

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico, Virginia,  
2 held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the Government Center at Parham and  
3 Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, December 19, 2001.

4

5 Members Present:                    Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Chairperson (Fairfield)  
6    Ms. Elizabeth G. Dwyer, C.P.C., Vice Chairperson (Tuckahoe)  
7    Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C. (Brookland)  
8    Mr. Allen Taylor, P. E., C.P.C. (Three Chopt)  
9    Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C. (Varina)  
10     Mr. David A. Kaechele, Board of Supervisors Representative  
11    (Three Chopt)

12

13 Others Present:                    Mr. John R. Marles, AICP, Director of Planning, Secretary  
14    Mr. Randall R. Silber, Assistant Director of Planning  
15    Mr. David D. O'Kelly, Jr., Principal Planner  
16    Ms. Leslie A. News, CLA, County Planner  
17    Mr. James P. Strauss, CLA, County Planner  
18    Mr. E. J. (Ted) McGarry, III, County Planner  
19    Mr. Kevin D. Wilhite, AICP, County Planner  
20    Mr. Michael F. Kennedy, County Planner  
21    Ms. Christina L. Goggin, County Planner  
22    Mr. Todd Eure, Assistant Traffic Engineer  
23    Ms. Diana B. Carver, Recording Secretary

24

25 **Mr. David A. Kaechele, the Board of Supervisors Representative, abstains on all cases**  
26 **unless otherwise noted.**

27

28 Mr. Archer -                    The Planning Commission will come to order. Good morning everyone. I  
29 would like to recognize the members of the press, if anyone is present. Okay. Consider yourself  
30 recognized. Before we get started, I do have an administrative task that I need to take of. So, with  
31 that, I will ask Ms. Dwyer if you would join me at the podium, please. I wrote this yesterday just to  
32 give myself a reference point. But, on January 11, 1996, Elizabeth Dwyer began her tenure here as  
33 Tuckahoe District Planning Commissioner. I know because that was also my first meeting. I don't  
34 know if she was as petrified as I was, but it was comforting to know that there was another rookie with  
35 whom I could share my lack of knowledge. You know there is no formal training for this job, but  
36 whatever there was we did it together. My immediate goal, I don't know what hers was, but my  
37 immediate goal was just to get up to the level of being merely incompetent. And, it would be in poor  
38 taste of me to say whether or not I reached that goal before she did. But, nonetheless, we did go on to  
39 take CPC, which I think stands for Competent Planning Commissioner, and we got out at the same  
40 time.

41

42 Being a Planning Commissioner is a position of public service and, as all my colleagues, Elizabeth has  
43 been a fine example of a public servant. Her contributions to new and innovative concepts will be  
44 utilized by all who participate in the Planning process, at least in Henrico, for many years to come.  
45 Elizabeth, I'm sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that after almost six years, and by my  
46 count is somewhere between 144 and 175 meetings, that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to have  
47 served with you on the Planning Commission and that Henrico is better for your being here. So, on

48 behalf of the Planning Commission and the entire Planning Staff, I would like to present to you with this  
49 small memento recognizing your service her.

50

51 Ms. Dwyer - Thank you.

52

53 Mr. Archer - Thank you. You have five minutes. Is there any opposition?

54

55 Ms. Dwyer - "Hardy Trees & Shrubs." Christina and I were just talking about this yesterday  
56 on the phone. Oh, how wonderful, staff signed it. Thank you so much. It's beautiful. Well, I would  
57 like to take a few minutes to extend my thank you, since someone called for a speech. It's been a real  
58 privilege and honor to serve these past six years and I would like to thank Pat O'Bannon for having the  
59 confidence in me to appoint me those six years. I've been very proud to serve with Pat, whom I  
60 respect as a politician who has the rare combination of integrity and diligence and intelligence. Even  
61 though she is not here, I would like for her to receive the thanks. I just wanted to mention her. I want  
62 to thank my colleagues on the Commission with whom I have served over the years. It's been a real  
63 pleasure and I've learned a great deal from you. Particularly, I want to thank staff. I've come over the  
64 years to have a tremendous respect for staff for what you do everyday. It's been a lot of talk these  
65 days about unsung heros and I really think you make such a tremendous contribution to Henrico County  
66 and no one, except those that work with you directly everyday, I know that I have probably done  
67 enough over the years to express my appreciation for the hard work that you do and all of the heart that  
68 you put into your work. But, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for teaching me and  
69 having patience with me over the years as well as for the contributions you make to all of Henrico  
70 County. Thank you.

71

72 Now, Chris and I are just going to exchange gifts with each other today. We didn't bring anything for  
73 anyone else, so sorry. But, Chris, this is a small token of our esteem and our appreciation.

74

75 Mr. Archer - It's not supposed to be today.

76

77 Ms. Dwyer - I know, but sometimes it's done in January and I wanted a chance to do it  
78 before I left. A small token of our appreciation for your service as an enlightened and lighthearted but  
79 serious, when appropriate, Chairman of the Planning Commission this past year.

80

81 Mr. Archer - Well, thank you so very much, I appreciate that. I don't have to open it do I?

82

83 Ms. Dwyer - Sure you do. Go on and open it.

84 Mr. Archer - I'll try not to tear this paper because I can use this to wrap a Christmas gift.

85

86 Mr. Vanarsdall - You can use the ribbon too.

87

88 Mr. Archer - Ahhh, this is really nice. "Great Projects." "The Epic Story of the Building of  
89 America from the Taming of the Mississippi to the Invention of the Internet." This is very nice. Thank  
90 you so much.

91

92 Mr. Vanarsdall - We signed that one too.

93

94 Mr. Archer - Okay. It is signed. I think I'll take the time and read all of these right now.

95 Thank you so much, all of you. I appreciate that. Does this include Virginia Center too? Gosh, now I  
96 feel like we need a brief recess. Well, Mr. Secretary, I have no idea where we are so I'll just turn this  
97 over to you and let you go with it from this point.

98

99 Mr. Marles - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commission  
100 members, ladies and gentlemen. The first item on the agenda is the Request for Deferrals and  
101 Withdrawals and those will be presented by Mr. Michael Kennedy.

102

103 Mr. Kennedy - Good morning ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to present the requests for  
104 deferrals and withdrawals this month. The first request is on page six of your agenda.

105

106 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL**

107

POD-15-75

Reynolds Metal – W.

Broad Street – 6603 & 6605

W. Broad Street

**Hirschler Fleischer:** Request for approval of a transfer of approval,  
as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County  
Code, from Reynolds Metals Company to Reynolds Development,  
LLC. The 19.384 acre site is located on the west side of Broad  
Street (U.S. Route 250) bounded by Glenside Drive and I-64 on  
parcels 92-A-19 and 92-A-20. The zoning is M-1, Light Industrial  
District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

108

109 Mr. Kennedy - The applicant requests deferral to the January 23, 2002, Planning Commission meeting.

110

111 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral of this transfer of  
112 approval request for POD-15-75, Reynolds Metal – W. Broad Street? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

113

114 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I will move that transfer of approval for POD-15-75, Reynold  
115 Metals on W. Broad Street, be deferred to January 23 at the request of the applicant.

116

117 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

118

119 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
120 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

121

122 Mr. Kennedy - Excuse me. I was just told that they have requested it until further notice. So, if you  
123 could amend your motion. They are still in the process of settlement. They don't know if they will close  
124 before the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

125

126 Mr. Taylor - Fine. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the transfer of approval to be  
127 deferred until further notice.

128

129 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

130

131 Mr. Archer - Okay. The motion was by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Ms. Dwyer that the  
132 deferral be until further notice. All in favor say aye...all opposed nay. The ayes have it.

133

134 Mr. Vanarsdall - Why did you say it was deferred until further notice?

**December 19, 2001**

**-3-**

135

136 Mr. Kennedy - There are settlement issues.

137

138 Mr. Vanarsdall - So, we don't need a date?

139

140 Mr. Kennedy - So, we don't need a date. It's just postponed until they are ready.

141

142 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay.

143

144 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred the transfer of approval request for  
145 POD-15-75, Reynolds Metals – W. Broad Street, until further notice.

146

#### 147 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

148

LP/POD-13-01

Smith Turf – Dabney Road

**Balzer & Associates, Inc.:** Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 2.1 acre site is located at 2203 Dabney Road on parcel 116-A-56B. The zoning is M-1, Light Industrial District and M-2, General Industrial District. **(Brookland)**

149

150 Mr. Kennedy - The applicant requests deferral to January 23, 2002.

151

152 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this deferment, LP/POD-13-  
153 01, Smith Turf, landscape plan? No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.

154

155 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that LP/POD-13-01, Smith Turf – Dabney Road, be deferred to  
156 January 23, 2002, at the applicant's request.

157

158 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

159

160 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in  
161 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

162

163 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred the landscape plan for LP/POD-13-  
164 01, Smith Turf – Dabney Road, to its January 23, 2002, meeting.

165

#### 166 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & LIGHTING PLAN**

167 **(Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

168

POD-78-01

Rigsby Road Retail Shops

**QMT Corporation for Than Phan & Lan Thi Huynh:** Request for approval of a plan of development and lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a one-story, 3,814 square foot retail building. The .41 acre site is located on the south line of Rigsby Road approximately 60 feet east of Pinehaven Road on parcels 92-9-B-8 and part of 102-10-B-1. The zoning is B-2, Business District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

**December 19, 2001**

169

170 Mr. Kennedy - The applicant requests deferral to January 23, 2002.

171

172 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this deferment, POD-78-01,  
173 Rigsby Road Retail Shops? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

174

175 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move that POD-78-01, Rigsby Road Retail Shops, be  
176 deferred to January 23, 2002, at the applicant's request.

177

178 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

179

180 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
181 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

182

183 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-78-01, Rigsby Road Retail  
184 Shops, to its January 23, 2002, meeting.

185

186

186 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

187

POD-84-01

Walgreens – Nuckols Road  
and Twin Hickory Lane

**Balzer & Associates, Inc. for CK Concourse Associates, LLC  
and G.H.K. Development, Inc.:** Request for approval of a plan of  
development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the  
Henrico County Code, to construct a 14,490 square foot retail  
building on an outparcel of a future community shopping center. The  
1.905 acre site is located on the northeast corner of Nuckols Road  
and Twin Hickory Lane on part of parcel 18-A-22D. The zoning is  
B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer.  
**(Three Chopt)**

188

189 Mr. Kennedy - This is the last one for deferral. The applicant requests deferral to January 23, 2002.

190

191 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this deferment, POD-84-01,  
192 Walgreens – Nuckols Road and Twin Hickory Lane? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

193

194 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move that POD-84-01, Walgreens – Nuckols Road and Twin  
195 Hickory Lane, be deferred to January 23, 2002, at the applicant's request.

196

197 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

198

199 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
200 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

201

202 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-84-01, Walgreens – Nuckols  
203 Road and Twin Hickory Lane, to its January 23, 2002, meeting.

204

205 Mr. Archer - All right. Mr. Secretary.

206

207 Mr. Marles - The next item on the agenda is the Expedited Agenda. Again, this will be  
208 presented by Mr. Kennedy.

209

210 Mr. Kennedy - Ladies and gentlemen, the first item on the Expedited Agenda is on page 7.

211

212

212 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & ALTERNATIVE FENCE HEIGHT**

213 **(Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

214

POD-77-01  
Staples Mill South - Storage  
Lot – School Avenue  
(POD-112-88 Expired)

**Foster & Miller, P.C. for Staples Mill South Mini-Storage Associates:** Request for approval of a plan of development and alternative fence height, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-95(1)(5) of the Henrico County Code to construct an automobile, truck, recreational vehicle, and boat storage facility and construct a seven-foot-high fence in the front yard. The 1.19 acre site is located on the northern terminus of School Avenue, approximately 105 feet north of Aspen Avenue on parcel 82-A-41. The zoning is M-1, Light Industrial District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

215

216 Mr. Kennedy - There is an addendum item for this case to delete a condition.

217

218 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to POD-77-01, Staples Mill  
219 South – Storage Lot? No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.

220

221 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that POD-77-01, Staples Mill South – Storage Lot – School Avenue,  
222 be approved with the following conditions Nos. 23 through 32 and delete condition No. 33 that's on  
223 the addendum.

224

225 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

226

227 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in  
228 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

229

230 The Planning Commission approved the plan of development and alternative fence height for POD-77-  
231 01, Staples Mill South – Storage Lot – School Avenue (POD-118-88 Expired) subject to the standard  
232 conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the  
233 following additional conditions:

234

235 23. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and  
236 Division of Fire.

237 24. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form  
238 acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.

239 **25.** Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be  
240 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the  
241 Department of Public Works.

242 26. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved by  
243 the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.

244 27. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the  
245 curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The elevations  
246 will be set by Henrico County.

247 28. No storage of wrecked or inoperative vehicles shall be permitted.

248 29. The construction plans for the storage lot shall include the design of School Avenue, which shall  
249 meet County standards.

**December 19, 2001**

**-7-**

- 250 30. A letter of credit sufficient to cover the cost of the School Avenue construction from Aspen  
251 Avenue to parcel 82-A-42 shall be approved and in force prior to construction plan approval.  
252 31. The applicant shall construct School Avenue when any POD approval for parcels 82-A-42 and  
253 43 requires access to School Avenue or when requested by the County.  
254 32. A landscape plan shall be submitted and approved with the construction plans.  
255 ~~32. The fence section within the 25-foot minimum front yard shall be black vinyl clad chain link.~~

256

257 **SUBDIVISION**

258

Hunton Park, Phase 2 **Foster & Miller, P.C. for Star City Land & Development**  
(A dedication of a 2500-foot **Company, L.C.:** The 4.519 acre site is located between Staples Mill  
portion of Hunton Park Road (U.S. Route 33) and Mill Road on part of parcel 21-A-2 and  
Boulevard from Phase 1 to its part of 13-A-24. The zoning is O/SC, Office/Service District  
eastern terminus) (Conditional). **(Brookland) 0 Lot**  
(December 2001 Plan)

259

260 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone present in opposition to this subdivision, Hunton Park, Phase 2?  
261 No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.

262

263 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move subdivision Hunton Park, Phase 2 (A dedication of a 2500-foot portion  
264 of Hunton Park Boulevard from Phase 1 to its eastern terminus) (December 2001 Plan) be approved  
265 with the annotations on the plans and condition No. 11, as recommended by staff.

266

267 Mr. Taylor - Second.

268

269 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in  
270 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

271

272 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Hunton Park, Phase 2 (A  
273 dedication of a 2500-foot portion of Hunton Park Boulevard from Phase 1 to its eastern terminus)  
274 (December 2001 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions not  
275 served by public utilities and the following additional condition.

276

277 11. The road construction plans shall accurately show the cemetery location, methods of protection  
278 and access from Hunton Park Boulevard.

279

280

280 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

281

LP/POD-59-00

Airport Homewood Suites –S.  
Airport Drive

**Dean E. Hawkins, ASLA for Shamin RIC Hospitality L.C.:** Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 5.0 acre site is located on the east line of S. Airport Drive, approximately 350 feet north of its intersection with Audubon Drive on parcel 163-A-19DN. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial District (Conditional), B-3C, Business District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. **(Varina)**

282

283 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to the landscape plan for  
284 LP/POD-59-00, Airport Homewood Suites – S. Airport Drive? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

285

286 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve landscape plan, LP/POD-59-00,  
287 Airport Homewood Suites, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for  
288 landscape plans on the Expedited Agenda.

289

290 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

291

292 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
293 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

294

295 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-59-00, Airport Homewood  
296 Suites, S. Airport Drive, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions attached to  
297 these minutes for landscape plans.

298

299 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

300

LP/POD-17-01

Gayton Business Center,  
Phase 8- Gayton Centre  
Drive

**James River Nursery for E. Carlton Wilton:** Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 1.06 acre site is located at 2551 Gayton Centre Drive on parcel 65-A-12B. The zoning is B-3, Business District. **(Tuckahoe)**

301

302 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this expedited item, LP/POD-  
303 17-01, Gayton Business Center, Phase 8 – Gayton Centre Drive? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

304

305 Ms. Dwyer - I move approval of LP/POD-17-01, Gayton Business Center, Phase 8, subject  
306 to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for landscaping.

307

308 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

309 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
310 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

311

312 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD17-01, Gayton Business Center,  
313 Phase 8 – Gayton Centre Drive, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions

314 attached to these minutes for landscape plans.

315

316 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

317

<p>LP/POD-35-98  Wilton Canterbury Green  Office – 10611 Patterson  Avenue</p>	<p><b>James River Nursery for Wilton Properties, Inc.:</b> Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 0.66 site is located southwest of the intersection of Patterson Avenue and Pump Road in the Canterbury Green Shopping Center on part of parcel 89-A-17. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional).  <b>(Tuckahoe)</b></p>
--	--

318

319 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this expedited item, LP/POD-320 35-98, Wilton Canterbury Green Office? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

321

322 Ms. Dwyer - May I just ask one question, Christina?

323

324 Ms. Goggin - Yes, ma'am.

325

326 Ms. Dwyer - We talked about the hollies on the corner.

327

328 Ms. Goggin - I spoke to Michael Hilderbrand yesterday, and he indicated to me that the little 329 red hollies go up to 10 feet in height, and they have red berries to feed birds.

330

331 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval of LP/POD-35-98, Wilton Canterbury 332 Green Office, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for landscape plans and 333 additional condition No. 6

334

335 Mr. Taylor - Second.

336

337 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor 338 say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

339

340 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-35-98, Wilton Canterbury Green 341 Office – 10611 Patterson Avenue, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions 342 attached to these minutes for landscape plans and the following additional condition:

343

344 6. The wooden fence running parallel with the project's southern property line will be repaired, at 345 a minimum, along the length of the site's southern boundary line (approximately 235 feet).

346 **SUBDIVISION**

347

<p>Chappell Ridge @  Wyndham Forest  (December 2001 Plan)</p>	<p><b>Youngblood, Tyler &amp; Associates, P.C. for Thoris G. Starke, Betsy S. Hasteley, HHHunt Homes and HHHunt Corporation:</b> The 5.93 acre site is located on the south line of Chappell Ridge Place and the east line of Twin Hickory Road on parcels 18-A-23, 11-A-02 and 11-3-A-2, 3 and 4. The zoning is R-3C and R-3AC, One-Family Residence Districts (Conditional). County water and</p>
---	---

sewer. (Three Chopt)  
**16 Lots**

348

349 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this expedited item,  
350 subdivision Chappell Ridge @ Wyndham Forest (December 2001 Plan)? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.  
351

352 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of Chappell Ridge @ Wyndham Forest  
353 (December 2001 Plan) on the expedited agenda.

354

355 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

356

357 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
358 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

359

360 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Chappell Ridge @ Wyndham  
361 Forest (December 2001 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for  
362 subdivisions served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional  
363 conditions:

364

365 12. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the 20-foot-  
366 wide common area along Twin Hickory Road shall be submitted to the Planning Office for  
367 review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.

368 13. The proffers approved as part of zoning cases C-32C-01 and C-18C-99 shall be incorporated  
369 in this approval.

370 14. Prior to requesting the final approval, a draft of the covenants and deed restrictions for the  
371 maintenance of the common area by a homeowners association shall be submitted to the  
372 Planning Office for review. Such covenants and restrictions shall be in form and substance  
373 satisfactory to the County Attorney and shall be recorded prior to recordation of the subdivision  
374 plat.

375

376

376 **LIGHTING PLAN**

377

LP/POD-69-00  
Kings Crossing, Phase V  
Castile Road

**William H. Spell, LLC for Weinstein Associates:** Request for approval of a lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 11.6 acre site is located on the south line of Castile Road, approximately 630 feet east of Pump Road on parcels 99-A-7, 58C and part of 89-A-28B. The zoning is R-5, General Residence District. **(Tuckahoe)**

378

379 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to this expedited item, lighting  
380 plan, LP/POD-69-00, Kings Crossing, Phase V – Castile Road? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

381

382 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of LP/POD-69-00, Kings Crossing, Phase  
383 V, lighting plan, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for lighting plans.

384

385

386 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

387

388 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
389 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the motion is granted.

390

391 The Planning Commission approved the lighting plan for LP/POD-69-00, Kings Crossing, Phase V –  
392 Castile Road, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions attached to these  
393 minutes for lighting plans.

394

395 **LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN**

396

LP/POD-18-00  
Overlook, Phase II

**Koontz-Bryant for Overlook at Brook Run Associates, L.P.:** Request for approval of a landscape and lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24.106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 13.8 acre site is located on the east line of Brook Run Drive approximately 1,200 feet west of its intersection with Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) on part parcel 95-A-2C, and part of 84-A-5 NR. The zoning is R-6, General Residential District. **(Fairfield)**

397

398 Mr. Kennedy - Ladies and gentlemen, this is the last item on the Expedited Agenda, the landscape and  
399 lighting plan for LP/POD-18-00, Overlook, Phase II and there is an addendum item. The addendum  
400 deletes the lighting plan from review at this time.

401

402 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to LP/POD-18-00, Overlook,  
403 Phase II? No opposition.

404

405 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Chairman, I have a quick comment for the Secretary. There is another  
406 project called Overlook in the Three Chopt district. So, I'm wondering how we keep the names  
407 straight. I know that in the past we have been concerned about having so many similar names. We had  
408 Cameron and Camden and all those. So, I just thought I mention that.

409

410 Mr. Marles - I wasn't aware of that, Ms. Dwyer, but that's certainly something we do try to  
411 avoid. I don't know how it got through this time.

412

413 Ms. Dwyer - Well, the one in Three Chopt is office and this is not.

414

415 Mr. Archer - That's very observant, Ms. Dwyer.

416

417 Mr. Kennedy - The Overlook in Innsbrook is an office building and I believe "Office" is in the title.

418

419 Ms. Dwyer - So, we allow that?

420

421 Mr. Kennedy - Yes.

422

423 Ms. Dwyer - It still would be confusing for the Fire Department and whatever.

424

425 Mr. Kennedy - Actually, next month it will get even worse because we will have New Bridge Baptist  
426 Church coming back and there are actually two different New Bridge Baptist Churches in the County  
427 and we don't know how to change those names.

428

429 Ms. Dwyer - It's first New Bridge and second New Bridge.

430

431 Mr. Archer - Okay. With that, I will move approval of LP/POD-18-00, Overlook, Phase II,  
432 subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for landscape plans and the language  
433 contained in this morning's addendum.

434

435 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

436

437 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in  
438 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. That motion is granted.

439

440 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-18-00, Overlook, Phase II,  
441 subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions attached to these minutes for  
442 landscape plans.

443

444 Mr. Kennedy - That concludes all of the cases on the Expedited Agenda.

445

446 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. All right, Mr. Secretary, where are we, sir?

447

448 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda are the subdivision extensions of  
449 conditional approval. This information will be presented by Mr. Wilhite. And the first one is being  
450 presented for informational purposes only.

451

452 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

453

454 **(FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSE ONLY)**

455

Subdivision	Magisterial	Original No.	Remaining	Previous	Year(s)
December 19, 2001					

	District	of Lots	Lots	Extensions	Extended
Cedar Park, Sec. 2 (November 1997 Plan)	Fairfield	7	7	3	1 Year 12/18/02

456

457

458 **FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

459

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
Dakota Estates (May 2000 Plan)	Varina	80	80	1	10 Months 10/23/02
*Eddleton Estates	Three Chopt	10	5	6	
*Laura Woods (Dec. 1992 Plan)	Three Chopt	5	5	8	
*Lakefield (Sept. 1986 Plan)	Varina	92	30	15	

460

461 Mr. Archer - Mr. Wilhite, good morning.

462

463 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. The subdivisions being granted for conditional extension is Cedar  
464 Park, Section 2, in the Fairfield District. Also on the agenda was listed four subdivisions for Planning  
465 Commission extension. Three of those have dropped off. The only one that you have to act on today is  
466 Dakota Estates (May 2000 Plan) in the Varina District. Staff is recommending extension for 10 months,  
467 until October 23, 2002. There is an addendum condition on page 1 of your addendum. The condition  
468 states: This development shall meet all ordinance requirements in effect as of the date of this extension.  
469 With that condition, staff would recommend approval of Dakota Estates (May 2000 Plan). The other  
470 three Eddleton Estates, Laura Woods and Lakefield, we did not get requests for extension for those  
471 three.

472

473 Mr. Archer - Okay, Mr. Secretary, do we need to take any further action?

474

475 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, I believe you would have to vote on Dakota Estates.

476

477 Mr. Archer - All right. Mr. Jernigan.

478

479 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to extend Dakota Estates subdivision plan for  
480 10 months, plus the addendum.

481

482 Mr. Taylor - Second.

483

484 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in  
485 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

486

487 The Planning Commission granted extension of conditional approval for Dakota Estates (May 2000  
**December 19, 2001**

488 Plan) for 10 months, October 23, 2002.

489

490 Ms. Dwyer - Do we need to vote on the other subdivision extensions?

491

492 Mr. Marlles - I believe Mr. Wilhite said no request for extension was requested so I would  
493 think you would not have to vote on that.

494

495 Mr. Archer - All right. The next item, Mr. Secretary.

496

497 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from then November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

498

POD-85-96

The Cameron at Virginia  
Center, Phase I  
(Formerly The Chesapeake  
at Virginia Center, Phase 1)

**Patrick J. Lally for Real Estate Advisory:** Request for approval  
of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106  
of the Henrico County Code, from Virginia Center, Inc. and Security  
Capital Atlanta, Inc. to Real Estate Advisory. The 18.7 acre site is  
located on the northwest corner of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) and  
Virginia Center Parkway on parcels 32-A-102 and 103. The zoning  
is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional). County water  
and sewer.

**(Fairfield)**

499

500 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to the transfer of approval  
501 request for POD-85-96, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase I? No opposition. Good morning,  
502 Mr. McGarry.

503

504 Mr. McGarry - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. The property closed on  
505 Monday, so it is eligible to be transferred. Staff can recommend the transfer of approval. All of the  
506 discrepancies that were found on the site had been corrected prior to the actual conveyance of the  
507 property. So, staff can recommend approval.

508

509 Mr. Archer - Are there any questions of Mr. McGarry by Commission members?

510

511 Ms. Dwyer I would just mention the same issue with the names. We have Cameron for a  
512 number of apartments, Cameron and Camden. So, I just thought I would point that out. Maybe you  
513 want to be more vigilant about names that are the same, even though it may be apartments versus office.

514

515 Mr. Marlles - Yes, ma'am.

516

517 Mr. Archer - There are different phases of this particular project, are there not, Ted?

518

519 Mr. McGarry - Yes, sir. The second phase is the next item on your agenda.

520

521 Mr. Archer - Well, I knew about that one, I was just wondering about the others. Are the  
522 editors associated as far as we know?

523

524 Mr. McGarry - The original Cameron's are all under one ownership, and they fought hard to keep the  
525 same name throughout the County.

**December 19, 2001**

**-15-**

526

527 Mr. Archer - Well, I guess that explains a part of it anyway.

528

529 Mr. McGarry - And now that entity that developed both of them is selling off this one.

530

531 Mr. Archer - Okay. With that, I move approval of this transfer of approval POD-85-96,  
532 The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase I.

533

534 Ms. Dwyer - Second.

535

536 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in  
537 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

538

539 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-85-96, The Cameron at  
540 Virginia Center, Phase I (Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase I) from Virginia Center,  
541 Inc. and Security Capital Atlanta, Inc. to Real Estate Advisory with the standard conditions and  
542 additional conditions previously approved on the original POD.

543

544 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

545

POD-20-98

The Cameron at Virginia  
Center, Phase II  
(Formerly The Chesapeake  
at Virginia Center, Phase II)

**Patrick J. Lally for Real Estate Advisory:** Request for approval  
of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106  
of the Henrico County Code, from Virginia Center, Inc. and Security  
Capital Atlanta, Inc. to Real Estate Advisory. The 6.3 acre site is  
located on the northwest corner of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) and  
Virginia Center Parkway on part of parcels 33-A-9 and 8. The  
zoning is R-6C, General Residence District (Conditional). County  
water and sewer.

**(Fairfield)**

546

547 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to the transfer of approval  
548 request for POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase II? No opposition. Mr. McGarry.

549

550 Mr. McGarry - This is the same situation with the second phase as we had with the first. Staff can  
551 recommend transfer of approval.

552

553 Mr. Archer - Are there any questions of Mr. McGarry by Commission members? Hearing  
554 none, I move approval of the transfer of approval for POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia, Phase II.

555

556 Mr. Taylor - Second.

557

558 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor  
559 say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

560

561 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-20-98, The Cameron at  
562 Virginia Center, Phase II (Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase II) from Virginia Center,  
563 Inc. and Security Capital Atlanta, Inc. to Real Estate Advisory with the standard conditions and

**December 19, 2001**

**-16-**

564 additional conditions previously approved on the original POD.

565

566 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

567

POD-113-78

POD-69-77

POD-79-73

Holiday Inn – W. Broad  
Street

**John A. Wilson for Columbia Properties Virginia, Ltd.:** Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from W. B. Johnson Properties to Columbia Properties Virginia Ltd. The 6.67 acre site is located along the west line of W. Broad Street (U. S. Route 250), approximately 1,600 feet north of Horsepen Road on parcel 92-A-28. The zoning is B-3, Business District, B-2, Business District and R-6, General Residence District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

568

569 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to the transfer of approval  
570 request for POD-113-78, POD-69-77 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn – W. Broad Street? No  
571 opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

572

573 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. I just met with John Wilson, the representative, this morning and  
574 we have come to an agreement on this transfer. This site hotel is currently closed for extensive  
575 renovations, and they contemplate, following a new landscape and lighting plan, for approval. We have  
576 agreed that staff can recommend transfer of approval with an added condition, which I'll state verbally.  
577 "A Letter of Credit shall be posted to ensure that the site deficiencies, as identified in the inspector's  
578 report dated October 15, 2001, shall be corrected by June 30, 2002." They expect the site to be  
579 closed or reopen about the end of May and the beginning of June. Staff would recommend approval of  
580 this transfer request.

581

582 Mr. Archer - Are there any questions of Mr. Wilhite by Commission members? All right, Mr.  
583 Taylor.

584

585 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval of the transfer authority POD-113-78, POD-  
586 69-77 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn – W. Broad Street, with the added condition on the letter of  
587 credit.

588

589 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

590

591 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
592 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

593

594 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-113-78, POD-69-77  
595 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn – W. Broad Street, from W. B. Johnson Properties to Columbia  
596 Properties Virginia Ltd. with the standard conditions and additional conditions previously approved on  
597 the original POD and the following additional condition:

598

599 1. A Letter of Credit shall be posted to ensure that the site deficiencies as identified in the  
600 inspector's report dated October 15, 2001, shall be corrected by June 30, 2002.

601

602 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

603

POD-61-90  
Glen Eagles Shopping  
Center – Ridgefield  
Parkway

**Blackwood Development Company for Richfield Associates, LLC:** Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from Richmond Glen Eagle Association and Paragon Group to Richfield Associates, LLC. The 12.42 acre site is located at the northeast intersection of Ridgefield Parkway and Glen Eagles Drive on parcel 66-A-11F. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer.  
**(Tuckahoe)**

604

605 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone present in opposition to the transfer of approval  
606 request for POD-61-90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center –Ridgefield Parkway? No opposition. Mr.  
607 Wilhite.

608

609 Mr. Wilhite - Approximately three quarters of the site deficiencies identified have been  
610 corrected at this point. Staff can recommend approval of this transfer with the condition that appears on  
611 page 1 of your addendum. The condition states: The site deficiencies, as identified in the inspector's  
612 report dated June 8, 2001, shall be corrected by January 31, 2002.

613

614 Mr. Archer - Are there any questions of Mr. Wilhite by Commission members? All right,  
615 Ms. Dwyer.

616

617 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the transfer of approval for POD-61-  
618 90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center, including the condition listed on our addendum.

619

620 Mr. Taylor - Second.

621

622 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor  
623 say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

624

625 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-61-90, Glen Eagles  
626 Shopping Center – Ridgefield Parkway, from Richmond Glen Eagle Association and Paragon Group to  
627 Richfield Associates, LLC, with the standard conditions and additional conditions previously approved  
628 on the original POD and the following additional condition:

629

630 1. The site deficiencies, as identified in the inspector's report dated June 8, 2001, shall be  
631 corrected by January 31, 2002.

632

633 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

634

POD-83-01  
The Lodge @ Hunton  
Park

**Foster & Miller, P.C. for Star City Land & Development Company, L.C. and The Hanover Company:** Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct fourteen (14) ~~two, three, and four-story~~ apartment buildings totalling 300 units.

**December 19, 2001**

60 detached garages and a two-story clubhouse. The 32.588 acre site is located on the north line of Hunton Park Boulevard, approximately 1,200 feet east of Staples Mill Road (U.S. Route 33) on part of parcels 12-A-4B, 5 and part of 21-A-2. The zoning is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

635

636 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-83-01, The Lodge @  
637 Hunton Park? No opposition. Mr. McGarry.

638

639 Mr. McGarry - The review of the revised plan by staff is complete, and all issues have been resolved.  
640 Staff can recommend approval subject to the standard conditions, plus conditions Nos. 23 through 30.

641

642 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. McGarry, on the addendum, two, three and four stories are lined through.

643

644 Mr. McGarry - That's correct. It was decided to go ahead and delete reference to the number  
645 of stories because it was confusing. So, it's just a straight 14 apartment buildings.

646

647 Mr. Archer - Are there any further questions or comments? No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.

648

649 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that POD-83-01, The Lodge at Hunton Park be approved with the  
650 annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type and on page two of the  
651 addendum the correction deleting the number of stories. And I would like to add Nos. 9 and 11  
652 amended, and then Nos. 23 through 30 additional conditions.

653

654 Mr. Taylor - Second.

655

656 Mr. Archer - All right. The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr.  
657 Taylor. All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The approval is granted.

658

659 The Planning Commission approved POD-83-01, The Lodge @ Hunton Park, subject to standard  
660 conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the  
661 following additional conditions.

662

663 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review  
664 and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

665 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including depictions  
666 of light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture and specifications and mounting height details  
667 shall be submitted for Planning Office review and Planning Commission approval.

668 23. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and  
669 Division of Fire.

670 24. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-47C-01 shall be incorporated in this  
671 approval.

672 25. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form  
673 acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.

674 26. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be  
675 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the

676 Department of Public Works.  
677 27. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved by  
678 the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.  
679 28. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the  
680 curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The elevations  
681 will be set by Henrico County.  
682 29. The developer shall provide the Planning Office details of the sound suppression requirement of  
683 proffer No. 11 with any building permit application.  
684 30. The owner shall apply for the rezoning of the applicable portions of the property to the C-1,  
685 Conservation District, prior to construction plan approvals as required by proffer No. 14.  
686

686 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

687

POD-82-01  
Millspring Townes,  
Section 1

**Bay Design Group, P.C. for Wilton Development Corporation:**  
Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a total of fifty-seven (57), two-story, residential townhouse units for sale. The 11.13 acre site is located along the west line of Hungary Spring Road, approximately 200 feet north of Olde West Drive on part of parcel 50-A-39. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) and C-1, Conservation District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

688

689 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-82-01, Millspring  
690 Townes, Section 1? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

691

692 Mr. Wilhite- Thank you. This is the first section of an approximately 150-lot townhouse  
693 development. They anticipate developing it in three sections total. I believe that the issues at this point  
694 have been resolved. There is a waterline extension from the Laurel Village Apartments serving this  
695 development and there is a need for Public Utilities to have maintenance access along this waterline,  
696 which will be accomplished with a stone base covered by topsoil and seeded, as well. Proffers for the  
697 rezoning of this property required the elimination of RV parking. We have received a waiver request  
698 and can support the approval of that waiver. The plan annotations show a redesign of the drive in front  
699 of the clubhouse in order to transition from a divided driveway to a standard 24-foot width. There will  
700 be a need for a median break in front of the clubhouse for fire access and also the reorientation or  
701 relocation of parking spaces in front of the clubhouse as well. The applicant has indicated that he  
702 wishes to construct a fence adjacent to Shannon Green Subdivision, along the western property line.  
703 His proffers had stated that there would be a fence on the other sides of this development. This is  
704 something that he is adding to the plan at this point. On page three of your addendum, there is a revised  
705 recommendation of approval. Staff is recommending both the landscape and lighting plan to come back  
706 to you due to the fact the proffers require Planning Commission approval of the landscape plan. Also,  
707 there is an added condition No. 36 requiring written approval from Henrico County Public Schools  
708 prior to approval of the construction plans for any site improvements shown on the Dumbarton  
709 Elementary School property. Mr. Wilton is here if you have any questions of him. Staff can  
710 recommend approval of the plan.

711

712 Mr. Archer - All right, thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Are there any further questions or comments  
713 for Mr. Wilhite?

714

715 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Wilhite, I thought, No. 36, I thought they did the approval before, but they  
716 can't until they get the construction, can they?

717

717 Mr. Wilhite - Typically, at this point, with the POD, we would require a signature on the  
718 application for any property owner where improvements are shown on his property. We don't have  
719 that from the Schools at this time, but we feel confident that we will get that signature, prior to  
720 construction plans.

721

722 Mr. Vanarsdall - I was thinking we would have that ahead of time.

723

724 Mr. Wilhite - That is something that we requested but have not received as of yet.

725

726 Mr. Vanarsdall - Okay.

727

728 Mr. Archer - Are there any further questions? Do you need to hear from the applicant, Mr.  
729 Vanarsdall?

730

731 Mr. Vanarsdall - No. Not, unless someone else does, I don't. I've talked to him about 15 times  
732 about this, but if he wants to come down, he's welcomed to.

733

734 Mr. Wilton - I just wanted to say Merry Christmas to everybody and I wanted to tell Mrs.  
735 Dwyer what a nice job she did and I thank her for all of the directions she has given me over the last six  
736 years.

737

738 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Wilton. All right, Mr. Vanarsdall.

739

740 Mr. Vanarsdall - You know, that was enough to make us approve it right there. I move that  
741 POD-82-01, Millspring Townes, Section 1, be approved with the annotations on the plans, additional  
742 conditions Nos. 23 through 35 and then on the addendum I want to add Nos. 9 and 11 amended and  
743 add condition No. 36.

744

745 Mr. Taylor - Second.

746

747 Mr. Archer - All right. The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr.  
748 Taylor. All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion is granted.

749

750 The Planning Commission approved POD-82-01, Millspring Townes, Section 1, subject to standard  
751 conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the  
752 following additional conditions.

753

754 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review  
755 and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

756 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including depictions  
757 of light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture and specifications and mounting height details  
758 shall be submitted for Planning Office review and Planning Commission approval.

759 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the  
760 County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being  
761 issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County  
762 Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

763 24. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on the

764 plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain must be  
765 labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement." The easement shall be granted to the  
766 County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

767 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and  
768 Division of Fire.

769 26. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the north side of Millstream Parkway.

770 27. Outside storage shall not be permitted.

771 28. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-30C-01 shall be incorporated in this  
772 approval.

773 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form  
774 acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.

775 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be  
776 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the  
777 Department of Public Works.

778 31. The pavement shall be of an SM-2A type and shall be constructed in accordance with County  
779 standard and specifications. The developer shall post a defect bond for all pavement with the  
780 Planning Office - the exact type, amount and implementation shall be determined by the Director  
781 of Planning, to protect the interest of the members of the Homeowners Association. The bond  
782 shall become effective as of the date that the Homeowners Association assumes responsibility  
783 for the common areas.

784 32. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and approved by  
785 the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.

786 33. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the  
787 curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The elevations  
788 will be set by Henrico County.

789 33. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.

790 35. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the Richmond  
791 Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be included on the construction  
792 plans prior to their approval. The standard street name signs shall be ordered from the County  
793 and installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.

794 36. Written approval from the Henrico County Public Schools is required for the proposed  
795 improvements on the Dumbarton Elementary School site prior to Planning Office approval of  
796 the construction plans.

797  
798

798 **SUBDIVISION**

799

Claytonshire  
(December 2001 Plan)

**Wingate & Kestner for Elinor Springs, LLC and Eddleton Estates LLC:** The 7.6 acre site is located along the north line of future Springfield Road, approximately 200 feet east of Linsey Lakes Drive on parcels 29-A-15, 16 and 23. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer.  
**(Brookland) 20 Lots**

800

801 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Claytonshire  
802 (December 2001 Plan)? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

803

804 Mr. Wilhite - In your packet there is a revised plan and a revised map for this project to  
805 address the staff's comments. They have eliminated the stem lot shown on the original plan. They will  
806 have four cul-de-sac lots in the subdivision, which will meet the current lot requirements. They also  
807 show the dedication of a portion of Springfield Road realigned on the plan as well. There are two  
808 additional conditions listed on page four of your addendum. There are a couple of lots that are very  
809 close, as far as buildable area is concerned, and they need to demonstrate to us, prior to final approval,  
810 that they have sufficient room to located homes on these lots. Condition No. 17 addresses a property  
811 boundary dispute with the adjacent Springcreek subdivision, which is already recorded. Apparently,  
812 there may be a 20-foot-strip of Springcreek subdivision actually located on the parcel owned by the  
813 applicant. He is in the process of trying to have that resolved. Condition No. 17 requires that he  
814 provide us documentation of this resolution prior to recordation of any impacted lots in this  
815 development. And if there is any additional portion of that parcel; that it be incorporated into this  
816 subdivision plan with recordation. With the additions of conditions Nos. 16 and 17, staff can  
817 recommend approval of the revised plan.

818

819 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Are there any questions of Mr. Wilhite?

820

821 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Wilhite, how did you get rid of that stem lot? Was that volunteered by the  
822 applicant?

823

824 Mr. Wilhite - We requested that he eliminate it. This subdivision replaces Eddleton Estates,  
825 which was pulled off of the Planning Commission agenda for extension. He was able to adjust lot lines  
826 slightly on adjacent lots. He created a couple of more cul-de-sac lots but was able to eliminate the stem  
827 lot without losing any lots in the subdivision.

828

829 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good. I just wanted to know because we have run into that before and will run  
830 into again. I don't have any more questions.

831

832 Mr. Archer - All right. Do you want to hear from the applicant, Mr. Vanarsdall?

833

834 Ms. Dwyer - What is the nature of the property dispute?

835

836 Mr. Wilhite - Springcreek subdivision, which shows up adjacent to realigned Springfield  
837 Road, on the right hand portion of the map. It is alleged by the applicant that 20 feet of that subdivision  
838 is actually recorded on his parcel due to a survey error. Our tax maps don't reflect this but his

839 subdivision plan does. So, what we have asked for is that he provide us enough evidence to determine  
840 whether or not that strip exists and if there is a dispute, that it be resolved prior to recording those lots in  
841 question.

842

843 Ms. Dwyer - Would that be something the County Attorney would have to approve?

844

845 Mr. Wilhite - I would imagine it's probably going to be a private matter. We would just need  
846 to see documentation that it has been resolved one way or the other.

847

848 Mr. Archer - Okay. Are there any further questions or comments? Do you need to hear  
849 from the applicant, Mr. Vanarsdall?

850

851 Mr. Vanarsdall - No.

852

853 Mr. Archer - All right, we are ready.

854

855 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move subdivision Claytonshire be approved and revised plans dated...  
856 when?

857

858 Mr. Wilhite - We received them Friday, the 14th.

859

860 Mr. Vanarsdall - Revised plans of December 14, 2001, and the annotations on the plans, the  
861 standard conditions for subdivisions of this type, and then on the addendum I want to add conditions  
862 Nos. 16 and 17.

863

864 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

865

866 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in  
867 favor of the motion say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

868

869 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval for subdivision Claytonshire (December 2001  
870 Plan) subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for  
871 subdivisions served by public utilities and the following additional conditions.

872

873 12. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the 25-foot-  
874 wide planting strip easement adjacent to realigned Springfield Road shall be submitted to the  
875 Planning Office for review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.

876 13. The proffers approved as part of zoning cases C-57C-94 and C-3C-96 shall be incorporated  
877 in this approval.

878 14. Prior to final subdivision approval, the applicant shall provide evidence satisfactory to the  
879 County Attorney and the Director of Planning of its legal right to construct lots over top of the  
880 20-foot private road.

881 15. The applicant shall quitclaim his interest in the 20-foot private road prior to recordation of the  
882 subdivision plat.

883 16. Prior to requesting final approval, the engineer shall furnish the Planning staff a plan showing  
884 dwellings situated on Lots 11 and 14 to determine if the lot design is adequate to meet the  
885 requirements of Chapter 24 of the Henrico County Code.

886 17. The applicant shall provide documentation of the resolution of the property dispute concerning  
887 the portion of parcel 29-A-23 abutting Springcreek subdivision prior to recordation of any  
888 impacted lots within this development. Any remaining portion of said parcel shall be  
889 incorporated into the bounds of this subdivision as building lots, dedicated right-of-way, and  
890 area reserved for future development as shown on the staff plan.

891

892 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

893

LP/POD-105-00

Super Wash Car Wash –  
8807 Brook Road

**Balzer & Associates, Inc. for Super Wash Car Wash:** Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 1.247 acre site is located on the east line of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) approximately 210 feet north of Mountain Road on parcel 53-A-24A. The zoning is B-3, Business District and A-1, Agricultural District. **(Fairfield)**

894

895 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this landscape plan, LP/POD-  
896 105-00, Super Wash Car Wash? No opposition. Ms. Goggin.

897

898 Ms. Goggin -

Good morning. I would like to point out that on page five of your addendum  
899 that there is a revised plan and a revised reconsideration for a condition approved at Planning  
900 Commission. The applicant, Mr. Rod Bialkowski, has submitted a landscaping plan and in conjunction  
901 with this landscape plan is requesting reconsideration of the fence location, condition No. 32, for your  
902 approval. With this new plan, the applicant purposes to place a majority of the required landscaping to  
903 the front of the site. In conjunction with this, it would move the fence from literally being completely  
904 around the site to the back 115 feet of the site. That is outlined in yellow on the color overhead. This  
905 fence would start approximately 95 feet east of Brook Road and run approximately 115 feet to the rear  
906 of the main project area. The fence would then follow the eastern project line and ultimately tie into the  
907 eight-foot board on board fence associated with POD-66-01, Brook Road Mini-Storage Auto Storage  
908 Lot, which came before you about three months ago. Staff feels that supplementing the trees with  
909 evergreen shrubs in the front of the building creates the same visual barrier that a fence would. The  
910 landscaping combined with the purposed fence creates a physical barrier to help deter people from  
911 using Super Wash as a cut thru to Telegraph Road. Staff feels that this proposal meets and  
912 incorporates the spirit and intent of the previously approved condition and recommends approval of this  
913 reconsideration as well as approval of the revised plan, the standard conditions for landscape plans and  
914 the applicant has agreed to the following additional condition, should the Planning Commission chose  
915 them. One would be that the "Owners/managers of the site shall continuously and properly maintain all  
916 fences on site in good repair." And the other condition would be "Trash and debris will not be allowed  
917 to accumulate along the fence." For the Planning Commissioners knowledge, I did talk to an adjacent  
918 property owner, Mr. and Mrs. Chewing, who lives just east of Telegraph Road. They have seen the  
919 plan, they are happy with it and they think that anything that we can do to make Brook Road look  
920 better is appreciated and they feel that the landscaping that they are going to see at the rear of the  
921 property is sufficient for them. The applicant is here to speak if you would like to hear from him.

922

923 Mr. Archer -

Thank you, Ms. Goggin. Are there any questions from the Commission  
924 members? Ms. Goggin, we did state that that fence would be a vinyl clad fence.

925

926 Ms. Goggin - A 42-inch, black vinyl coated fence. The Planning Commission previously  
927 approved a decorative style fence as a part of the condition, but in speaking with the applicant and  
928 Police, we were feeling that chain-link would stand a better chance staying up and looking more  
929 attractive in the long run.

930

931 Mr. Archer - Okay. Well, for the benefit of my colleagues on the Commission, Ms. Goggin  
932 and I have discussed this quite extensively, and we feel that having the landscaping moved in the manner  
933 that it has, does enhance the appearance of the site. And, I actually, feel like the chain-link fence would  
934 probably be a better prohibitor of people entering the site from the rear than would any other kind of  
935 decorative fence and probably would require less maintenance. If no one else have a question, then I  
936 will recommend approval of LP/POD-105-00, Super Wash Car Wash, subject to the standard  
937 conditions, the annotations on the plan, the revised condition No. 32 that is an addendum item and the  
938 additional conditions as stated by Ms. Goggin for the maintenance. Do we need to list that as a  
939 condition number or have it in writing?

940

941 Ms. Goggin - I have it down as condition Nos. 5 and 6 but I'll make sure that it is numbered  
942 correctly in the approval letter.

943

944 Mr. Jernigan - I'll second your motion, Mr. Chairman.

945

946 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All in  
947 favor of the motion say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

948

949 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-105-00, Super Wash Car Wash –  
950 8807 Brook Road, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for landscape plans the  
951 annotations on the plans, the revised additional condition No. 32 and the following additional conditions  
952 for the landscape plan.

953

954 5. Owners/managers of the site shall continuously and properly maintain all fences on site in good  
955 repair.

956 6. Trash and debris will not be allowed to accumulate along the fence.

957 **SUBDIVISION**

958

Roundabout Farm  
(December 2001 Plan)

**Engineering Design Associates for Mary B. Wise:** The 11.302  
acre site is located at 8565 Roundabout Road, approximately 600  
feet east of the intersection of Strath Road and Local Street on parcel  
248-A-82A. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well  
and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 2 Lots**

959

960 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Roundabout Farm  
961 (December 2001 Plan)? No opposition. Ms. Goggin.

962

963 Ms. Goggin - The subdivision in front of you today, does meet all minimum requirements for  
964 the district it's located in. Staff did notice some design issues that could effect building design on the  
965 future parcel and potentially any future splits from the parent parcel. Staff has expressed their concern  
966 to the engineer and the applicant, but the applicant is happy with the design that is in front of you today.  
967 If you would like I can express some of the staff's concerns a little bit more. Just for your knowledge,

**December 19, 2001**

**-27-**

968 they are annotated on the plan. Should the Commission act on this, staff recommends approval with the  
969 standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities, but staff would like to Planning  
970 Commission to give directions on the recommendations on the plat.

971

972 Mr. Archer - Are there any questions by the Commission?

973

974 Mr. Jernigan - Ms. Goggin, did you ride down there and look at that?

975

976 Ms. Goggin - I went down there and I looked at it but, like I told you previously, I really  
977 don't like going on acreage by myself.

978

979 Mr. Jernigan - Well, I rode down there and checked it out. Basically, the reason this didn't go  
980 on the Expedited Agenda, was because we wanted to make them aware that they wouldn't have the  
981 chance to do another lot split because of the road frontage. But, after seeing the layout, the property  
982 line comes right up to his driveway now. That's where they had it stake off and I don't think at this time  
983 that he is planning on doing anymore lot splits.

984

985 Ms. Dwyer - If someone wanted to in the future, how would that work?

986

987 Mr. Jernigan - Well, that's the reason that she brought it in here was because they would have  
988 to take that lot and bring it deeper and narrow it up on the road. But, that's the reason we are making  
989 the applicant aware at this time that there will not be anymore lot splits. When you look at Lot 1, right  
990 behind that is a training corral for horses. I guess that's the reason they don't want to run it any deeper.  
991 There will not be anymore lot splits on this property. If he did, he would have to bring it for a variance.  
992 That's the reason we are bringing it today to let them know that this is it.

993

994 Ms. Goggin - Exactly. Just to expand on that a little bit. Lot 2, in the A-1 district, would  
995 need to have 150 feet of lot width at the front yard setback. The design now has only 228 feet, so they  
996 would have to request a variance for lot width. Lot 1, the proposed Lot 1, has a building area of  
997 approximately 50 feet by 320 feet. So, it could come into affect if a person wanted to add an addition  
998 then they go outside their setbacks.

999

1000 Mr. Jernigan - I'm okay with it. I've seen the layout.

1001

1002 Mr. Archer - Okay. Are there any further questions? Do you need to hear from the  
1003 applicant, Mr. Jernigan?

1004

1005 Mr. Jernigan - No, Mr. Chairman. Nothing is going to change on it. Like I said, Ms. Goggin  
1006 and I discussed this earlier just to let the landowner know that there wouldn't be any additional splits.  
1007 So, I would like to make a motion to approve subdivision plan Roundabout Farm subject to the  
1008 annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities.

1009

1010 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

1011

1012 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
1013 favor of the motion say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1014

1015 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval for subdivision Roundabout Farm (December  
1016 2001) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions not served by public  
1017 utilities and the annotations on the plan.

1018

1019 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT RECONSIDERATION**

1020 **(Deferred from the November 28, 2001, Meeting)**

1021

POD-30-99

Reflections of West Creek  
(Formerly Summit Gayton  
Apartments)

**Foster & Miller, P.C. for North Gayton Road Venture, LLLP:**

Request for approval of its reconsideration of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to amend architectural elevations, to relocate two garage buildings, and to amend the name of the project. The 22.649-acre site is located on the east line of Gayton Road Extended on part of parcel 36-A-45 and part of 36-A-43. The zoning is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional) and R-6C, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

1022

1023 Mr. Archer -

Is there anyone here opposed to POD-30-99, Reflections of West Creek? Mr.

1024 Kennedy.

1025

1026 Mr. Kennedy - Ladies and gentlemen, I am back using the portable mike and they have quarantined me  
1027 for coming back and being sick. We have a revised plan, so we need a waiver of time limits. What we  
1028 have done is, in order to ease presentation, I am going to present the plan on your video screen, so you  
1029 don't have to page through more paper. There is a lot of paper attached to this, and I think that it will  
1030 be easier for presentation purposes if you just looked at your screens. What we have done is, I've got  
1031 elevations of the building. The top elevations are going with the primary elevation where they have the  
1032 brick front, and there are brick bases, little brick walls around the front, around the patio. On those  
1033 elevations that don't have brick, it would just be a foundation, brick row on the foundation, but the  
1034 appearance otherwise would be the same on the type #1 building.

1035

1036 On the type #2 buildings where they are smaller buildings, it would just have a single-story of brick  
1037 around on the facing with the brick facing. On those side that don't face the street, it would just be  
1038 again, the foundation brick.

1039

1040 Now I am going to go to the site, which specifies the elevation types. What we have is – the plan  
1041 actually does specify elevation type - this is a very difficult to see – the Commission's previous concerns  
1042 were those buildings that were facing streets, not just the interior streets but those that were visible from  
1043 East/West Summit Road in this location, and visible from North Gayton Road, and the applicant has  
1044 revised his plan to provide brick facing on the side of the building facing this building here (referring to  
1045 slide) facing North Gayton Road Extended, as well as all of those backs of buildings facing East/West  
1046 Summit Road. The Commission's concerns were also extended to the landscape plan and the  
1047 conditions, which was raised by staff about the level of landscaping. For that purpose, the applicant has  
1048 submitted a conceptual landscape plan for the Commission to review as part of this. You do realize that  
1049 a final landscape plan will come back, but they wanted to at least have some sort of commitment to the  
1050 Planning Commission to that effect. In addition to that, the applicant was also asked to address one  
1051 other issue, which was raised by Mr. Taylor regarding noise levels. Staff had raised that concern as  
1052 well about the level of noise that was going to be coming from the Interstate. The biggest part of the site

**December 19, 2001**

**-29-**

1053 is at grade with the Interstate and there is very little landscaping with a limited right of way. The  
1054 applicant has agreed to provide a berm at that location, which will be behind these garages, and that  
1055 berm would provide additional sound buffering, and they put the landscaping in on top of it. So, in  
1056 effect, at those locations we'd have almost 20 feet high sound buffering between the berm and the  
1057 landscaping. Just to go briefly over the landscape plan, it is a two-part landscape plan. Along  
1058 East/West Summit Road, they have a proffered buffer. Along North Gayton Road Extended, which is  
1059 actually a ramp going onto the Interstate and going along the Interstate, they will have the equivalent of a  
1060 25-foot transitional buffer, and basically around the entire perimeter of the property, they have a  
1061 provided 25-foot transitional buffer or the equivalent. Landscape plan to show the balance as it runs  
1062 around the building, the perimeter of the building, around the perimeter of the property. They have  
1063 extended the transitional buffer entirely around the property in keeping with the Commission's  
1064 recommendations as far as multi-family design standards. So, they are in keeping with those design  
1065 standards, even though the plan was originally approved prior to the implementation of those design  
1066 standards.

1067

1068 Just going back to Landscape Plan #1, there is just one single building where they have done a typical  
1069 landscape plan around the front of the building. That landscape plan will be repeated with all of the  
1070 other buildings, so it just a typical at this time, but they do intend to have typical landscaping around the  
1071 building and around – immediately around the building. They have said that they intend to provide  
1072 irrigation, and on the drainage plan, there is an annotation on this plan, but there is an existing BMP as  
1073 you come up North Gayton Road, which is the front of their property, and that BMP is not landscaped  
1074 at this time. They have committed themselves to provide a 25-foot transitional buffer along the BMP as  
1075 it faces North Gayton Road, and they have agreed to provide based on the annotation on this plan to  
1076 provide it along East/West Summit Road on the other side. What their intention there is to put a  
1077 fountain in that and make it more of a landscape feature and it gives them some additional buffering from  
1078 the car dealership as well as well as from the fact that it is a BMP.

1079

1080 The final thing, just so you will know, which is on the landscape plan schedule is that they have  
1081 increased the planting size to be significant, 3-1/2 inch caliper trees is the size of the proposed trees. So,  
1082 they have made significant concessions to staff. Staff is pleased with where they have come with this  
1083 and at this time we can recommend approval.

1084

1085 Mr. Archer - All right. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Are there questions from the  
1086 Commission?

1087

1088 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I just would like to clarify one point with Mr. Kennedy and that  
1089 is with regard to the berm. Do they mention the height of that berm? You have mentioned 20 feet,  
1090 which I guess is a composite of the trees. How high will the berm be in and of itself?

1091

1092 Mr. Kennedy - They contemplate it in the range of eight to ten feet. They are going to come back with  
1093 a revised plan for administrative approval. So, they have got 25 feet behind the buildings where they  
1094 are going to do that. They could do a 2 to 1 slope. They may be able to work with VDOT within their  
1095 right of way to put some more slope on that. They haven't worked out the details yet, but there is a  
1096 commitment there to do so.

1097

1098 Mr. Taylor - But, in any case and every case, we will be able to look at that when we get a  
1099 landscaping plan and that will have a cross section, so we will know. And I presume that that will be

1100 constant over the length we discussed.

1101

1102 Mr. Kennedy - Yes. There is an existing berm on one portion of this. One section of it is with that  
1103 grade and that is where staff is concerned about the noise level.

1104

1105 Mr. Taylor - I frankly think that will go a long way to knocking that noise level down. The  
1106 other question that I have is with regard to soundproofing. You mentioned soundproofing. Is that  
1107 soundproofing within the walls that is extraordinary or is that attendant with the brick?

1108

1109 Mr. Kennedy - They have had to, the walls really were not the problem. In order to get the HUD  
1110 financing, which is their base financing, they have been interested in the sound levels within the buildings.  
1111 The site itself exceeds permitted levels because of the Interstate and actually, they had to do a 10-year  
1112 projection that show that interior noise levels don't exceed permitted limits. Basically, the main concern  
1113 was actually the windows. They had to put in specialized windows to reduce sound levels. It is not the  
1114 walls that would transmit the sound, it would be the windows, and between that and the fact that they  
1115 have, they have relocated the garages to be again like a secondary wall and have the landscaping in the  
1116 berm, and we feel that has adequately addressed that concern.

1117

1118 Mr. Taylor - Thank you very much.

1119

1120 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Kennedy, what is the factor on the soundproofing? The new miracle  
1121 number that they have? I know 50-54 is standard.

1122

1123 Mr. Kennedy - STC 30. They have had to address HUD's concern in order to reduce it below their  
1124 level. HUD requires a dynamic noise level of no more than 65 decibels, and the site currently is at 72,  
1125 and projected it would go to 74. So, they had to come to some extraordinary design concession in  
1126 order to make their living areas meet that within the building, so that is not even counting the fact that the  
1127 garage placement and the berms and the landscaping, so that is just within the units themselves,  
1128 considering that there would be nothing there. So, we think that all of these factors coming together that  
1129 they will end up being a habitable, good project, in which the sound levels will be reduced by the  
1130 combination of all of those factors.

1131

1132 Mr. Jernigan - I have seen that we have cases come through and they show a suppression level  
1133 from 50 to 54, and then they save that 55 is a significant financial change. At some point in time, could  
1134 we get some documentation and tell us what the difference in 54 and 55 is? Do we have any of that in  
1135 this County?

1136

1137 Mr. Kennedy - We can take a look at that and we do have someone who does in General Services  
1138 who does provide some expertise in that. So we will see if we can get something in general put together  
1139 for the Planning Commission for general information one day.

1140

1141 Mr. Archer - Great suggestion, Mr. Jernigan. I appreciate that. I was hoping we'd never  
1142 hear that again or we'd hear something about it.

1143

1144 Mr. Kennedy - This is like our second meeting in a row where we had to talk about sound levels from  
1145 the Interstate because they came up with Twin Hickory, as well. It is a common problem and staff is  
1146 starting to look at that as an issue that needs to be addressed in our planning. So we are trying to

1147 address it in our planning role and it is important for you all to be updated, as well, on it, and be  
1148 prepared to your satisfaction.

1149

1150 Mr. Jernigan - Well, it is a major factor for a developer when you go from 54 to 55. I just  
1151 don't know what the difference is.

1152

1153 Mr. Archer - I am with you.

1154

1155 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, the residential setback ordinance, which went to the Board at a  
1156 work session and was reviewed by the Board at a work session, and is going to be scheduled for public  
1157 hearing, will also help address the noise issue. But, putting single-family units further back from major  
1158 roads, also multifamily units. I think we got an additional 15-feet added, so noise was certainly a  
1159 consideration with that amendment, too.

1160

1161 Mr. Kaechele - Mr. Kennedy, are there BMPs that serve this property?

1162

1163 Mr. Kennedy - Yes. There are. The BMP across the street, which is existing, actually serves the road,  
1164 East/West Summit Road. So, technically, it does serve this property because the road itself is located  
1165 on the property. The other BMP on the site actually serves the development itself.

1166

1167 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Kennedy, can you scroll back to that?

1168

1169 Mr. Kennedy- This is a portion of it. It is actually located on two portions of the plan. This  
1170 portion right here (referring to slide) actually separates them, and here (referring to slide) separates them  
1171 from the actual service area of the car dealership, so it was kind of strategically placed to put the  
1172 buildings, the residential buildings that are closest to the car dealership actually are separated by the  
1173 BMP in a sense, so they have additional separation from that area where they are doing servicing of a  
1174 car in that car dealership. So, I think they kind of had some strategic planning in that, but there is a large  
1175 BMP on the site which is on site there, as well.

1176

1177 Mr. Taylor - An additional question I have is that I would presume when we look at the  
1178 landscaping plan we will see all of these trees and the berms and cross section, and I will assume for the  
1179 moment that they are adequate to reduce the sound, as Mr. Kaechele and I are concerned about. At  
1180 that particular time of review of the landscaping plan, can we make some kind of a provision for  
1181 additional supplemental planting if we do not get the right attenuation of sound? Probably with another  
1182 line of trees.

1183

1184 Mr. Kennedy - I am not sure it would be easy to test until you have the landscaping in place and it I  
1185 don't think we would know until it grows, and typically what we are looking at is a 10-year growth  
1186 period. So, it is really going to be very difficult to assume. I think, we looked at the type and the size  
1187 and type of trees that they planted. I think they are going to provide a very good buffer. Basically, the  
1188 evergreen screen that they provided double-rowed, evergreens are continuous, and with the walls itself,  
1189 I don't think there is really the ability for us to do an evaluation at the landscape plan stage. It is No. 9  
1190 Amended, so it will come back at that point, we will have a cross section of the berm, and we will know  
1191 how high the landscape is going to be but I don't think we will be able to make any representation of  
1192 what the noise level will be behind them at that point.

1193

1194 Mr. Taylor - One other question that you provoke with that response is if in fact we put in the  
1195 berm, we put in the trees, we think the trees will work and the sound levels are still higher than we  
1196 anticipate, is there a step that we could design toward but not implement, in the event that we needed it?  
1197 And that would be leave some area that if the sound attenuation was not adequate and the sounds  
1198 levels were too high, we could install some kind of sound absorbent fence or a solid fence between  
1199 rows of trees, I guess, would be the appropriate thing to do to knock down the sound. That would only  
1200 be if we couldn't reach the expected low levels of sound and the people in those apartments were still  
1201 hearing a lot of noise.

1202

1203 Mr. Kennedy - Well, the sounds levels within the apartments would be met because they have to meet  
1204 HUD's engineering requirements. So, that's receiving an engineering review. What we are talking  
1205 about is on the site itself. There are two things that we have to remember. One is that the road itself  
1206 Gayton Road Extended hasn't been extended. At the time that section of the road and the ramp is put  
1207 in, this complex will be in place before that. And, so, there will be some barrier provided with that  
1208 extension of the road at that time, as part of the approval of that process to the connection to a Federal  
1209 Highway. But, from what Mr. Reynolds has told me, and I think he should speak to that, their desire is  
1210 to rent apartments and they can't rent apartments if the sound levels are high. They are providing luxury  
1211 apartments and they receive a certain amount of rent. And if they have to take additional steps, he said  
1212 they will take additional steps, but I think that really best comes from the applicant. I'll ask Mr.  
1213 Reynolds to answer that directly.

1214

1215 Ms. Dwyer - May I just interject something in this discussion too? I've heard engineers say  
1216 that additional landscaping, that Mr. Taylor talked about, really doesn't help with sound reducing the  
1217 noise levels. I don't know if that is true or not, but that might be something that staff could bring  
1218 forward when they bring forward information in response to Mr. Jernigan's question. I think that there  
1219 are a lot of questions that come up generally about sound. But, certainly we don't want to require  
1220 something if it is not going to be effective.

1221

1222 Mr. Kennedy - What work I've seen, actually, talks about the sound levels at the lower levels of  
1223 development where basically it comes from the lower parts of the trucks and cars and it is really the  
1224 road noise. They actually projects how buffering makes noise go up on a plane. So, it is really the  
1225 buffering at the lower levels, the berming and that sort of thing. That provides the most protection.

1226

1227 Ms. Dwyer - And the walls that sometimes you see.

1228

1229 Mr. Kennedy - Yes, and the walls that sometimes make it projects up and over buildings. I'll take a  
1230 look at some of that stuff. Basically, what they do say is that the trees actually diffuse it and kind of  
1231 dampen it, but they are not very good walls because they aren't continuous. In this case, they are  
1232 evergreens. So, they should be pretty continuous and it's not like a typical limited access road where  
1233 you have deciduous trees. These are evergreen trees.

1234

1235 Mr. Marles - Staff will do some research and bring some information back to the  
1236 Commission.

1237

1238 Mr. Archer - Of course, Ms. Dwyer won't be here to get it, but I will.

1239 Mr. Kennedy - But, to speak to the original issue that Mr. Taylor raised, I think I'll ask Mr. Reynolds  
1240 just to state what their intention is.

1241

1242 Mr. Reynolds - Good morning. The financing requires 45 decibels maximum within the units. We have  
1243 already done an environmental study by Dominion Environmental. There are 73 decibels out there at  
1244 the highway. So, to reduce it to that 45, we do have to increase, with a better constructive window  
1245 with the STC of 30. None of this information takes into account the landscaping that going into place.  
1246 The distance from the highway. The fact that a building in there which is located in the center or top  
1247 portion of the screen here, is the closest building and probably the most affected because that's the area  
1248 that needs the berm. That's the area that's open to I-64. The site was cleared that way before we  
1249 purchased the property. And so we kind of have what we have there, and we are hoping to landscape  
1250 and the berm will make the difference. But, our financing does require a maximum 45 decibels within  
1251 the units, which we have to address for them as well.

1252

1253 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you want to state your name for the record?

1254

1255 Mr. Reynolds - I'm sorry. My name is Jeff Reynolds project manager for the Breeden Company.

1256

1257 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

1258

1259 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Reynolds, excuse me. Did you say the financing requires the 45-decibel  
1260 limit and what financing is that?

1261

1262 Mr. Reynolds - That's a HUD financing that we are seeking now.

1263

1264 Mr. Marlles - So, that is a HUD requirement.

1265

1266 Mr. Reynolds - That's a HUD requirement.

1267

1268 Mr. Marlles - For the interior of the unit.

1269

1270 Mr. Reynolds - The interior unit. A maximum of 45 decibels and usually the weak links are window and  
1271 doors. The way it is currently designed, with the vinyl siding, the sheathing, the house wrap, the two by  
1272 four studs, the standard installation and the walls, the sheet rock on the inside protector is there but the  
1273 windows really are the weak link. Thank you.

1274

1275 Mr. Marlles - Thank you.

1276

1277 Mr. Reynolds - You're welcome.

1278

1279 Mr. Taylor - While you are there, Mr. Reynolds, I have just a follow up question. Is there  
1280 any way that we could develop effectively a section, as you would see on a drawing, and we can began  
1281 at the road and check the decibel level there. And then take that crosssection over to the buildings as in  
1282 function of distance, and super impose on that, let's say all of the soundproofing measures we taking  
1283 and how they might attenuate the sound. Do you see where I'm going on this? Cross that profile as a  
1284 function of sound versus distance to get an idea of what it's going to be the sound level within those  
1285 buildings. Is that a doable, physical, mathematical thing that can be arrived at?

1286

1287 Mr. Reynolds - I can tell you what we have learned with talking with the financing folks at HUD, there

1288 are sound engineers that can do that type of study for us. Our intent was to proceed with whatever you  
1289 will approve and then we would go forward by doing some sound decibel level testing after we  
1290 constructed that building closest to the highway.

1291

1292 Mr. Taylor - I think that would be good just to make sure that we are all finished. Before we  
1293 start, we have an idea of what we can do. Then if there are some step that needs to be taken, as Mr.  
1294 Kennedy pointed out, it's a function of distance above ground that effectively attenuates the sound, up  
1295 and away from the building. Then as we look at that, if there needs to be some additional step taken,  
1296 you know I am thinking of something like a vertical opaque sound fence or some other thing that you  
1297 would see along the highway. But, I would hope that that would not be necessary, but I would like to  
1298 see those calculations, or at least that data sheet as a part of this submission for the landscaping plan.

1299

1300 Mr. Reynolds - Okay. We plan to take it one step at a time, at this point.

1301

1302 Mr. Taylor - That's good. I'm with you and....

1303

1304 Mr. Reynolds - And I made a note, Mr. Taylor, that you asked for a cross section of the berm when we  
1305 come back with the landscape plan.

1306

1307 Mr. Taylor - And I'm sure that staff will work with you and look at it. Thank you very much.

1308

1309 Mr. Reynolds - Thank you.

1310

1311 Mr. Archer - Okay. Are there any other questions or observations, suggestions, remedies,  
1312 clues? Okay. Mr. Taylor.

1313

1314 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I'm ready for a motion. I'll move first on POD-30-99, to waive  
1315 the time limit.

1316

1317 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

1318

1319 Mr. Archer - The motion to waive the time limit was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by  
1320 Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye...all opposed say no. The motion carries.

1321

1321 The Planning Commission approved to waive the time limit for POD-30-99, Reflections of West Creek  
1322 (Formerly Summit Gayton Apartments).

1323

1324 Mr. Taylor - And next, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank Mr. Reynolds and the staff for  
1325 bearing with us in working with Mr. Kennedy and doing all the work. I think this will pay us long-range  
1326 dividends in the future. With that, Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval of POD-30-99, Reflections of  
1327 West Creek, subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this  
1328 type and the added conditions with regard to brick and landscape plans.

1329

1330 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

1331

1332 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
1333 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion carries.

1334

1335 The Planning Commission approved POD-30-99, Reflection of West Creek (Formerly Summit Gayton  
1336 Apartments) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minute, the annotations on the plans  
1337 and the previously approved additional conditions.

1338

### 1339 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT RECONSIDERATION & REVISED SUBDIVISION**

1340

POD-68-01  
Andover Hills, Section B

**Foster & Miller for WTC, L.L.C.:** Request for approval of reconsideration of a plan of development and revised subdivision plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to amend the street layout and add two (2) lots, for a total of 62 lots. The 17.92 acre site is located on the south line of Mayland Drive extended and Meadow View Road extended on parcels 58-3-C4 thru 10, 58-3-D-1 thru 7, 58-3-F-1 thru 5 and part of 58-2A-3A and 4B, 58-3-E-6 thru 11. The zoning is R5AC, General Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer.  
**(Three Chopt)**

1341

1342 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here opposed to POD-68-01, Andover Hills, Section B? No  
1343 opposition. Mr. Strauss.

1344

1345 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Commission would bear with me, I have a bit  
1346 of a cold. Apparently, the quarantine of Mr. Kennedy was not quite as affective as we hoped. Staff's  
1347 recommendation is on page six of this morning's addendum. There is a handout that Leslie is  
1348 distributing. This handout has a revised map which shows the Bartley Pond project to the west of the  
1349 subject property and that's a recently rezoned townhouse project, right here, where I am indicating on  
1350 the map. This rezoning and other activity, to the west on Pemberton, is the reason for this  
1351 reconsideration. Originally, when this conditional subdivision and POD was approved there was a stub  
1352 street in this location, right here (referring to screen) as you can see on your monitor. Since the time of  
1353 approval of these two previous applications, there have been some rezoning discussions in this area, the  
1354 A-1 area, and for townhousing as well. The Planning staff suggested to the applicant that the stub road  
1355 was no longer necessary because we didn't see a need for townhouses to use the street for the single-  
1356 family, zero lot line project. The applicant submitted a revised plan. They have discussed it with Public  
1357 Works and received a favorable recommendation from Public Works. They did however gain two

1358 additional lots and that's why we are here today for this reconsideration. The original conditions of the  
1359 approval would continue to apply. With that, staff can recommend approval of this reconsideration. I'll  
1360 be happy to answer any questions you may have and Mr. Bill Johnson is also here from Foster &  
1361 Miller.

1362

1363 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Strauss. Are there questions from the Commission? Do you  
1364 need to hear from the applicant, Mr. Taylor?

1365

1366 Mr. Taylor - No, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so. I think that this particular plan is  
1367 carefully considered and thought out after the actions of other developers on it. I think it works in favor  
1368 of the overall neighborhood and the road distribution, and in addition to all of those good things, it adds  
1369 two lots for the developer. I do think it will help the overall traffic distribution. So, I think it's a win,  
1370 win for both the developer and for the County. With that, I'll move approval of POD-68-01, Andover  
1371 Hills, Section B, subject to the original conditions of the Planning Commission approval of May 23,  
1372 2001 and September 26, 2001, they continue to apply.

1373

1374 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

1375

1376 Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in  
1377 favor say aye...all opposed say nay.

1378

1379 Mr. Vanarsdall - They approved it on the addendum, on page six.

1380

1381 Mr. Archer - Do we need to amend anything, Mr. Vanarsdall?

1382

1383 Mr. Vanarsdall - No. She will pick it up back there.

1384

1385 Mr. Archer - All right. Did everybody vote? No opposition. The motion carries.

1386

1387 The Planning Commission approved the reconsideration for POD-68-01, Andover Hills, Section B,  
1388 subject to the standard conditions and the additional conditions previously approved and the annotations  
1389 on the revised plans.

1390

1390 Mr. Archer - All right, Mr. Secretary, where are we now?

1391

1392 Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, we are at the very last item on page 28.

1393

1394 **WORK SESSION/ORDINANCE AMENDMENT: To Amend and Reordain Section 24-104**

1395 **Entitled “Signs” of the Code of the County of Henrico to Regulate Changeable Message**

1396 **Signs.**

1397

1398 Mr. Marles - You may recall that we introduced this at our last Planning Commission meeting.

1399 The staff report will be given by Mr. Blankinship.

1400

1401 Mr. Archer - Good morning, Mr. Blankinship.

1402

1403 Mr. Blankinship - Good morning. Does everyone have a copy.

1404

1405 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't.

1406

1407 Mr. Taylor - I don't have one either.

1408

1409 Mr. Archer - I did have one but I forgot to bring it.

1410

1411 Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Chairman, this issue was raised by a member of the Board of Supervisors  
1412 approaching the Director of Planning and asking some questions about how we regulate changeable  
1413 message signs. The Code, as it stands today, regulates two different kinds of signs. One are the very  
1414 common time and temperature signs that banks and others have been putting up for years and the other  
1415 is just sort of the open ended changeable message sign. Whatever message people want to put on it.  
1416 As you look at “paragraph (e)” running on at the bottom on page 1, there. It states: “The prohibition  
1417 against moving parts or moving lights does not apply to signs that indicate the temperature or time by the  
1418 movement of the hands on the clock or dial on the thermometer or by digital displays that change less  
1419 frequently than every three seconds.” And then it goes on to the next kind of sign. “In addition, signs  
1420 on which the message does not change more frequently than allowed by the table below.” This is the  
1421 existing language, and there is the table that compares the speed on the highway to the size of the letters  
1422 on the sign. That table has proved to be unnecessarily complicated out in the field when it comes to  
1423 administering these regulations. The inspectors have to measure or estimate the height of the letters and  
1424 then check the speed limit on the highway before they can time the sign and determine whether it's  
1425 changing too fast. Presumably for that reason, the State changed the State Code on this kind of sign  
1426 two or three years ago. Whereas they used to have this sort of an arrangement, they now just say the  
1427 sign can't change more than every four seconds. When the State Code was changed, we did not at that  
1428 point see the necessity to come back and change the County Code, so we still have this table. Now we  
1429 are getting two different kinds of complaints. One is just that the signs are changing too frequently and  
1430 the other is, from our own staff, that it is complicated to administer it by this table. So, we talked first  
1431 about just changing to be consistent with the State requiring that these signs not change more than every  
1432 four sections. After discussing that with the County Manager's Office and with some members of the  
1433 Board, the suggestion was made that four seconds is really too frequently and that we ought to set the  
1434 rate at every 20 seconds. So, the amendment before you, would leave alone time and temperature  
1435 signs, first of all. They would still be allowed to change every three seconds. But, any other changeable  
1436 message sign, rather than being regulated by this table, would be allowed to change no more frequently

1437 than once every 20 seconds. The final change is adding the word "Office" before business and industrial  
1438 districts. Back in April we had looked into this issue of whether changeable messages signs should be  
1439 allowed in office districts, and I think you have seen a rezoning recently on that issue.

1440

1441 Mr. Marles - Mr. Blankinship, just one correction and this is no fault of your own. Randy  
1442 and I have discussed this extensively and we would recommend to the Commission that we not include  
1443 office districts at this time. That's no fault of yours.

1444

1445 Mr. Blankinship - All right. Thank you very much.

1446

1447 Mr. Archer - So, we strike the word "Office?"

1448

1449 Mr. Marles - Right.

1450

1451 Mr. Vanarsdall - So, we are not going to include office, you said.

1452

1453 Mr. Marles - That's correct. We are not recommending that changeable message signs be  
1454 permitted in office districts at this time.

1455

1456 Mr. Vanarsdall - So what districts will they be permitted?

1457

1458 Mr. Blankinship - Business and Industrial districts only. In that case then, the real affect of this  
1459 amendment will be to remove the table and substitute just 20 seconds as the standard for changeable  
1460 message signs.

1461

1462 Mr. Kaechele - Mr. Secretary, was it the sign at Three Chopt and Parham that initiated this discussion.

1463

1464 Mr. Marles - That was certainly one of the signs that was creating a lot of problems and we  
1465 still have problems in terms of enforcement with that current sign.

1466

1467 Mr. Kaechele - They have changed the sign and the location. Do they conform now to what we are  
1468 proposing?

1469

1470 Mr. Marles - They do in terms of the location. We still get complaints on the frequency of  
1471 that message. And, again, part of it is that four seconds to most people seem to be too fast.

1472

1473 Mr. Kaechele - Right. Well, I don't disagree with that. I guess there is no technical hardship involved  
1474 with this. They can change the timing.

1475

1475 Mr. Marles - The timing on these signs are adjustable with a control panel so it should be a  
1476 fairly simple matter to do it.

1477

1478 Mr. Vanarsdall - That's that Walgreens isn't it?

1479

1480 Mr. Marles - Yes, sir.

1481

1482 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank thing has more messages on it than you can absorb.

1483

1484 Mr. Archer - All right. Thank you, Mr. Blankinship. Are there any questions or comments  
1485 for Mr. Blankinship? All right. Mr. Secretary, what action do we have to take on this?

1486

1487 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I believe at our last meeting we did schedule a public hearing on  
1488 this. Mr. Blankinship, do you recall the date?

1489

1490 Mr. Blankinship - Yes, January 23, 2002.

1491

1492 Mr. Vanarsdall - May I ask one more question?

1493

1494 Mr. Archer - Sure, Mr. Vanarsdall.

1495

1496 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Mr. Marlles. We have, I say we but we don't  
1497 have it, we passed it on to the Board. What does this do to the sign that GE Financial wanted?

1498

1499 Mr. Marlles - That request was withdrawn, Mr. Vanarsdall, so we really don't have.... Wait  
1500 a minute Mr. O'Kelly might be correcting me here.

1501

1502 Mr. O'Kelly - The rezoning case was deferred to the Board's February 12, 2002, meeting.

1503

1504 Mr. Vanarsdall - Wasn't that request for Office?

1505

1506 Mr. Blankinship - I believe it was to rezone a small portion of an office site to a business zoning,  
1507 specifically for the purpose of allowing these signs. That's what lead to the confusion over inserting  
1508 "Office" in this draft.

1509

1510 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

1511

1512 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anything further? Thank you, sir. Mr. Secretary, I guess this  
1513 brings us about to the end of the agenda. In the real estate section of Sunday's Times Dispatch, there is  
1514 an article in here that speaks to E.I.F.s., Iffice, Exterior Installation Systems or whatever we call it. I  
1515 don't know if anyone got a chance to read it or not, but if they didn't, can you copy it and make sure  
1516 that everybody get a chance to see that. It's eye opening I should say but shilling also to be honest with  
1517 you. Make sure I get a copy back also. All right. Go ahead, Mr. Secretary.

1518

1519 Mr. Marlles - Leslie, would you come up to the podium. Mr. Chairman, I do like to  
1520 recognize staff for doing good work. A couple of weeks ago I had the pleasure, along with Mr.  
1521 O'Kelly and Mrs. News, to attend the reception for the Henricopolis Soil and Wood or Conservation  
1522 District where the Planning Office received an award. It is actually their Urban Forestry Award, and  
1523 this was for work associated that Leslie did on the North Park Library site in terms of working with the  
1524 Department of Forestry to protect trees. She basically designed the site and it was significant enough  
1525 that it won, I guess, this is the first Urban Forestry Award. But, again, I would like to recognize Leslie  
1526 for her work on this because it really was her initiative...

1527

1528 Mr. Archer - Congratulations, Mrs. News.

1529

1530 Mrs. News - It's a beautiful site and we are glad we could save it. We had a good site to

1531 work with throughout the hold process. We were saving trees all the way from the substantial in accord  
1532 and the site selection and through the Board paper. Great attention was paid to that.

1533

1534 Mr. Archer - You are far too modest, Mrs. News. Good job and we appreciate it.

1535

1536 Mrs. News - Thank you.

1537

1538 Mr. Archer - Thank you. All right, is there anything further?

1539

1540 Mr. Mariles - Yes, sir. Just on behalf of staff, I would be remiss if I let Ms. Dwyer leave  
1541 without thanking her on behalf of the staff for her dedication and not only her support of staff but her  
1542 upholding of good planning, excellent planning in Henrico County. Thank you.

1543

1544 Mr. Kaechele - Mr. Chairman, before you do adjourn, I also would like to make one comment. As you  
1545 know, the Board of Supervisors position rotates every year, and so you will have a new face here in  
1546 January. But I would just like to say that I have enjoyed and appreciated the work here of this  
1547 Commission and the staff. So, it has been an honor and a pleasure to work with you this year. And, I  
1548 would like to further commend this Commission and the staff on the way you treat our citizens and the  
1549 way you conduct business here. I think that's what the Board really looks for and appreciates. Our  
1550 citizens are our herd when they come in here. There is a lot of concern for their feelings and a lot  
1551 meetings are set up to further explore difficulties, so I think you are doing a great job. I would just like  
1552 to say that and then it's been a good year to work with you. Thanks.

1553

1554 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Kaechele, we appreciate that, sir.

1555

1556 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Kaechele, I've been in here when you have been on the Commission  
1557 several times before and it is always a pleasure to have you.

1558 Mr. Kaechele - Thank you.

1559

1560 Mr. Archer - Mr. Kaechele, I believe you were the Board representative when Elizabeth and  
1561 I came aboard. Now, as the outgoing Chairman, let me take this opportunity to also thank the staff for  
1562 many years of support. You guys just get better all the time. And when I say guys, that's an inclusive  
1563 term, Leslie, and not chauvinistic at all. And I would also like to thank my colleagues for all the respect  
1564 and candor they have given me this year as chairman. I appreciate it and on top of that I hope all of you  
1565 have a very happy holiday season and a prosperous and joyous New Year. And, good bye, Ms.  
1566 Dwyer.

1567

1568 Ms. Dwyer - Good bye.

1569

1570 Mr. Vanarsdall - Same to you, Mr. Chairman.

1571

1572 Ms. Dwyer - I move to adjourn.

1573

1574 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

1575

1576 Mr. Archer - With that, this meeting is officially adjourned at 10:36 a.m. Merry Christmas.

1577

1578 On a motion by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall, the Planning Commission adjourned its  
1579 meeting for December 19, 2001, meeting at 10:36 a.m.

1580

1581

1582

1583

---

C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Chairman

1584

1585

1586

1587

1588

---

John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary

1589

1590

1591

1592

1593

1594