, I don't think, from Route 5 to the bank is almost level. So, it would be 92 feet above
304 Route 5, I believe. In other words, the property is very level at this place, and then it goes down
305 to a bank to another bank and this development will not be down on that bank.

306

307 Mr. Jernigan - This is on the first level before it takes a drop?

308

309 Mr. Axselle - Yes, sir.
310
311 Mr. Jernigan - The only other thing I had and I discussed with you earlier was my
312 concerns that I had spoken to the Fire Division myself and told you that I felt that I know that
313 condominiums would be sprinkled because of the height, anything over four stories has to be
314 sprinkled, and I told you I felt that we needed to sprinkle the townhomes, too, so I appreciate
315 the fact, and I am reading this condition that was put in here for this, that any townhouse that
316 exceeds 35 feet in height will be constructed with fire protection sprinkler systems acceptable to
317 Henrico County Division of Fire.
318
319 Mr. Axselle - We have no problem with that because of the density and the proximity
320 of the buildings to each other. We think that is appropriate, so we have no problem with that,
321 and the taller buildings would have to be by Code, already sprinkled, and the taller buildings are
322 of non-combustible materials, too.
323
324 Mr. Vanarsdall - Bill, let me ask you a question. Does the Division of Fire feel better
325 about it now that you have worked everything out?
326
327 Mr. Axselle - Feeling better, yes. Not completely worked out. I think they have two
328 remaining concerns, one is there is an agreement in concept that we will need to assist them in
329 locating a fire station in some close proximity to Rockets Landing. I think they have recognized
330 that it does not need to be in Rockets Landing, but it should be where it can serve it fairly closely
331 and from the trip we took to Northern Virginia, they are looking at where it might be, and we will
332 be working with them in that respect. The second feature is the one that is referenced in the
333 staff report, and that is getting to and having access to the buildings with their equipment, and
334 so forth, and we recognize that this is something that is fairly new to the Fire Department and
335 Henrico County. We don't have many residential buildings with this height and that has to be
336 addressed with them, and so they have been in discussions and that will be addressed more in
337 the POD stage.
338
339 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't have any idea that they won't work it out.
340
341 Mr. Axselle - Thank you.
342
343 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I asked the Division of Fire today and on the response call
344 the fire truck will have to come from Strath Road or either Darbytown. That is the closest in
345 Henrico. Darbytown and Strath.
346
347 Mr. Vanarsdall - Seems pretty far.
348
349 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, that is one reason that I – even when we discussed on the bus with
350 Fire at that time and with the developer about sprinkling, pretty much everything around there.
351
352 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.
353
354 Mr. Jernigan - With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move for approval of Case P-4-
355 05, Burrell Saunders for Jason Vickers-Smith for Rockets Landing, LLC, Phase 1, and that it be
356 sent to the Board for approval with addition of condition No. 1.
357
358 Mr. Archer - Second.
359
360 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor
361 say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is passed.

362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412

REASON: Acting on a motion by Mr. Jernigan, seconded by Mr. Archer, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request because is it reasonable in light of the surrounding uses and existing zoning on the property, and when properly developed and regulated by the recommended special condition, it would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, welfare and values in the area.

Mr. Silber - The next case is in the Brookland District. This case was deferred from the April 14, 2005 meeting.

Deferred from the April 14, 2005 Meeting:

C-61C-04 Dominion Land & Development Partnership: Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-5AC General Residence District (Conditional), Parcels 759-767-5161, 759-767-2638, 759-767-6934, 759-767-6516 and 758-767-8413, containing approximately 14.2 acres, located on the west line of Francistown Road at Castle Point Road. The applicant proffers to develop no more than thirty-three (33) single-family units, an equivalent density of 2.32 units per acre. The R-5A District allows a minimum lot size of 5,625 square feet, an equivalent of 7.74 units per acre. The Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre, and Environmental Protection Area.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? No opposition.

Mr. Humphreys - Thank you Mr. Secretary. Good evening Commissioners.

The applicant recently revised their request for this property from their original request for R-3C. The revised request for R-5AC would combine five parcels with a total of 14.2 acres to develop a detached single-family residential neighborhood. The development would allow a maximum of 33 units, which is an equivalent density of 2.3 units per acre. The property is slightly irregular in shape, and has a considerable amount of potential wetlands. The R-5AC zoning category will allow more flexibility in the lot layout to help preserve the wetlands.

The 2010 Land Use Plan recommends this property for Suburban Residential 1 and Environmental Protection area. The request is consistent with both of these designations.

The applicant has submitted revised proffers dated May 12, 2005, which have just been handed out to you. The time limits for these proffers would have to be waived if you recommend approval. These proffers offer assurances of quality development including a Conceptual Plan for the property. This Conceptual Plan shown here on the screen (referring to rendering) differs from the one you received with the staff report, in that it does not include portions of the adjacent school property the applicant is still attempting to acquire, but has not done so at this time.

Major additions to the proffers from those in the reports include:

- A minimum lot width of 80 feet for 80% of the lots, with no lot being less than 70 feet.
- A gross minimum square footage of 3,300 square feet with a minimum finished square footage of 2,700.
- All lots abutting Francistown Road would face Francistown Road and be accessed by a 20-foot access road built to County standards with the exception of width.
- A minimum front yard set back of 20 feet from the western curb line of the access road would exist for all of these lots.

- 413 • A minimum of 50% of the homes within the whole subdivision would have a minimum of
414 50% brick on the front elevation, and all homes fronting on Francistown would have
415 100% brick fronts with a 12-inch brick wrap along the sides.
416 • All homes would be constructed with a two-car side and all of those would either be rear
417 or side facing.
418 • A planting strip of 25 feet would be located along Francistown Road. A sidewalk and
419 wrought iron style fence with brick pillars would be located within the planting strip. The
420 fence would extend 25 feet into the property at either end of its Francistown Road
421 frontage.
422 • All roads within the proposed development would be dedicated as public roads with the
423 exception of the 20-foot access road along Francistown Road.
424

425 Overall, the proposed single-family development with a density of 2.3 units per acre is consistent
426 with the Land Use Plan recommendation for SR-1 and it would also be a logical extension of the
427 existing single-family development in the area. At this time, staff is willing to recommend
428 approval of this request.
429

430 This concludes my presentation. I would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.
431

432 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Humphreys?
433

434 Mr. Kaechele - Are there some lots in there that don't meet R-3 requirements? This is
435 R-5, right?
436

437 Mr. Humphreys - This is R-5A. There would be a few lots along the wetlands areas that
438 may not be to R-3 standards in terms of lot width.
439

440 Mr. Kaechele - I am curious because the area is R-5A...
441

442 Mr. Humphreys - Correct.
443

444 Mr. Silber - I think there is a proffer that says, "All lots shall be at least 70 feet
445 wide."
446

447 Mr. Vanarsdall - Seventy or eighty?
448

449 Mr. Humphreys - Eighty percent of the lots would be 80 feet wide. No lot would be less
450 than 70 feet wide, so there are a few in there where they want a little bit of flexibility to preserve
451 the wetlands.
452

453 Mr. Silber - The R-5A also gives them flexibility on the overall area of the lots and
454 setbacks for houses on the lots. Mr. Humphreys, on the lots that are fronting on Francistown
455 Road, how wide are those lots?
456

457 Mr. Humphreys - In the proffers, they have proffered an average of 80 feet for those lots.
458

459 Mr. Silber - There is a proffer that says that all houses that front on Francistown
460 Road shall have rear entry garages.
461

462 Mr. Humphreys - Correct.
463

464 Mr. Silber - I just want to make sure that it is wide enough that they can achieve
465 that.

466
467 Mr. Humphreys - I think we are seeing along the side lot lines, they have to be located by
468 the lot line, and an average of 80 feet in width. I think that will provide enough room for them
469 to have it. Actually, if they were side loaded, I would be more concerned because you would
470 need more turning radius to come into the home.
471
472 Mr. Silber - That's a good point.
473
474 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions for Mr. Humphreys? Thank you. I want to thank
475 you for the hard work you did on this.
476
477 Mr. Humphreys - Thank you.
478
479 Mr. Vanarsdall - I see Gibson there in the audience and this case has come a long ways
480 since you filed it in November. With that, I want to waive the time limits, but before I say that...
481 this is probably one of the better subdivisions on Francistown Road and all of the amenities they
482 put in here and things like side-yard sod as well as front, privacy fences, no wooden stockade,
483 3300 sq. ft. and 2700 finished. I move that the time limit be waived on C-61C-04.
484
485 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
486
487 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor
488 say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.
489
490 The Planning Commission voted to waive the time limits on Case C-61C-04, Dominion Land &
491 Development Partnership.
492
493 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that Case C-61C-04 be recommended to the Board of Supervisors
494 for approval.
495
496 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
497
498 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor
499 say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.
500
501 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Mr. Jernigan, the Planning
502 Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant**
503 the request because the proffers and requested zoning district would provide for appropriate
504 development consistent with the residential developments in the surrounding area.
505
506 **C-19C-05 James Theobald for Parker & Orleans Homebuilders, Inc:** Request to
507 conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District and R-2 One Family Residence District to R-2C
508 One Family Residence District (Conditional), Parcels 761-767-6317, 761-767-2889 and 762-767-
509 8633, containing 78.814 acres, located on the west line of Staples Mill Road (U. S. Route 33),
510 1,129 feet north of Courtney Road and Saluda Avenue. The applicant proposes a single family
511 residential subdivision with a maximum density of 1.48 units per acre. The R-2 District allows a
512 minimum lot size of 18,000 square feet, an equivalent of 2.42 units per acre. The Land Use Plan
513 recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre.
514
515 Mr. Silber - This case is in the Brookland District.
516
517 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone in opposition to this case? Thank you. Mr. Tyson.
518

519 Mr. Tyson - Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kaechele, members of the Commission, Mr. Secretary.
520 This is a request to rezone approximately 78 acres to permit construction of 98 single-family
521 dwellings. The applicant has proffered this conceptual layout of the development, which is
522 different than what is in your packets. The original application was for 117 single-family
523 dwellings on the site.

524
525 The Land Use Plan recommends SR-1, One Family Residence use for this parcel. The proposed
526 project and density of approximately 1.2 units per acre are consistent with the use recommended
527 in the 2010 Land Use Plan and

528
529 The applicant has submitted a revised proffer statement dated April 28, 2005 that has just been
530 handed to you.

531
532 The applicant is proffering:

533
534 All dwellings shall be single-family dwelling units constructed on brick or stone foundations with
535 a minimum of 2700 square feet of finished floor area. All units will have two car garages, and
536 75% of these will be either side or rear loaded. Brick or stone steps and stoops will be provided.

537
538 The applicant has proffered the conceptual layout dated April 28, 2005, which shows 98 units.
539 The revised site plan eliminates many lots that had sizeable amounts of wetlands on them, and
540 consolidates these wetland areas in common-areas.

541
542 Two points of access are shown on the concept plan, one of which aligns with the current
543 crossover opposite the Meadow Farm subdivision. The applicant has also submitted a concept
544 plan for the entrance feature.

545
546 The front and side yards will be sodded and irrigated. No fences over 72" will be permitted, and
547 all fences over 42" must be masonry or masonry and metal. No wooden stockade-style fences
548 are permitted. A street-tree plan will be provided for review, and will have a minimum of two 2.5
549 inch caliper trees per street frontage. Three foot roll-top curb and gutter will be used. Sidewalks
550 will be provided along one side of all interior streets except for the end of cul-de-sacs.

551
552 The applicant has made a good effort at providing a quality proposal and in many ways mirrors
553 the Oaks at CrossRidge development. The staff has become aware of three minor concerns, one
554 being a commitment to a prohibition on the burning of construction debris, another the
555 prohibition on the stepping down of siding, and another is a concern about the width of this one
556 single lot along Staples Mill Road. Actually, I scaled it off. The lot width combined with the
557 common area and the required setback would put building side about 85 feet from that side
558 property line of the common area. Staff believes that the use and density are consistent with the
559 2010 Land Use Plan and staff would recommend the Planning Commission send the application to
560 the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval

561
562 This concludes my presentation, I would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.
563 This case was discussed in somewhat truncated fashion at a community meeting that Mr. Glover
564 hosted, and, again, I will be glad to try to answer any questions that you might have.

565
566 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Tyson? I want to ask one. I just noticed Proffer
567 No. 10 says brick or stone steps. I thought we had in addition to brick steps we had brick
568 stoops.

569
570 Mr. Tyson - The second line of that proffer, Mr. Vanarsdall, stoops shall be brick or
571 stone.

572
573 Mr. Vanarsdall - I see so many changes on there it is hard for me to keep my eyes on the
574 ball. Thank you. I didn't think you overlooked it. All right.
575
576 Mr. Archer - I would like to comment on Proffer No. 20 dealing with hours of
577 construction. The highlighted area down there indicates signs in both English and Spanish shall
578 be posted and maintained, and you know, I think when you consider the first thing you look for,
579 you should probably explore new ways of writing more often. We should use it more often I
580 think. Think about standardizing...
581
582 Mr. Silber - Mr. Archer, we have begun to use this fairly consistently.
583
584 Mr. Archer - I didn't know it. I just saw it at this one...
585
586 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't know. This might be the first.
587
588 Mr. Silber - I think Mrs. O'Bannon asked for it in the Gaskins Centre case and we
589 have been using it fairly consistently.
590
591 Mr. Vanarsdall - I agree with Chris. I think it is an excellent idea. I wish I had thought of
592 it. Since we have some opposition, Mr. Theobald, we will need to hear from you.
593
594 Mr. Silber - As Mr. Theobald comes forward, since there is opposition, let me remind
595 those here this evening of the Planning Commission rules and regulations, so that we can move
596 the meeting along, but we do have a policy that allows the applicant to take 10 minutes to
597 present his/her case, some of which time he can reserve for rebuttal. Likewise, anyone in
598 opposition in each case has 10 minutes in their argument or their opposition, collectively 10
599 minutes in all for those in opposition. Keep that in mind as you come forward. We will be
600 keeping an eye on the time. The Planning Commission does have the right to preset the
601 allotment of time if they feel the need to do that, and if the Planning Commission is asking
602 anyone questions, that will not be taken away from your rebuttal time. Thank you.
603
604 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good evening, Mr. Theobald.
605
606 Mr. Theobald - Good evening, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.
607
608 Mr. Silber - Mr. Theobald, would you like to save some time for rebuttal?
609
610 Mr. Theobald - Two minutes, please. Thank you. My name is Jim Theobald and I am
611 here this evening on behalf of Parker & Orleans Homebuilders, Inc. This is a request to rezone
612 approximately 78 acres of land. We are asking permission to rezone 14 acres from A-1 to R-2
613 and 64 acres from R-2 to R-2C, so that 64 acres is already zoned R-2, without any proffered
614 conditions whatsoever.
615
616 This property is adjacent to the Oaks and Doubletree Subdivision, and at 1.24 units per acre, we
617 are well within the County's Land Use Plan designation, suggesting that up to 2.4 units per acre
618 would be appropriate. There are two critically important points to be made with this rezoning
619 request. No. 1, we are merely adding quality guarantees where none presently exist on this 64
620 acres of unconditional R-2, and secondly, we have committed not to punch through the stub
621 streets that currently exist on the subdivision behind us, accessing this development solely from
622 Staples Mill Road. You have heard the summary of proffered conditions. I won't repeat that. I
623 believe that this request is consistent with the County's Land Use Plan, it was patterned after the
624

624 2003 zoning and in some instances exceeds the criteria set forth in the 2003 zoning and meets or
625 exceeds surrounding area development. Mr. Glover did hold a community meeting, notifying all
626 residents. We notified all residents by letter when this case was filed. The County, obviously,
627 when they sent out the notices for a public hearing, and then again, Mr. Glover sent out notices
628 to those adjacent neighbors and a considerable number of additional residents. We held a
629 community meeting and had a good attendance at that meeting where the case was explained.
630 I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

631

632 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Theobald? All right. Thank you.

633

634 Mr. Theobald - Thank you.

635

636 Mr. Keller - Good evening, my name is David Keller. I live at 5301 Singletree Court
637 in the Doubletree Subdivision bordering the proposal. My comments will be very brief. I am
638 here representing the Doubletree Subdivision Homeowners Association. I am here with a couple
639 of my neighbors. We do not oppose the subdivision as a whole, but we have a couple of
640 concerns we'd like to throw out. We have two main concerns, one which was just addressed,
641 that the stub streets would not be connected with the new neighborhood. I would just ask that
642 that condition remain in effect. The other main concern that we had has to do with the natural
643 buffer that separates the two communities. We do have 75 acres of natural woods behind us
644 that, the majority of which is going to be going away, and it is difficult to get the laymen to read
645 the map and see how much natural buffer is intended to be left, separating the community, and I
646 would ask that they would try to leave a buffer between the two communities, just a natural. We
647 feel like both communities would benefit from a minimum of privacy of natural buffer left
648 between them. Those are our main concerns and I appreciate your time.

649

650 Mr. Vanarsdall - David, were you at the meeting?

651

652 Mr. Keller - No, sir. I did not get that notice.

653

654 Mr. Vanarsdall - You didn't get the notice? OK. We had quite a few people and I think
655 that your neighborhood is the same zoning as this neighborhood, and it doesn't have to be any
656 kind of buffer between you at all unless the applicant wants to do it, so I will let Mr. Theobald
657 talk to you about that. We appreciate your input. Thank you.

658

659 Anyone else? Come on down to the microphone so we can pick you up, and give us your name
660 and address.

661

662 Mr. Eric Umstead - My apologies. I am not accustomed to this. My name is Eric Umstead. I
663 live at 5313 Singletree Court and I also have some concerns about the wetlands area bordering
664 the property. There is a significant amount of water that flows into many of the properties in the
665 Singletree Subdivision that borders the wetland areas, and a lot of the rain water and water from
666 the area comes from the proposed subdivision, and I'm concerned about grading in the
667 subdivision and how that water could affect the existing wetlands area that border the
668 Doubletree Subdivision and the properties that are already there. If any additional rainwater,
669 any runoff from that property will affect those wetland areas, and affect the yards that are
670 currently drenched by those wetland areas.

671

672 Mr. Silber - I can answer that question or provide you with some information on
673 that. Obviously, anytime property is developed, a concern is additional run off. Your point is
674 well taken. As this property is engineered for a subdivision, it will be appropriate for the
675 developer to accommodate any storm water runoff on impervious roads, etc., and we will be
676 handling the storm drainage system and divert it away from your subdivision. So, you should not

677 have any additional run off than what you have now, and in fact, you will probably have less run
678 off, as water is collected and diverted underground. The engineers will make sure that you don't
679 have any more water running on your property than you have right now.

680

681 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. Mr. Theobald, do you want to address those two questions
682 for him?

683

684 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir. With regard to the wetlands, I think Mr. Silber has adequately
685 addressed that. I would just note that we are not able to disturb those wetlands, obviously, and
686 it is my understanding that the water that drains, actually out of that subdivision, feeds those
687 wetlands and in some instances may actually goes to Staples Mill Road, if I am not mistaken. So,
688 if there is some softness on the other side of the property line, there may be wetlands over there
689 as well. I am just not aware of it, but Mr. Silber is correct. We cannot put any more water over
690 there. In fact, typically, you approve the drainage situation when you bring in a new subdivision,
691 but those wetlands will remain protected in that area. With regard to a buffer, that was a
692 discussion that Mr. Glover had at some length at the community meeting, Mr. Vanarsdall. I think
693 reminding those attending that in Henrico County we don't really buffer residential single-family
694 detached residential and that the option was there for folks on both sides of the line to preserve
695 or plant those trees that they might deem necessary. It is the same zoning classification. The R-
696 2 classification does provide for 45 ft. rear yard setback depending upon how the lot orients on
697 the other side of the line. It would be a minimum of 90 feet of separation between dwellings, so
698 there is not a formal buffer plan. Again, it is likely possible that the folks might choose to plant
699 some things back there for their mutual benefit, so that was discussed at some point at that
700 meeting.

701

702 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Thank you, Mr. Theobald.

703

704 Mr. Silber - Mr. Vanarsdall, if I could just add to that from the County's perspective
705 on the buffering between single-family and single-family. The County's Ordinances deal with
706 buffering between incompatible uses or differing uses, and in this case it is a single-family
707 subdivision backing up to a single-family subdivision. As Mr. Theobald indicated, in these
708 particular cases, the Ordinances don't provide for required buffering. In fact, we believe it
709 imposes an imposition on someone who may have to preserve trees in their back yard and on the
710 other side of the fence, preservation trees are not necessary. The County looks out for differing
711 land uses and certain protection through buffers and screening, but when it is single-family
712 backing up to single-family; we believe that is another situation.

713

714 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Silber. I have a couple of questions to ask you, Mr.
715 Theobald before I make a motion.

716

717 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir.

718

719 Mr. Vanarsdall - On No. 20, would you do these things between now and the Board time,
720 so we won't have to defer this or hold it up?

721

722 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir. We are going to...

723

724 Mr. Vanarsdall - On No. 20, would you add, "no burning?"

725

726 Mr. Theobald - Yes, we will add, "no burning."

727

728 Mr. Vanarsdall - And the other thing was...

729

730 Mr. Theobald - There is no step-down foundation language.
731
732 Mr. Vanarsdall - Entrance feature, although it is the same people, Higgins, could you add
733 Hastings?
734
735 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir.
736
737 Mr. Vanarsdall - And then we had one more that I didn't really understand, the 80 ft.
738 setback.
739
740 Mr. Theobald - I think Mr. Glover's point, perhaps, when he spoke with Mr. Tyson, I am
741 not sure whether or not he had the plan in front of him, but there is only one lot that faces, and
742 his comment was 85 ft. setback for homes along Staples Mill. There was only one lot that is
743 even technically adjacent to Staples Mill Road and actually there is a 50 ft. landscaped area that
744 is not part of the lot that you see in here that is also, by the way, wetlands, and given the
745 building envelopes that are drawn on the plan on side yard setbacks, the minimum building
746 envelope for this lot will be 70 feet from the road and more likely the house once sited would be
747 in excess of that, so I am not sure Mr. Glover had that in front of him when he made that
748 observation. He wanted what? I am sorry. I didn't hear the comment.
749
750 Mr. Silber - I think Mr. Emerson was in a meeting recently with the Board Member
751 and he had indicated an 80' setback would be more appropriate, building setback from the right-
752 of-way line. That maybe something, Mr. Vanarsdall, that can be dealt with between now and the
753 Board.
754
755 Mr. Vanarsdall - Lee, I talked to him twice today, and there was nothing mentioned about
756 that.
757
758 Mr. Tyson - We will make sure that he...
759
760 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't mean that it didn't come up, don't get me wrong.
761
762 Mr. Theobald - We'll make sure he is comfortable on that, obviously, before we go to
763 the board.
764
765 Mr. Vanarsdall - I'm going to let you take care of that at Board time if you don't mine.
766
767 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir.
768
769 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anything else?
770
771 Mr. Silber - These other items, are you going to address those now Mr. Theobald?
772
773 Mr. Theobald - Pardon.
774
775 Mr. Silber - Other items dealing with the no burning...
776
777 Mr. Theobald - I'm just going to re-file once so we don't have to mark these up, frankly.
778
779 Mr. Silber - Okay.
780

781 Mr. Theobald - It will be the no burning, the wrap around foundations. I'll get with Mr.
782 Glover on the setback and then we will correct the labeling or add to the labeling of the
783 elevations for the entrance feature.

784

785 Thank you.

786

787 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. I don't have to waive the time limits, do I? Here again, is
788 another excellent case in our district for tonight, but I'm not as surprised in this area because Mr.
789 Atack has set the pace for CrossRidge a good while ago and this is in keeping with the same
790 thing as in CrossRidge. We have a house size of 2,700 square feet of finished floor, have two (2)
791 car garages and 75% of them will be side or rear loaded. In addition to all the regular proffers
792 we have nice landscaping, roads, and curb and gutter, and the front and side yards, again, will
793 be sodded. There will be lampposts and mailboxes at every place. I think that it is going to be
794 excellent. With that I recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors, C-19C-05.

795

796 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.

797

798 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Mr. Archer. All in favor,
799 aye. All opposed, nay. The ayes have it. Thank you.

800

801 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Mr. Archer, the Planning
802 Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant** the
803 request because it conforms to the recommendation of the Land Use Plan, it would permit
804 development of the land for residential use in an appropriate manner, and the proffered
805 conditions will assure a level of development not otherwise possible.

806

807 **Deferred from the March 10, 2005 Meeting:**

808 **C-58C-04**

809 **Loftis Real Estate & Development:** Request to conditionally rezone
810 from A-1 Agricultural District to RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional), part of Parcel
811 800-730-7438, containing 6.981 acres, located at the north intersection of Elkridge Lane and 20th
812 Street, adjoining the northwest property line of the Oak Hill subdivision. Single family detached
813 condominiums are proposed. The maximum density in the RTH District is nine (9) units per acre.
814 The Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2, 2.4 to 3.4 units net density per acre.

814

815 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anyone in the audience in opposition to this case? All right, sir, thank
816 you.

817

818 Mr. Tyson - Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kaechele, members of the Commission, Mr. Secretary.
819 Good evening, once again. This is a request to rezone property at 2811 Mechanicsville Turnpike
820 from A-1 Agricultural District to RTHC, Residential Town House. The site is located in a
821 redevelopment corridor.

822

823 The Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2 for this site. The applicant is proposing
824 37 detached condominium units for sale. The proposed density is greater than that
825 recommended by the Land Use Plan and greater than that of the surrounding residential
826 development; however, the use may serve as an appropriate transition from the multi-family
827 residential zoning that is already in place along Mechanicsville Turnpike. You can see there is
828 some R-5 just to the west of this site. This is the subject property (referring to rendering). This
829 is the R-5 (referring to rendering). Single-family development also borders the subject property
830 on the south and east. A mixture of semi-public, commercial, and single-family uses borders the
831 property as well.

832

833 The subject property represents an opportunity for quality infill development in a mature
834 residential and commercial area. When taken as a whole, the mixed townhouse and
835 condominium development that is proposed could be seen as an appropriate use for the site
836 provided that the quality of the project is kept at a high level.

837

838 In an effort to mitigate a number of potential impacts that may be associated with the proposed
839 development, the applicant has submitted a revised proffer statement. Major aspects of the
840 proffers include:

841

- 842 • Minimum unit size of 1,350 square feet of finished floor area;
- 843 • A landscaped entrance feature on Elkridge Lane that is shown before you (referring to
844 rendering);
- 845 • A conceptual layout showing greenspace, landscaping and the coordinated development of
846 the already zoned R-5 parcel fronting on Mechanicsville Turnpike.
- 847 • Installation of six inch curb and gutter;
- 848 • Sidewalks adjacent to interior roadways and parking areas.
- 849 • No cantilevered chimneys, gas vent units, or bay windows.
- 850 • 1/3 of all units will have a one car garage, and all front loaded garages will be recessed a
851 minimum of 5' behind the front building line.

852

853 The applicant has proffered these two layouts as being representative of what may be
854 constructed on-site. They have some architectural elements and interest that might not
855 otherwise be developed on the property. The applicant has proffered that a minimum of 25% of
856 the frontage on the units in the aggregate, not on an individual basis, will be brick. The applicant
857 has also proffered that foundations, while on slab, will have a minimum of 5 courses of brick.
858 That will give the aesthetic of crawlspace construction. The applicant has proffered that each
859 façade will have a minimum of 2 windows, so that there will not be any blank walls.

860

861 The applicant has shown a willingness to work with the staff on addressing a number of issues,
862 and the application has actually come a very long way since it was originally filed. The staff
863 appreciates those efforts to date. Staff encourages the applicant to develop language that will
864 commit to the private drives and roads that will be constructed to County road standards and
865 that an engineer certify that condition. Again, the project has come a long way and has evolved
866 since its first filing and staff believes that the proposed use and development could be an
867 impetus redevelopment in the area.

868

869 This concludes my presentation, I would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

870

871 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there any questions for Mr. Tyson? No questions. All right, we will
872 hear from the applicant since we do have some opposition.

873

874 Mr. Theobald - Mr. Silber, I would like to reserve two (2) minutes, if I might please, for
875 rebuttal.

876

877 Mr. Silber - Okay.

878

879 Mr. Theobald - Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Jim Theobald and I
880 am here on behalf of Loftis Development. While this is not the biggest case that we've ever
881 discussed, I am very proud of this case. This really is a jewel of a case. It is but 7 acres, but we
882 have worked in a very positive collaborate effort with Mr. Archer and staff to come up with what
883 I hope you will find to be appealing.

884

885 This portion of the property here (referring to rendering), along Mechanicsville Turnpike is
886 already zoned unrestricted R-5. So, multi-family development could be constructed as a manner
887 of right without any quality guarantees whatsoever. The original submission for townhouse
888 zoning for the back, all of this being controlled by Loftis Development was a continuation of a
889 townhouse, a fairly standard townhouse development throughout the property.

890
891 In speaking with Mr. Archer, we tried to come up with a way that would provide single-family
892 detached owner occupied housing and yet with enough density to merit the investment in the
893 area. This is a redevelopment corridor in the county. And, as we were brainstorming together
894 we came up with the notation of doing this in the rear as detached condominiums as has been
895 done in Twin Hickory and elsewhere. Thus you get more flexibility without having to deal with a
896 lot line since they are technically condominiums, or be it single-family detached.

897
898 So once we made that leap we were able to then develop the quality guarantees that you see
899 before you this evening, including the production of what I think is a neat plan from Higgins and
900 Gerstenmaier showing a unified development with that which is already zoned R-5 along with the
901 detached condominiums. It includes entrance features, as you see depicted here (referring to
902 rendering), which are proffered. A sense of arrival, a sense of place. These stub streets do not
903 connect to the neighborhood behind; it does connect onto the side street here (referring to
904 rendering) with one entrance off of Mechanicsville Turnpike, which will still enable you to wind
905 back through the property. I think it accomplishes a number of objectives in your Land Use Plan.
906 Quality, yet affordable housing in a redevelopment corridor with significant quality guarantees in
907 the written conditions.

908
909 With that I would be more than happy to answer any questions that you might have.

910
911 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Theobald by Commission Members?

912
913 Mr. Archer - Mr. Theobald, would you address staff concerns about private drives and
914 roads that are conforming...

915
916 Mr. Theobald - Yeah, we are going to do, provide the language. We heard about that at
917 some point late in the day and it has become a fairly typically condition Mr. Archer, and we will
918 provide that.

919
920 Mr. Archer - Okay. The only other thing that I have a concern about is, and I think
921 that it can probably, can maybe, be handled at POD time and that would be the impact study
922 report had some crime prevention measures that should be utilized and I don't know whether it
923 is necessary to proffer. It would be best if they were proffered, I suppose, before the time that it
924 would get to the Board. But, did you look at those?

925
926 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir.

927
928 Mr. Archer - Okay. All right. Then I think that can be fairly easily handled. I will
929 reserve anymore questions until we hear from the opposition.

930
931 Mr. Theobald - Thank you.

932
933 Mr. Archer - Thank you.

934
935 Rev. Barry Young - Good evening to the Members of the Commission, my name is Rev.
936 Barry Young. I am the pastor of the Mosby Memorial Baptist Church at 2901 Mechanicsville
937 Turnpike, which is just to the east of the proposed new development and we are not in

938 opposition to the development as such, but our concern is for a shared easement that we have
939 currently with the Osthimer Florist which is next to us and the home which is directly behind
940 Osthimer Florist. If we are looking at the pictures that we have seen correctly it appears that the
941 development is closed off on that end and there will not be any access to the development from
942 our side of the property. We just want to make sure that that is the case. We would also like to
943 know if or how many total units are going to be in the property, both the condominium section
944 and townhouse section, just for our information. I also want to say, thank you, both to Mr.
945 Archer and to staff and to Loftis for, I understand this has been a long process getting to where
946 we are now and we appreciate this. We are pleased with what we see. We just want to ask that
947 question about access.
948
949 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Rev. Young.
950
951 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Rev. Young. Anyone else?
952
953 Mr. Archer - I think that was it. Mr. Theobald or Mr. Loftis can answer that, I believe.
954
955 Mr. Theobald - There are about 47 townhomes in this portion of the site (referring to
956 rendering), and we will not be utilizing the access. That should not be an issue.
957
958 Mr. Archer - That satisfy you, Rev. Young?
959
960 Rev. Young - Okay, thank you.
961
962 Mr. Silber - Mr. Theobald, there is another access question I had for you. The
963 Elkridge Lane, it comes it, there actually appears to be right-of-way that comes out all the way to
964 Mechanicsville Turnpike.
965
966 Mr. Theobald - Yeah.
967
968 Mr. Silber - I guess on the southern side of your property. You are not proposing to
969 construct any portion of that, yet that concept plan you have on the screen right now looks as
970 though there is a driveway. I can't tell if the driveway has access to Mechanicsville Turnpike or
971 not. The southern most...
972
973 Mr. Theobald - This is the access to Mechanicsville Turnpike here (referring to
974 rendering).
975
976 Mr. Silber - Okay. So you would only have that one access.
977
978 Mr. Theobald - Yes, sir.
979
980 Mr. Silber - Not the one that is closes to Elkridge.
981
982 Mr. Theobald - No, this is not being opened or utilized.
983
984 Mr. Silber - Okay. I think the proximity of that...
985
986 Mr. Theobald - Or owned for that matter.
987
988 Mr. Silber - Right. I mean you are adjacent to that right-of-way, but I think if there
989 was going to be a future road there your access drive might be to close to that, but your access
990 is actually going to be the northern most.

991
992 Mr. Theobald - That is right.
993
994 Mr. Silber - Okay.
995
996 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Theobald.
997
998 Mr. Theobald - Thank you.
999
1000 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, Mr. Archer.
1001
1002 Mr. Archer - Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As staff has indicated we have come
1003 quite a ways since this was first proposed. Mr. Theobald's idea about the detached
1004 condominiums was a unique one for us and I appreciate that. The only thing that I might
1005 caution you about is that between now and the time that we go to the Board with this, staff has
1006 indicated a preference for crawl spaces instead of slab, but you have indicated that you would do
1007 five (5) courses of brick. I might add to that that if you could put some faux vents in there that
1008 could make it look a little bit more like a crawl space, but also caution you that the Board might
1009 want to look at crawl spaces anyway. I know we have this argument all the time about which is
1010 best, but to be honest with you I don't know. I have my preference, but I'll just keep it to
1011 myself. But, with that and the fact that you all have met with the neighborhood and I didn't hear
1012 anybody come out of that meeting with an objection that we have here. I think the plan is
1013 adequately proffered. At this point, I think I'm prepared to move for recommendation to the
1014 Board.
1015
1016 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right.
1017
1018 Mr. Archer - Are this proffers on time. All right. Well, I first move to waive the time
1019 limits on the proffer.
1020
1021 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1022
1023 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1024 All opposed. The ayes have it.
1025
1026 The Planning Commission voted to waive the time limits on Case C-58C-04, Loftis Real Estate &
1027 Development.
1028
1029 Mr. Archer - I move for recommendation of approval on C-58C-04, F. Robert Loftis.
1030
1031 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1032
1033 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1034 All opposed. The ayes have it. Thank you.
1035
1036 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Jim.
1037
1038 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan, the
1039 Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors
1040 **grant** the request because it would not be expected to adversely affect the pattern of zoning
1041 and land use in the area, it would permit development of the land for residential use in an
1042 appropriate manner, and the proffered conditions will assure a level of development otherwise
1043 not possible.

1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096

Deferred from the April 14, 2005 Meeting:

C-11C-05 Rogers-Chenault, Inc.: Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-3C One Family Residence District (Conditional), Parcel 777-764-6922, approximately 41.6 acres, located on the west line of Mountain Road at its intersection with Megan Drive. The applicant proposes a single-family residential subdivision with a maximum number of eighty-six (86) lots, an equivalent density of 2.07 units per acre. The R-3 District allows a minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet, an equivalent density of 3.96 units per acre. The Land Use Plan recommends Open Space/Recreation and Environmental Protection Area.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more in the audience in opposition to C-11C-05? All right, sir. Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Coleman.

Mr. Coleman - Than you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. This request was presented to the Planning Commission at the April meeting, and proposes to rezone the 41.6 acre Spring Lake Golf Club property from A-1 to R-3C to develop a single-family subdivision. The applicant would limit development to 86 units.

The applicant has made several changes to the proffers since the April meeting, including:

- At least 33% of the garages would now be side or rear loading;
- At least 25% of the dwelling units would now have brick fronts; and
- The four lots fronting Mountain Road would provide a minimum lot depth of 180' in addition to a 25' buffer along the roadway.

There remains one item from the staff report that the applicant has not addressed:

- The applicant is encouraged to retain trees along the northern property line to diminish light emitted from the adjacent softball complex onto future homeowners.

In summary, a single family subdivision, properly designed and regulated, could be acceptable use for this site. The proffers include several assurances of quality development. If the applicant addressed the remaining item, staff could recommend approval of this request.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Coleman by Commission Members?

Mr. Archer - Mr. Coleman are those tall mature trees on that northern lot line.

Mr. Coleman - There are trees there.

Mr. Archer - I've been through there I just don't remember.

Mr. Coleman - If memory serves me correct they are mature trees there.

Mr. Archer - Okay. That is all I have.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions? Thank you, Mr. Coleman. Now we will hear from the opposition. Come down and state your name or do you want to hear from the applicant?

Mr. Archer - Mr. Chenault, do you want to speak first? Or do you want to wait?

1097 Mr. Chenault - (Unintelligible).
1098
1099 Mr. Vanarsdall - I didn't mean to slight you.
1100
1101 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, Commission Members.
1102
1103 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good evening.
1104
1105 Mr. Taylor - My name is H. Nathaniel Taylor, I reside at 1775 Altman Road and I am
1106 the President of the North Run Estate Civic Association. I have also been asked to speak on
1107 behalf of an adjacent community to ours, which is called Mountain Ridge. Mountain Ridge is less
1108 than a tenth of a mile from this proposed development and of our concern is that while each of
1109 our neighborhoods have approximately 100 homes currently we are used as a cut through from
1110 Mountain Road to Hungary Road. We have been longed used as a cut though, however in recent
1111 times because the bridge near Lydell and Hungary Road is closed, traffic has subsided. That
1112 bridge is to reopen in September and we expect a large volume of traffic to again use our
1113 neighborhood to go from Mountain Road to Hungary Road.
1114
1115 I have in my possession and I would like to leave with you all tonight a letter and attached
1116 petitions from 119 of our residences from North Run Estate, which represents 84% of our
1117 residence. We've collected those petitions in less than a week. We have another 30 petitions
1118 from Mountain Ridge, representing 22 of their homes. We are obviously strongly opposed to
1119 traffic, which will cut through the two communities. Not necessarily opposed to the
1120 development. According to the county's traffic planning department approximately 884 trips per
1121 day will be generated from this development. We are also understanding that between the
1122 development and Mountain Ridge there will also be proposals before you for an additional 45
1123 residences. So between the two developments the projection is for 1,400 car trips a day out of
1124 the two developments. If we only get 10% of those that is 140 cars passing in front of our cars
1125 and through our neighborhood. If we get 15% it is 210 cars coming through our neighborhood a
1126 day.
1127
1128 So, in addition to just traffic we have long been bothered by speeders, by litter thrown by cars
1129 and by the loud noise from boom cars. In spite of numerous complaints we have gotten very
1130 little response from the County to correct these situations. So, we ask this Commission and the
1131 County to do whatever is necessary to keep traffic from cutting through our neighborhood, if this
1132 development is approved. Whether we are talking about cutting a street at the rear of this
1133 development away from Mountain Road. Whether street closures will be a remedy and/or traffic
1134 calming procedures. We hope that you hear our concerns and if the traffic can not be kept out
1135 of our neighborhoods we certainly would be in total opposition to the proposed development.
1136
1137 Thank you for your consideration.
1138
1139 May I leave the letter and petition?
1140
1141 Mr. Archer - Certainly. Give them to any person...
1142
1143 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Taylor.
1144
1145 Mr. Archer - Mr. Taylor, I'm trying to think of a good way to answer your concern. I
1146 wish there were a way we could prevent traffic from traveling on any street, but unfortunately
1147 we don't have, that is not within our (unintelligible) to be able to do it. I understand what you
1148 are saying; I sympathize with you because we suffer from the same thing in my neighborhood,
1149 probably all neighborhoods do. There is no legal way that we can prevent any citizen from using

1150 any street. It would be hopeful that the 884 trips that are generated by this development
1151 certainly would not all come through your neighborhood.
1152

1153 Mr. Taylor - Excuse me for cutting you off, but that is why I used the 10% estimate.
1154

1155 Mr. Archer - You are a very good mathematician too, 10 out of 15. The point I am
1156 trying to make is as long as we are on this earth and America is in love with the automobile as it
1157 is right now, I don't see anyway that we are going to ever solve our traffic problems. It will just
1158 get worse and worse. We don't seem to be at all inclined to do any mass transportation
1159 whatsoever and I am guilty of the same thing that you are talking about. I have a daughter that
1160 lives near you and I have to cut through to get to her house when I go there especially since the
1161 road is closed over there. In fact, she has to cut through to get to work. And, I think at the
1162 time, is it September that the bridge is suppose to be complete. That will probably alleviate quite
1163 a bit of the problem, but other than that and I'm telling you this because I don't want you to go
1164 away with just no answer and think that we are ignoring you because we are not. We hear this
1165 often about neighborhoods that are beset by people who cut through. But, I do it too. I always
1166 take the shortest point that I can get between two places that I'm traveling from and going to.
1167

1168 Mr. Taylor - One response, you say the bridge will alleviate the problem. I say that
1169 the bridge will actually compound the problem, increase the problem.
1170

1171 Mr. Archer - Then we will leave it closed then. I'm just kidding.
1172

1173 Mr. Taylor - That would be better.
1174

1175 Mr. Archer - But you know, that is another thing to be aware of. People come in
1176 quite often and they say the road is to narrow and we have got to much traffic on it. Well, if you
1177 widen the road you will get more traffic. So, I guess what I am saying, I don't really have a
1178 good answer for this. The traffic department has indicated that the roadway network can
1179 accommodate the traffic. That is the only legal recourse that we would have would be to say, for
1180 the traffic department to tell us that it couldn't handle the traffic.
1181

1182 Mr. Taylor - In my conversations with the traffic department, the road they spoke to
1183 was Mountain Road...
1184

1185 Mr. Archer - Yeah.
1186

1187 Mr. Taylor - ...and not the cut through in my neighborhood.
1188

1189 Mr. Archer - But generally when they do their report to us they talk about the
1190 roadway network. We can't assume, I guess we can assume that a certain percentage of those
1191 cars will use your neighborhood to cut through, but still I don't have an answer as to how you
1192 can prevent people from using any portion of the roadway network. Unless it is a private road
1193 we can't stop people from doing that.
1194

1195 Mr. Vanarsdall - Maybe one suggestion, maybe, have you thought about, we don't have
1196 speed bumps we have speed humps. Have you thought about if that might help?
1197

1198 Mr. Taylor - That was one of the solutions that I mentioned. I mentioned a road to
1199 the rear of this development. I mentioned consideration of road closures in our neighborhood
1200 and I mentioned traffic calming.
1201

1202 Mr. Vanarsdall - Last year we put them on Bremono Road, which is a direct route from
1203 Monument to Broad Street and it cut down on the numbers and the speed considerably. Speed
1204 hump that slow down and then speed up again. Speed humps that come, it doesn't stop the
1205 traffic but it discourages them from coming. Our traffic department, I don't know how they
1206 determine what streets to put them on, but it might be an idea.
1207
1208 Mr. Archer - Is someone here from traffic today?
1209
1210 Mr. Silber - No.
1211
1212 Mr. Archer - Mr. Taylor, we can take all of this into consideration between now and
1213 the time that it comes up for whatever the next hearing is. I am sympathetic with what you are
1214 saying; I'm telling you I just don't know what the answer is to overcome that.
1215
1216 Mr. Taylor - I appreciate everything...
1217
1218 Mr. Archer - If there were one, I'd try whatever can be done to do it. Its just like,
1219 Mr. Vanarsdall talked about speed humps, 50% of your neighbors would probably want to kill you
1220 if you did that and the other 50% would love you. You have got to find the right half.
1221 Everybody doesn't like the speed humps.
1222
1223 Mr. Vanarsdall - Henrico police will come and put radar there. All you have to do is ask
1224 them.
1225
1226 Mr. Taylor - We have asked and we have gotten limited support if at all. I appreciate
1227 every consideration that you all can...
1228
1229 Mr. Archer - We appreciate you coming out to speak with us too.
1230
1231 Mr. Vanarsdall - I've known you a long time. I never remember you speeding on
1232 anybody's street. I know that you are not guilty.
1233
1234 Mr. Taylor - Not that I would admit to. Thank you.
1235
1236 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Taylor.
1237
1238 Mr. Vanarsdall - The number one complaint is traffic and I wish there was something we
1239 could do.
1240
1241 Mr. Archer - Anyone else to speak in opposition? Mr. Chenault, do you have any
1242 answers to all of that?
1243
1244 Mr. Chenault - Mr. Archer, for the record I am Mac Chenault and I represent the
1245 applicant here. Mr. Archer, if I had the answer to that I could be a very wealthy man because
1246 that is a common complaint whether you are in Henrico County, King William County or Hanover
1247 County and I'm certainly sympathetic with Mr. Taylor and he is very eloquent in his comments.
1248 However, we don't have control over the public streets and where we hope people wouldn't cut
1249 through, wouldn't speed through his neighborhood, I'm certainly sympathetic. I think I hear him
1250 mention boom cars and I dislike those as much as anybody.
1251
1252 Mr. Archer - I've got one, 10:32 every night. I can set my watch by it.
1253

1254 Mr. Chenault - Mr. Archer, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how much you want me to go
1255 into. We have tried to address all of the staff concerns. If you go through the latest staff report
1256 we tried to change our proffers to coincide with what staff was asking for. I would like to call to
1257 the Commissions attention to this boundary. This is the boundary Mr. Coleman was talking
1258 about, that he was asking about retention of trees. This is a 50' SPA boundary. It is a stream
1259 boundary, defined by the code of Henrico County. We can't disturb that, so we have no intention
1260 of removing any trees from that boundary. Don't want to disturb them, can't disturb them, so I
1261 don't think we need a proffer to address that. That would be my answer to that.

1262
1263 I wanted to talk to you a little bit about quality. That was something that came up at the last
1264 meeting. We have proffered that 25% of the houses that the front elevation would be brick,
1265 excluded, of course, the doors and windows. We have proffered, we haven't proffered this, but
1266 something I wanted to talk to you about. I understand that there are various types of vinyl. My
1267 client generally uses ALCOA Charleston beaded siding. Siding comes from a .04, let me make
1268 sure I have got that exactly right, siding comes in a thickness, excuse me a .040 to a .048. My
1269 client generally uses a .046, which is a pretty good standard, a pretty good thickness of vinyl.
1270 They like the ALCOA vinyl because it gives them a good choice of colors and it is a good stable
1271 product. It certainly would not be opposed to committing to this Commission and to the Board
1272 that they would use at least that quality or better on these homes. I also wanted to tell you
1273 although it is not proffered, my clients are committed to all houses that face Mountain Road
1274 would have brick fronts.

1275
1276 One other question that I do remember coming up. The houses that front Mountain Road.
1277 These house right here (referring to rendering) will face Mountain Road, but they do not back up
1278 to a cul-de-sac, in other words the back of the house will be backed up to the rear of the house
1279 behind them.

1280
1281 I also can tell you if you are interested, which lot is going to the side and rear entry garages. I
1282 can tell you exactly which lots if you would like to know. The numbers of those would be lots 1,
1283 3, and 11, lots 30, 31, 51, 54, 55, 56, 58 and 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77,
1284 80 and 81 would all have side or rear loaded garages. Those lots are large enough to do that.

1285
1286 Although, I have probably taken a lot more time than I should have I will be glad to answer any
1287 questions or address any issues that the Commission may have.

1288
1289 Mr. Archer - I appreciate you bringing us some information on the qualities of the
1290 vinyl. The standards that you indicated, are those just the ones, who did you say, ALCOA? Are
1291 those ALCOA standards or are those industry standards for thickness for vinyl.

1292
1293 Mr. Chenault - They are industry standards. My client just happens to use the ALCOA
1294 product and that is why I wanted to tell you what they used.

1295
1296 Mr. Archer - Well, I called that to your attention last week because somebody called it
1297 to mine. They are different and varying degrees of quality of vinyl. Your product overall seems
1298 to be very much in keeping with the quality that we are trying to achieve here and I appreciate
1299 the fact that you are willing to go with that high of quality of vinyl where it is used.

1300
1301 I don't have anymore questions. I have got some comments before we finish, unless somebody
1302 else does.

1303
1304 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any more questions by our Commission Members? Thank you, Mr.
1305 Chenault.

1306

1307 Mr. Chenault - Thank you.
1308
1309 Mr. Vanarsdall - No more questions, then are we ready for a motion.
1310
1311 Mr. Archer - Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to wrap this up by saying when we
1312 initially started with this Mr. Duke, I believe was calling me, he indicated townhouses and I say,
1313 "No", and I didn't hear from him again. But, since that time to my way of thinking this is an
1314 exemplary quality subdivision that he seems to be planning. I did ask him on the first meeting, I
1315 believe was scheduled for March and I ask him if he would withhold that meeting and have a
1316 meeting at St. Peters Baptist Church and he did that and they were open to questions and
1317 answers and staff has worked quite a bit with them to try and get to the point where we are
1318 now. And, I think we have come pretty close to achieving what I'm hoping will be a subdivision
1319 whose quality will be such that the proposed residence would be an asset to the community and
1320 more especially to St. Peters Baptist Church because they are directly across the street from St.
1321 Peters.
1322
1323 There are probably some things that may be ask of your sir to tweak this a little bit more by the
1324 time it gets to the Board level. Maybe a lot, but hopefully just a little. With that I think we have
1325 come to the point where we can recommend this for approval to the Board. So, I will motion for
1326 a recommendation of approval of C-11C-05, Roger Chenault Mountain Road.
1327
1328 Mr. Jernigan - Second, Mr. Chairman.
1329
1330 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1331 All opposed. The ayes have it. Thank you. Thank you all for coming.
1332
1333 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan, the Planning Commission
1334 voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request
1335 because it is appropriate residential zoning at this location and the proffered conditions would
1336 provide for a higher quality of development than would otherwise be possible.
1337
1338 **Deferred from the April 14, 2005 Meeting:**
1339 **C-13C-05 Shawn Smith for The Estate of Madeline W. Smart and William D.**
1340 **Smart, Sr. and Mamie J. Smart:** Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District
1341 to R-2AC One Family Residence District (Conditional), part of Parcel 740-770-0883 and all of 740-
1342 770-5728, containing 30.4 acres, located on the north line of Shady Grove Road approximately
1343 1,100 feet east of Pouncey Tract Road (State Route 271). The applicant proposes a single-family
1344 residential subdivision with the maximum density not to exceed 1.5 lots per acre. The R-2A
1345 District allows a minimum lot size of 13,500 square feet, an equivalent of 3.23 units per acre.
1346 The Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre.
1347
1348 **Deferred from the April 14, 2005 Meeting:**
1349 **C-14C-05 Shawn Smith for The Estate of Madeline W. Smart:** Request to
1350 conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-3C One Family Residence District
1351 (Conditional), part of Parcel 740-770-0883, containing 14.5 acres, located on the south line of
1352 Shady Grove Road approximately 1,100 feet east of Pouncey Tract Road (State Route 271). The
1353 applicant proposes a single-family residential subdivision with the maximum density not to
1354 exceed 2.0 lots per acre. The R-3 District allows a minimum lot size of 11,000 square feet, an
1355 equivalent of 3.96 units per acre. The Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 2, 2.4 to
1356 3.4 units net density per acre.
1357

1358 Mr. Vanarsdall - These are companion cases, but I have to take them separate. Is there
1359 anyone in the audience in opposition to C-13C-05? All right. How about the second one, C-14C-
1360 05? Thank you. Mr. Coleman.

1361
1362 Mr. Coleman - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. This request
1363 would rezone 30.4 acres from A-1 to R-2AC to develop a single-family subdivision. The site is
1364 designated Suburban Residential 1 on the Land Use Plan, and the proffered density of 1.5
1365 units/acre would be consistent with this recommendation.

1366
1367 The applicant has also filed an application across Shady Grove Road to the south for additional single
1368 family development. The applicant submitted an unproffered lot layout showing a total of 40 building
1369 lots on the two properties.

1370
1371 The applicant submitted revised proffers dated May 4, which contain several positive features.
1372 Major aspects include:

- 1373
- 1374 • Minimum finished floor area of:
1375 2,600 square feet for two-story dwellings; 2,500 square feet for one-story dwellings; and
1376 at least 75% of the units will be two story.
 - 1377 • At least 50% of the dwellings shall include at least 50% brick, stone, or EIFS on the front
1378 elevation;
 - 1379 • Each home will have a two-car garage, and at least 33% of the garages will be side/rear
1380 loaded;
 - 1381 • All lots will have a minimum 85' lot width, and 90% will have a minimum 90' lot width;
 - 1382 • A 25' foot buffer would be provided along the ultimate right-of-way of Shady Grove
1383 Road, which will be landscaped equivalent to a Transitional Buffer 25;
 - 1384 • Sodded and irrigated front and side yards;
 - 1385 • A landscaped entrance feature;
 - 1386 • A street tree plan; and
 - 1387 • A sidewalk along Shady Grove Rd.
- 1388

1389 Additional proffers address foundations; underground utilities; prohibitions on cantilevered chimneys,
1390 closets, and windows; driveway surfaces; restrictive covenants; foundation plantings, and other
1391 items.

1392
1393 Although the proffers include several positive features, staff recommends consideration of the
1394 following changes:

- 1395
- 1396 • Providing brick fronts on all of the dwellings;
 - 1397 • Eliminating the option for asphalt driveways;
 - 1398 • Providing for future connectivity to adjacent properties;
 - 1399 • Identify areas that could be utilized as neighborhood amenities; and
 - 1400 • The applicant is encouraged to work with Recreation and Parks staff to develop a plan for
1401 the early 1900's colonial house located on the site.
- 1402

1403 In summary, residential development is an appropriate use, and the proffers include several
1404 assurances of quality development. If the applicant could address the issues I have presented,
1405 staff could recommend approval of this request.

1406
1407 This concludes my presentation. The applicant has indicated their intent to submit new proffers,
1408 which are not yet available, and I would defer questions about those to the applicant.

1409

1410 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions for Mr. Coleman by the Commission Members?
1411
1412 Mr. Jernigan - What did you say on the brick? How many homes do you want with
1413 brick fronts?
1414
1415 Mr. Coleman - We are encouraging them to include some brick on all of the homes.
1416
1417 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you want to hear from the applicant?
1418
1419 Mr. Branin - Mr. Jernigan, while they are coming down, the opposition is coming
1420 down, I am working with this applicant. I have encourage no vinyl or very limited vinyl.
1421
1422 Mr. Jernigan - I misunderstood Mr. Coleman when we said, I thought he said he
1423 wanted 100%. He wanted some brick on...
1424
1425 Mr. Branin - We are going with at least 70% brick or stone on the front of all of
1426 them.
1427
1428 Mr. Vanarsdall - Right now do you want to hear from the applicant?
1429
1430 Mr. Branin - Yeah.
1431
1432 Mr. Vanarsdall - Then we will hear from you, just as soon as we hear from him. Thank
1433 you.
1434
1435 Mr. Kaechele - Don't these revised proffers dated 5-11 address most of that?
1436
1437 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good evening.
1438
1439 Mr. Smith - Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Mr.
1440 Secretary, Mr. Kaechele, my name is Shawn Smith and I'm here this evening representing the
1441 applicant. Also this evening are Keith Wood and Brett Bar with Centex Homes and Steve
1442 Worthington with ABS Consulting Engineers. As Mr. Coleman indicated this is a request to
1443 conditionally rezone approximately 30.4 acres from A-1 Agricultural District to R-2A One Family
1444 Residential District (Conditional) and is consistent with the county's Land Use Plan. We are very
1445 excited about the opportunity to bring this high quality development neighborhood to the County
1446 and to that end have worked very hard with staff and with Mr. Branin to that end.
1447
1448 The twenty-five (25) proffers that we have included what this applicant addressed: infrastructure
1449 needs will insure quality development we can all be proud of. We have proffered a maximum
1450 density of 1.5 single-family dwelling units per acre on the north side of the road with minimal
1451 square footage of 2500 and 2600 square feet for one (1) and two (2) stories respectively. In
1452 fact, many of the homes will far exceed those square footages. We will have strike and front
1453 elevations constructed as we mentioned with brick, stone and shake. All the homes will have at
1454 least a two (2) car garage of which 1/3 of them will be side or rear loaded. The neighborhood
1455 will also include sidewalks along the roads as well as walking trails throughout the common
1456 areas. An attractive entrance feature with extensive landscaping will also welcome everyone to
1457 the neighborhood. We have also proffered to dedicate the right-of-way necessary along Shady
1458 Grove Road for its ultimate width of 80' and in addition a 25' buffer located within the 25'
1459 common area will be provided along Shady Grove Road. This buffer will be landscaped to the
1460 standards of the 25' transitional buffer to insure adequate screening along Shady Grove Road.
1461 We have also worked extensively with the Department of Recreation and Parks on the photo

1462 documentation of the home that was indicated on the site. That work has been done. Mr. Chuck
1463 Pebble and I have spoke today and they have been able to complete that work.
1464
1465 In summary, we feel this community will nicely complement the neighboring, Twin Hickory and
1466 proposed Grey Oaks Development. With that if you have any questions.
1467
1468 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any questions for Mr. Smith?
1469
1470 Mr. Smith - Again, we did, today we submitted some proffers, black line proffers that
1471 I believe ya'll have that address some of the concerns.
1472
1473 Mr. Branin - Mr. Smith, I'm sure I'll have some comments for you, but I would like to
1474 hear the opposition first, if that is okay, Mr. Chairman.
1475
1476 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you. All right, we will take the opposition. Come on down and
1477 state your name. Good evening.
1478
1479 Ms. Snead - Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is
1480 Esther Davis Snead and I represent my parents, Grady and Esther Davis who reside at 4918
1481 Shady Grove Road. For over 50 years my family has owned the site that is adjacent to the
1482 property of request, 13C-05 and across from the request 14C-05. My family respectfully opposes
1483 the rezoning of these parcels from agricultural to residential based on the following three (3)
1484 concerns and two (2) of these have been expressed previously this evening: (1) concerns the
1485 land, which is somewhat poorly drained. It negatively impacts the water quality and flooding
1486 downstream, or it could without special precautions; (2) secondly, the properties are located on a
1487 4/10th of a mile stretch from the intersection of Shady Grove Road and Pouncey Tract Road to
1488 the soccer field. That is between two (2) points where there is already a high volume of traffic
1489 and the proposed development will generate additional traffic passing through this area; (3)
1490 thirdly, and most important the two (2) subdivisions forced into this space will not be in harmony
1491 with the rural character of the existing home sites and the property zoned as agricultural along
1492 this section of Shady Grove Road. The property of 13C-05 joins land that is currently delineated
1493 on the Henrico County 2010 Land Use Plan map as an environmental protection area and where
1494 no future development is planned to occur.
1495
1496 My family humbly and respectfully request that this Commission not vote in the favor of rezoning
1497 13C-05 and 14C-05. Thank you for your consideration.
1498
1499 Mr. Branin - Ms. Snead.
1500
1501 Ms. Snead - Yes.
1502
1503 Mr. Branin - Where exactly is your residence compared to 13C?
1504
1505 Ms. Snead - It is directly across from the soccer field. So it is adjacent.
1506
1507 Mr. Silber - Is it the first parcel to the east of this case. Can someone point to it
1508 with the pointer?
1509
1510 Ms. Snead - Yes. 4918.
1511
1512 Mr. Silber - Is it on the other side?
1513
1514 Mr. Branin - Those are Smart family properties, I believe.

1515
1516 Ms. Snead - Closes to Pouncey Tract.
1517
1518 Mr. Silber - That is the back entrance to the Strikers Park. So that is your property?
1519
1520 Ms. Snead - Yes.
1521
1522 Mr. Silber - Okay.
1523
1524 Mr. Kaechele - Is that on the north side of Shady Grove?
1525
1526 Mr. Silber - It is on the north side of Shady Grove just to the east of the subject
1527 property, right there (referring to slide).
1528
1529 Mr. Kaechele - Okay.
1530
1531 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions? Thank you. Anyone else?
1532
1533 Mr. Branin - No one. Mr. Smith, first I would like to say thank you for working so
1534 diligently on this project. The quality that you are putting in, I'm sure will be much appreciated
1535 and it will be a high quality product. The only two (2) things that concern me on C-14C-05 is the
1536 proffering of the elevations and also I want to make sure, I had ask for you guys to remove two
1537 (2) lots, which they were stem lots or flag lots.
1538
1539 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir.
1540
1541 Mr. Branin - I would ask you to consider proffering those. I would like to see those
1542 proffered that there will be no stem lots. On C-13C-05, again the elevations, and you have
1543 agreed to put in a stub road for the remaining Smart properties.
1544
1545 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir.
1546
1547 Mr. Branin - I'm also going to be looking for a proffer when this is on its way to the
1548 Board stating that that will be in there.
1549
1550 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir. We are prepared to proffer both the elevations and the layouts.
1551
1552 Mr. Branin - Okay. Now there has been some opposition. Would you make comment
1553 to that?
1554
1555 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir. I certainly can appreciate their concerns. With respect to the
1556 drainage issue our engineer is here with us this evening, but I can assure them that there will be
1557 no additional drainage coming across their property and essentially where there are some low
1558 laying areas there that are consider wetlands we will not be doing anything to impact those
1559 wetlands or in any way create additional run off coming onto their properties. As far as the
1560 traffic issue goes, I believe transportation addressed that in the staff report. The roads are
1561 adequate for the development. We aren't going to be overloading the roads as currently exist.
1562 We are dedicating right-of-way for the ultimate width of 80' and we will be doing some
1563 improvements along Shady Grove Road as far as turn lanes and etc...to make it a safe situation
1564 for the development going in. As far as the development not being in creature, this is consistent
1565 with the county's land use plan and the adjacent neighborhoods of Twin Hickory and Great Oaks
1566 which are going in currently.
1567

1568 Mr. Branin - Ms. Snead, have you met with the developers and voiced your concerns
1569 prior?
1570
1571 Ms. Snead - No.
1572
1573 Mr. Branin - You have not. Would you like to see detailed plans of the type of
1574 product because you haven't seen pictures? We can provide those for you now if you would like
1575 to see those. What kind of housing is going in there? Okay. Also, wouldn't in most cases, when
1576 you put in a new subdivision with storm water, curb and gutter, doesn't that improve drainage?
1577
1578 Mr. Silber - Yes, it does.
1579
1580 Mr. Branin - So the drainage concerns will probably be improved for your property
1581 because of this development.
1582
1583 Mr. Smith - We would be happy to meet with them as well.
1584
1585 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Branin, I want to say something because I don't want to see you get
1586 trapped on your proffers. The reason I had asked Mr. Coleman, I misunderstood him when he
1587 was talking about the brick.
1588
1589 Mr. Branin - Okay.
1590
1591 Mr. Jernigan - But in the proffered conditions its showing that at least all of the homes
1592 will have 50%, but in the elevations that you have in the packet here, this first home has only
1593 got 33%. Two of the elevations that they have put in here you wouldn't be able to build. And,
1594 these are nice looking homes. It you look at the first elevation, according to the proffers you
1595 wouldn't be able to build that.
1596
1597 Mr. Branin - Which one are you looking at?
1598
1599 Mr. Jernigan - The front of that house is only about 30 to 33% brick.
1600
1601 Mr. Branin - Correct and when I brought that up to Mr. Smith he assured me that
1602 they would stick by their proffers...
1603
1604 Mr. Jernigan - Brick the rest of them.
1605
1606 Mr. Branin - ...so there would be additional more, there would be either more stone
1607 or brick or they would be able to meet their proffers.
1608
1609 Mr. Smith - We included these elevations just as, we would be in substantial with
1610 what is shown here.
1611
1612 Mr. Jernigan - That is a nice looking house like it is. I was just making a statement.
1613
1614 Mr. Silber - Mr. Jernigan, that is a point well taken. The proffer does say that they
1615 would have to have 50% brick or stone. It looks as though one of the elevations doesn't meet
1616 that, but they would have to comply with this proffered condition. Mr. Jernigan's point is well
1617 taken. When we look at the elevations in the pictures they don't comply with the proffered
1618 conditions its good to at least raise that point.
1619
1620 Mr. Branin - Yes, sir. Right.

1621
1622 Mr. Kaechele - Well, if you look at item (b) on proffer #6, it goes up to 70% brick or
1623 stone for front elevations. Is that right?
1624
1625 Mr. Silber - No, that would...
1626
1627 Mr. Jernigan - Some of the homes are 70%.
1628
1629 Mr. Branin - That would be a combination. Essentially what we are saying or trying
1630 to say there is that most of the brick homes would be at least, the brick homes will be at least
1631 70%. Where we have stone shake, that combination would be 70%.
1632
1633 Mr. Kaechele - Right. So every front elevation will have 70% of either brick,
1634 combination brick, stone and shake.
1635
1636 Mr. Branin - When you put shake with, shake doesn't go that well with brick, so you
1637 will have 50% brick, or you will have stone and shake which would be 70%.
1638
1639 Mr. Kaechele - Oh, well that is a little bit confusing.
1640
1641 Mr. Branin - It would be 70% brick.
1642
1643 Mr. Kaechele - Right, okay. And/or 70% stone and shake. All right.
1644
1645 Mr. Jernigan - I think one thing, I wanted to commit, that house looks good the way it
1646 is, but if you brick all the front of the house and leave just the garage with siding that house is
1647 not going to be balanced. I mean, you have siding on each side and brick in the middle and it is
1648 balanced out and I think it looks good. But if you go to the proffer and have to put brick on all
1649 that then...
1650
1651 Mr. Branin - Well actually Mr. Jernigan that is not brick that is stone.
1652
1653 Mr. Vanarsdall - I think it looks good.
1654
1655 Mr. Jernigan - Well stone, I'm sorry, masonry.
1656
1657 Mr. Silber - Mr. Jernigan that actually meets the proffer condition. If you look at the
1658 siding carefully that is shake.
1659
1660 Mr. Branin - Its shake.
1661
1662 Mr. Silber - So they are having at least 70% that is stone and shake, so that meets
1663 the proffered condition.
1664
1665 Mr. Branin - What we are trying to do, Mr. Jernigan, is get away from vinyl siding.
1666
1667 Mr. Jernigan - Okay.
1668
1669 Mr. Branin - And, by doing a combination of stone, shake and brick we will be able to
1670 (unintelligible) the faces of all the properties, of all these houses the elevations, to have a high
1671 quality look.
1672
1673 Mr. Jernigan - All right, I see the shake.

1674
1675 Mr. Silber - It is a confusing proffer. We might want to work on that because I think
1676 Mr. Jernigan has a good point. If you read (a) by itself you have to have 50% brick or stone and
1677 that house doesn't have brick or stone.
1678
1679 Mr. Jernigan - Okay, I was seeing the shake. Is that a vinyl shake?
1680
1681 Mr. Branin - That is a vinyl shake.
1682
1683 Mr. Vanarsdall - Jean Moore was talking about this not long ago. Not this case, but the
1684 same kind of proffer. That you go 50% up to the drainpipe, I think, and then stop.
1685
1686 Mr. Jernigan - I just didn't want to see you get trapped there.
1687
1688 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't know why they don't leave brick alone and just make it all brick.
1689
1690 Mr. Branin - Sometimes you just got to shake it up, Mr. Chairman.
1691
1692 Mr. Vanarsdall - I'm old fashion...whatever turns you on.
1693
1694 Mr. Kaechele - There is a buffer along the back of the homes that back up to Shady
1695 Grove, right?
1696
1697 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir there is.
1698
1699 Mr. Kaechele - That will be landscaped too, because you will be looking at the back of
1700 the home, right?
1701
1702 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir. That would be landscaped to the 25' transitional buffer.
1703
1704 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any more questions for Mr. Smith, if not we will move on?
1705
1706 Mr. Branin - Mr. Smith, I would ask you to please meet with the Sneads when this
1707 meeting is done.
1708
1709 Mr. Smith - Yes, sir.
1710
1711 Mr. Branin - Ms. Snead, is that okay? So you can look at the plans.
1712
1713 Mr. Vanarsdall - We need a separate motion for each one, Mr. Branin.
1714
1715 Mr. Branin - Which one would you like me to start with Mr. Chairman?
1716
1717 Mr. Vanarsdall - 13.
1718
1719 Mr. Branin - 13.
1720
1721 Mr. Silber - Yes.
1722
1723 Mr. Branin - I move for recommendation that C-13C-05 go to the Board of
1724 Supervisors with the understanding that between tonight and the Board meeting the applicant
1725 address the elevations proffer and the stub road proffer.
1726

1727 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do I hear a second?
1728
1729 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1730
1731 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1732 All opposed. We have it, thank you.
1733
1734 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr. Jernigan, the Planning Commission
1735 voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant the request
1736 because the use and density of the project is in keeping with the 2010 Land Use Plan's
1737 designation for Suburban Residential 1 which recommends a density of 1.0 to 2.4 units per acre
1738 and it continues a similar level of single family residential zoning as currently exists in the area.
1739
1740 Ms. Moore - I'm sorry, the time limits would have to be waived for both of these.
1741
1742 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, the time limits, Mr. Branin.
1743
1744 Mr. Archer - Both cases.
1745
1746 Mr. Branin - I move that the time limits be waived.
1747
1748 Mr. Jernigan - Second, Mr. Chairman.
1749
1750 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Ms. Moore. Motion made by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr.
1751 Jernigan. All in favor, aye. All opposed. The ayes have it.
1752
1753 The Planning Commission voted to waive the time limits on Case C-13C-05, Shawn Smith for The
1754 Estate of Madeline W. Smart and William D. Smart, Sr., and Mamie J. Smart.
1755
1756 Mr. Vanarsdall - Now we will do the same thing for C-14C-05.
1757
1758 Mr. Branin - Almost. I move recommendation...
1759
1760 Mr. Silber - Lets waive the time limit first.
1761
1762 Mr. Branin - I move that we waive the time limits on C-14C-05.
1763
1764 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1765
1766 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1767 All opposed. The ayes have it.
1768
1769 The Planning Commission voted to waive the time limits on Case C-14C-05, Shawn Smith for The
1770 Estate of Madeline W. Smart.
1771
1772 Mr. Branin - I move the recommendation of C-14C-05 to the Board of Supervisors
1773 with the understanding that between tonight and the Board meeting the applicant address the
1774 elevations and the proffer no stem lots.
1775
1776 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1777

1778 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1779 Opposed. The ayes have it. It looks like we have come to the end of the rainbow. Thank you.
1780 Mr. Silber do you have anything...

1781

1782 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Branin, seconded by Mr. Jernigan, the Planning Commission
1783 voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant the request
1784 because the use and density of the project is in keeping with the 2010 Land Use Plan's
1785 designation for Suburban Residential 1 which recommends a density of 1.0 to 2.4 units per acre
1786 and it continues a similar level of single family residential zoning as currently exists in the area.

1787

1788 Mr. Silber - Yes, sir. We're not quite at the rainbow yet. We do have approval of
1789 the minutes and I do have one (1) discussion item.

1790

1791 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Planning Commission April 14, 2005**

1792

1793 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anybody read them? We need a motion.

1794

1795 Mr. Archer - I move approval of the minutes as written, Mr. Chairman.

1796

1797 Mr. Jernigan - Bonnie Leigh said she read hers but she hasn't read every body elses. I
1798 said if you have done yours you have done your part, don't worry about the rest of them.

1799

1800 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do I have a second?

1801

1802 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

1803

1804 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor, aye.
1805 All opposed. The ayes have it and that takes care of the minutes.

1806

1807 The Planning Commission approved the minutes of the April 14, 2005 Planning Commission
1808 meeting.

1809

1810 Mr. Jernigan - Before we break I do have one thing that I would like to bring up. Has
1811 anybody had problems in their district with 4-wheelers?

1812

1813 Mr. Vanarsdall - I haven't.

1814

1815 Mr. Jernigan - Four-wheelers, terrain vehicles.

1816

1817 Mr. Archer - Yes, I have.

1818

1819 Mr. Vanarsdall - Not as I know of I don't.

1820

1821 Mr. Archer - I saw one go down the street the other day and it was only on two (2)
1822 wheels, I think it had four (4) wheels, but it was standing straight up in the air.

1823

1824 Mr. Jernigan - Okay. Most of my stuff is A-1, but they've got some tracks...

1825

1826 Mr. Archer - This one went right by my house.

1827

1828 Mr. Jernigan - ...they've got a track right across from some of my neighbors. The
1829 police have been out there seven (7) times. I mean they run those things wide, they've built a
1830 course out there and right now that is nothing we can do with. I mean there is no problem.

1831
1832 Mr. Vanarsdall - I want to bring up something else. Have you had any problem with
1833 using this, your ID card?
1834
1835 Mr. Jernigan - No.
1836
1837 Mr. Archer - No.
1838
1839 Mr. Vanarsdall - Have you tried it everywhere?
1840
1841 Mr. Archer - I usually just come in the back way.
1842
1843 Mr. Jernigan - No, I haven't tried, I came in this door tonight.
1844
1845 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay. Bonnie did you say you could come in this door.
1846
1847 Mrs. Jones - I use it in the garage.
1848
1849 Mr. Vanarsdall - And that is the only place it will work.
1850
1851 Mrs. Jones - I use it elsewhere.
1852
1853 Mr. Vanarsdall - Tommy told me tonight his won't work anywhere.
1854
1855 Mr. Branin - No, this door. This is the only door I can get in. This is the only door
1856 that you guys will let me in. That's sad.
1857
1858 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay. I will take care of that.
1859
1860 Mr. Archer - Mine works real good.
1861
1862 Mr. Kaechele - Mr. Chairman or Randy, this case still contains with the last case we did,
1863 contains the cash proffers. So we're...
1864
1865 Mr. Archer - One of mine did too.
1866
1867 Mr. Silber - I noticed that and ...
1868
1869 Mr. Kaechele - Okay.
1870
1871 Mr. Silber - ...that would not be recommended onto the board. No, sir.
1872
1873 Mr. Kaechele - So they can take that out.
1874
1875 Mr. Archer - They can take it out at the Board level, yeah. I think if they pay it you
1876 should keep it, though.
1877
1878 Mr. Silber - I do have one additional item, Mr. Chairman. I'm passing down to you
1879 information on the upcoming 4th Annual Richmond Regional PDC Planning Commissioners Forum.
1880 Packets have your name on it. If you recall the PDC has these, coordinates these Planning
1881 Commissioners Forums once a year. This is a one day, I think it might be more like a half day
1882 forum. This one will be held in Ashland, VA on June 3rd. We need to know if you are interested
1883 in going so we can...

1884
1885 Mr. Vanarsdall - I've already signed up with your secretary. I gave...
1886
1887 Mr. Archer - I will have to check my calendar.
1888
1889 Mr. Silber - Check your calendar.
1890
1891 Mr. Vanarsdall - I gave that form to Regina the other day. I hope that was already.
1892
1893 Mr. Silber - That was fine. The others need to let me know.
1894
1895 Mr. Archer - Who is hosting it this year? Hanover?
1896
1897 Mr. Vanarsdall - Hanover.
1898
1899 Mr. Archer - I got a email or something
1900
1901 Mr. Vanarsdall - Randolph Macon, the whole chapel, second floor. I already turned mine
1902 in to go.
1903
1904 Mr. Silber - We just need to know by next Wednesday, so we can get the form in.
1905 Okay.
1906
1907 Mr. Archer - Yes, sir.
1908
1909 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.
1910
1911 Mr. Silber - Thank you. That is all I have at this point.
1912
1913 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
1914
1915 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for adjournment.
1916
1917 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1918
1919 Mr. Vanarsdall - Adjourned.

1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931

Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairman

Randall R. Silber, Secretary