

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico,
2 Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the Government
3 Center at Parham and Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, June 22,
4 2005.

5

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

14

15 Others Present: Mr. David D. O'Kelly, Jr., Assistant Director of Planning
16 Ms. Leslie A. News, CLA, Principal Planner
17 Mr. James P. Strauss, CLA, County Planner
18 Mr. Kevin D. Wilhite, C.P.C., AICP, County Planner
19 Mr. E. J. (Ted) McGarry, III, County Planner
20 Mr. Michael F. Kennedy, County Planner
21 Ms. Christina L. Goggin, AICP, County Planner
22 Mr. Michael P. Cooper, County Planner
23 Mr. Tony Greulich, County Planner
24 Mr. Michael Jennings, Assistant Traffic Engineer
25 Ms. Diana B. Carver, Recording Secretary

26

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

29

30 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning everyone. The Planning Commission will now come to
31 order. Everybody is here today and Ms. News is ready to go, and I'll turn the meeting over to
32 our Secretary and Director of Planning, Mr. Silber.

33

34 Mr. Silber - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have all members of the Commission
35 present this morning. First on the agenda would be consideration of requests for deferrals and
36 withdrawals. I'm not aware of any withdrawals that we have. We do have a couple of
37 deferrals. Ms. News, would you inform us of those please.

38

39 Ms. News - Yes, sir. Staff has one request for a deferral and this is on page 3 of the
40 agenda and it is located in the Varina District. It's a landscape and lighting plan LP/POD-34-
41 05, The Village @ Osborne on Osborne Turnpike. The applicant is requesting a deferral to the
42 July 27, 2005, meeting.

43 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

44

LP/POD-34-05
The Village @ Osborne –
Zero Lot Line Dwellings
Osborne Turnpike

Foster & Miller, P.C. for FTF, LLC: 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 41.758-acre site is located at 7101 Osborne Turnpike, approximately 4,500 feet north of Burning Tree Road on parcels 802-696-9269 and 803-696-6866. The zoning is R-5AC, General Residence District (Conditional) (**Varina**)

45

46 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral of this case,
47 LP/POD-34-05, The Village @ Osborne, in the Varina District? No opposition.

48

49 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I move to defer LP/POD-34-05, The Village @ Osborne
50 on Osborne Turnpike to July 27, 2005, by request of the applicant.

51

52 Mr. Archer - Second.

53

54 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Archer.
55 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

56

57 Pursuant to the applicant's request, the Planning Commission deferred the landscape and
58 lighting plan for LP/POD-34-05, The Village @ Osborne on Osborne Turnpike, to its July 27,
59 2005 meeting.

60

61 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any other deferrals?

62

63 Ms. News - That's all that staff has. There may be some that the Commission has.

64

65 Mr. Jernigan - I have one. On page 5, Walgreens.

66

67 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

68

POD-11-05
Walgreens – S. Laburnum
Avenue – 4845 - 4851 S.
Laburnum Avenue

VHB for Laburnum Avenue Realty, LLC and Mid-Atlantic Commercial Properties, LLC: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one-story, 14,460 square foot drug store. The 2.11-acre site is located on the east line of S. Laburnum Avenue, approximately 300 feet north of Williamsburg Road (U.S. Route 60) and on the north line of Williamsburg Road, approximately 170 feet east of S. Laburnum Avenue on parcels 816-714-4637 and 5217. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. County water and sewer. (**Varina**)

69 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral of POD-11-
70 05, Walgreens, in the Varina District, for 30 days? No opposition.

71

72 Mr. Jernigan - With that, Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to defer POD-11-05,
73 Walgreens, to July 27, 2005, by request of the Commission.

74

75 Mr. Archer - Second.

76

77 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Archer.
78 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

79

80 The Planning Commission deferred POD-11-05, Walgreens - 4845-4841 S. Laburnum
81 Avenue, to its July 27, 2005 meeting.

82

83 Mr. Silber - No other deferrals by the Commission? Next on the agenda would be
84 the Expedited Agenda. For the benefit of those here this morning, these are items that are on
85 the Planning Commission's agenda that do not have any outstanding issues. The plans have
86 been reviewed by staff, and staff has no unresolved issues. The Planning Commissioner from
87 that district has no outstanding issues, and unless there is opposition, these are placed on the
88 Expedited Agenda so they can be heard in a quicker fashion. I believe we have four items on
89 the Expedited Agenda.

90

91 Ms. News - That's correct, Mr. Secretary. First on page 9 in your agenda and
92 located in the Brookland District is POD-40-05, the Villas @ Hunton Park - Clubhouse. This
93 is POD-52-04 revised, on Hunton Park Boulevard.

94

95 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

96

POD-40-05 Villas @ Hunton Park - Clubhouse-Hunton Park Drive (POD-52-04 Revised)	Foster & Miller, P.C. for Clarendon Associates, L.L.C. and HP Villas Development Corporation: Request for approval of a revised plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one-story, 2,301 square foot clubhouse. The 1.26-acre site is located on the southwest corner of Hunton Park Boulevard and the proposed entrance drive on parcel 762-773-4696. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Brookland)
---	--

97

98 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there any opposition to POD-40-05, Villas @ Hunton Park -
99 Clubhouse, in the Brookland District? No opposition. I move POD-40-05, Villas @ Hunton
100 Park, be approved on the Expedited Agenda with the standard conditions for developments of
101 this type and the following additional conditions Nos. 23 through 30 and the annotations on the
102 plans.

103

104 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

105 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Jernigan.
106 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

107

108 The Planning Commission approved POD-40-05, Villas @ Hunton Park – Clubhouse, subject
109 to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the
110 annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

111

112 23. The site including paving, pavement markings, signage, curb and gutter, dumpster
113 screens, walls, fences, lighting and other site improvements shall be properly
114 maintained in good condition at all times. Any necessary repairs shall be made in a
115 timely manner.

116 24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
117 Utilities and Division of Fire.

118 25. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-67C-03 shall be incorporated in this
119 approval.

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

123 27. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
124 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by
125 the Department of Public Works.

126 28. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
127 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
128 issuance of a building permit.

129 29. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
130 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-
131 way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.

132 30. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment (including
133 HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes, transformers, and
134 generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All equipment shall be screened
135 by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the
136 Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

137

138 Ms. News - Next on page 11 of your agenda and located in the Varina District is
139 subdivision Midview Farms (June 2005 Plan). There is also an addendum item which has a
140 revised recommendation indicating that all outstanding issues have been met, which address
141 road improvements and demonstrating placement of dwellings on the lots could be
142 accomplished, and staff is now recommending approval; and a revised plan that incorporates
143 these changes.

144 **SUBDIVISION**

145

Midview Farms
(June 2005 Plan)
Midview Road

Foster & Miller, P.C. for Elaine M. and Dorothy Ogburn and Midview Group, L.L.C.: The 40.8-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 95 single-family homes is located on the north line of Midview Road, approximately 200 feet east of the intersection of Midview Road and Fox Downs Drive on parcel 806-703-3309. The zoning is R-2AC, One-Family Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Varina) 95 Lots**

146

147 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Midview
148 Farms (June 2005 Plan), in the Varina District? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

149

150 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, with that, I will move for approval of subdivision
151 Midview Farms (June 2005 Plan) subject to the standard conditions for subdivisions served by
152 public utilities and the following additional conditions Nos. 12 through 17 and the staff
153 recommendation on the addendum.

154

155 Mr. Archer - Second, Mr. Chairman.

156

157 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Archer.
158 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

159

160 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Midview Farms (June
161 2005 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions served
162 by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

163

164 12. Each lot shall contain at least 13,500 square feet, exclusive of the flood plain areas.

165 13. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the
166 25-foot-wide ~~planting strip easement~~ landscape buffer along Midview Road shall be
167 submitted to the Department of Planning for review and approval prior to construction
168 plan approval.

169 14. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the
170 construction plan by the Department of Public Works.

171 15. The proffers approved as part of zoning case C-17C-05 shall be incorporated in this
172 approval.

173 16. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located within the
174 buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be developed with
175 engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in accordance with the
176 Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical guidelines established by a
177 professional engineer. A detailed engineering report shall be submitted for the review
178 and approval by the Building Official prior to the issuance of a building permit on the
179 affected lot. A copy of the report and recommendations shall be furnished to the
180 Directors of Planning and Public Works.

181 17. All dwellings located adjacent to Midview Road shall be oriented to face Midview
182 Road.

183

184 Ms. News - Next on page 12 of your agenda and located in the Brookland District is
185 subdivision Mill Place West, Section C (June 2005 Plan).

186

187 **SUBDIVISION**

188

Mill Place West, Section C **Foster & Miller, P.C. for Atack/Eagle Hunton Meadows**
(June 2005 Plan) **Investments, L.C.:** The 0.414-acre site proposed for a
subdivision of 1 single family home is located along Mill Place
Drive opposite Wingsteam Court on parcels 764-772-1731 and
763-772-8743. The zoning is R-2, One-Family Residence
District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland) 1 Lot**

189

190 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision Mill Place
191 West, Section C (June 2005 Plan), in the Brookland District? No opposition. I move that Mill
192 Place West, Section C, be approved with the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions
193 for subdivisions served by public utilities and the following additional conditions Nos. 12 and
194 13.

195

196 Mr. Archer - Second.

197

198 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Archer.
199 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

200

201 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Mill Place West,
202 Section, C (June 2005 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
203 subdivisions served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional
204 conditions:

205

206 12. Each lot shall contain at least 18,000 square feet.

207 13. Prior to requesting the final approval, a draft of the covenants and deed restrictions for
208 the maintenance of the common area by a homeowners association shall be submitted to
209 the Department of Planning for review. Such covenants and restrictions shall be in form
210 and substance satisfactory to the County Attorney and shall be recorded prior to
211 recordation of the subdivision plat.

212

213 Ms. News - The last item is on page 13 of your agenda and located in the Three
214 Chopt District. This is subdivision Bell Tower, Section C (June 2005 Plan).

215 **SUBDIVISION**

216

Bell Tower, Section C
(June 2005 Plan)

Youngblood, Tyler & Associates, P.C. for Barrington Investors Limited: The 1.11-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 2 single-family homes is located on the east line of Bell Tower Court, approximately 300 feet southeast of its intersection with Bell Tower Lane on parcels 743-756-3422 and part of 743-756-3913. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer.
(Three Chopt) 2 Lots

217

218 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to Bell Tower, Section C
219 (June 2005 Plan), in the Three Chopt District? No opposition. Mr. Branin.

220

221 Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I like to move that subdivision Bell Tower, Section C
222 (June 2005 Plan) be approved on the Expedited Agenda.

223

224 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

225

226 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Branin and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All
227 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

228

229 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Bell Tower, Section, C
230 (June 2005 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions
231 served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

232

233 12. Each lot shall contain at least 11,000 square feet, exclusive of the flood plain areas.

234 13. The proffers approved as part of zoning cases C-18C-00 and C-9C-05 shall be
235 incorporated in this approval.

236 14. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located within the
237 buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be developed with
238 engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in accordance with the
239 Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical guidelines established by a
240 professional engineer. A detailed engineering report shall be submitted for the review
241 and approval by the Building Official prior to the issuance of a building permit on the
242 affected lot. A copy of the report and recommendations shall be furnished to the
243 Directors of Planning and Public Works.

244 15. Prior to requesting the final approval, a draft of the covenants and deed restrictions
245 addressing the inclusion of Section C into the existing homeowners association shall be
246 submitted to the Department of Planning for review. Such covenants and restrictions
247 shall be in form and substance satisfactory to the County Attorney and shall be recorded
248 prior to recordation of the subdivision plat.

249

250 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Ms. News.

251

252 Ms. News - You're welcome.
253

254 Mr. Silber - Next on the agenda, would be the Conditional Subdivision Extensions.
255 These are subdivisions that have conditional approval but their period for approval has reached
256 the end and they are up for extension. These have requested an extension of time. Each of these
257 three do require Planning Commission approval. Often they are for informational purposes only
258 but these do require Commission action. Ms. Goggin.

259

260 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL:**

261

262 **FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

263

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended Recommended
Cedar Grove (June 1998 Plan)	Fairfield	191	22	4	1 Year 6/28/06
Westerre Parkway (June 1999 Plan)	Three Chopt	0	0	5	1 Year 6/28/06
Wyndham Forest, Sec. 7 (June 1999 Plan)	Three Chopt	51	1	4	1 Year 6/28/06

264

265 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Ms. Goggin.

266

267 Ms. Goggin - There are three subdivisions on the agenda that require Planning
268 Commission conditional extension approval. The vote for these can be made all at once or
269 individually, depending on how you all pursue this. The first case is Cedar Grove (June 1998
270 Plan) and that's located in the Fairfield Magisterial District. There are 22 lots left and the
271 developer is attempting to buy the adjacent parcel next to it to develop it as a part of the
272 subdivision so that they can also use the subdivision's amenities. Staff can recommend a one-
273 year extension to June 2006 on that.

274

275 The second subdivision is Westerre Parkway located in Three Chopt. The owner is requesting an
276 extension because they do not wish to disrupt existing businesses with construction and would
277 like to do the roadwork in conjunction with office PODs that are about to begin construction.
278 Staff can also recommend a one-year extension to June 2006.

279

280 The last case is also located in Three Chopt and the one lot is located in Wyndham Forest,
281 Section 7 (June 1999 Plan). The developer is presently applying for wetland permits to have
282 adequate buildable area for a house. Staff can also recommend a one-year extension to June
283 2006. I'll be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

284

285 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any questions for Ms. Goggin? No questions. Mr. Branin,
286 since you have two, would you like to make the motion to approve these extensions?

287 Mr. Branin - Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I move that we approve all three extensions until
288 2006.

289

290 Mr. Archer - I'll second, Mr. Chairman.

291

292 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Branin and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
293 favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

294

295 The Planning Commission voted to approve the subdivision extensions of conditional approval
296 for 12 months, June 28, 2006, for the following subdivisions: Cedar Grove (June 1998 Plan),
297 Westerre Parkway (June 1999 Plan) and Wyndham Forest, Section 7 (June 1999 Plan).

298

299 Mr. Silber - The first plan on the agenda this morning is a lighting plan and it was
300 deferred from the May 25 meeting. This is LP/POD-5-05, POD-24-05 and POD-31-05, Grayson
301 Hill, requesting for approval of a lighting plan.

302

303 **LIGHTING PLAN (DEFERRED FROM THE MAY 25, 2005, MEETING)**

304

LP/POD-5-05 POD-24-05 and POD-31-05 Grayson Hill-Patterson Avenue and N. Gaskins Road	Roy Allen for Gaskins Centre, LC: Request for approval of a lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 54.59-acre site is located at the southeast corner of Patterson Avenue (State Route 6) and N. Gaskins Road on parcel 745-740-9892. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District (Conditional). (Tuckahoe)
---	---

305

306 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this lighting plan for
307 LP/POD-5-05, POD-24-05 and POD-31-05, Grayson Hill, in the Tuckahoe District? No
308 opposition. Good morning, Mr. Wilhite.

309

310 Mr. Wilhite - Good morning, Commission members. You just received a revised plan
311 that staff received on Friday. The original plan in your packet was lacking quite a bit of
312 information required for lighting plan approval. Most of the comments at this point have been
313 addressed, at this time. The new plan does show the wall-mounted fixtures that were missing off
314 of the original plan for both the dwelling units and also the clubhouse. These would be wall
315 mounted 75-watt fixtures with incandescent bulbs. Also, the location of bollard lights along the
316 pedestrian paths throughout the entire development is shown on the plan as well. In addition,
317 additional accent lighting for walls and trees are also included.

318

319 There are two main types of streetlights included. The larger one, that's already in the packet, is
320 for the main travel areas within this development. The smaller fixture would be used for the
321 other streets and also in the alleyways. Staff, from its review, cannot see any negative impact on
322 adjacent properties by the lighting plan that is proposed. However, staff does have some concern
323 about some of the light levels shown on the plan; in particular, around the alleyways, the
324 garages, and around the clubhouse. Mainly, because the information was lacking on the 75-watt
325 foot wall fixtures as far as the creation of light spread. I believe the CEPTED Planner for the

326 County would like to take a look at the site after the lights are installed and they may have a
327 recommendation to use higher wattage bulbs in some of these areas.

328

329 Staff is still checking for conflicts with storm sewer lines and utilities lines. That was part of the
330 staff original comments. I believe they can stand by themselves and that would have to be
331 resolved prior to the staff signing the lighting plan. I do not have any other items to cover. If
332 you have any questions, I will try to answer those

333

334 Mrs. Jones - Mr. Wilhite, you said 75-foot, you mean 75-watt.

335

336 Mr. Wilhite - Yes, 75-watt incandescent bulbs on the wall-mounted fixtures.

337

338 Mrs. Jones - I would like to have all this settled before this is approved but you are
339 considering the unresolved issues to be easily taken care of.

340

341 Mr. Wilhite - We asked the applicant for information on light spread for the wall-
342 mounted fixtures. This would be around the clubhouse, the sides of the dwelling units and also
343 around the garages. Apparently, the manufacture does not have this information. It's not
344 available so we can't really check it. Bulb wattage can be changed. They could upgrade to a
345 higher wattage bulb in the future but at this point the information is not there according to the
346 applicant.

347

348 Mr. Silber - Mr. Wilhite, you indicated that the CEPTED Planner will like to review
349 the lighting in the alleyways and some of the locations after the lights are in placed.

350

351 Mr. Wilhite - This is really the first experience that we have had with rear-loading
352 alleys, garages, and alleyways in townhouse developments, so it is sort of a new type of product
353 that we are seeing. I know that she has been up to Northern Virginia to take a look at some
354 similar developments up there, but I think she has some lack of experience with this type of
355 project.

356

357 Mr. Silber - How will that be handled if after the lighting is in place and she finds that
358 there needs to be changes made, will that require change to the lighting plan?

359

360 Mr. Wilhite - I think we could probably just do it.... Well, it depends. If they decide if
361 she recommends the addition of more fixtures or if she would just recommend addition of higher
362 wattages of the bulbs being used. We are just going with the information that we have available
363 to us.

364

365 Mr. Silber - I understand.

366

367 Mrs. Jones - Can the fixtures accommodate higher wattage bulbs without a problem?

368

369 Mr. Wilhite - The applicant would have to answer that question.

370

371 Mr. Vanarsdall - You never did get everything that you wanted, did you? When I talked to
372 you, you needed two or three things.

373

374 Mr. Wilhite - We asked for the information and there response was that that it's just not
375 available for fixtures of this low wattage.

376

377 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Are there any more questions for Mr. Wilhite?

378

379 Mr. Silber - Mr. Wilhite, I have one other question. I don't see any lighting along the
380 eastern boundary adjacent to the single-family homes on Lakewater, is that correct?

381

382 Mr. Wilhite - No. The only lighting would be on the wall-mounted fixtures on the back
383 of the buildings. Once, again, these would be 75-watt incandescent fixtures. There is substantial
384 tree saved there along the property line. Staff does not feel that it would have any negative
385 impact on the adjacent properties.

386

387 Mr. Silber - Okay.

388

389 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Mrs. Jones.

390

391 Mrs. Jones - Well, I think we have most everything squared away and staff is content
392 that the plan has been brought forward to meet their concerns with just a few minor issues that
393 need to be resolved and I don't think the resolving is a difficult issue. I would like to move that
394 LP/POD-5-05, which is also POD-24-05 and POD-31-05, Grayson Hill, be approved as
395 presented with the annotations on the plan.

396

397 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

398

399 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All
400 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

401

402 The Planning Commission approved the lighting plan for LP/POD-5-05, POD-24-05 and POD-
403 31-05, Grayson Hill - Patterson Avenue and N. Gaskins Road, subject to the standard conditions
404 attached to these minutes for landscape and lighting plans.

405 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (DEFERRED FROM THE MAY 25, 2005, MEETING)**

406

POD-29-05
Children's Choice Daycare
@ Henrico Doctor's
Hospital - E. Parham Road
(POD-14-00 Revised)

Draper Aden Associates for HCA Health Services of Virginia, Inc. and Centex Concord: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a 9,807 square foot day care facility to be located on the site of an existing hospital. The 2.12-acre site is located at Henrico Doctor's Hospital, 7700 E. Parham Road on the north line of E. Parham Road approximately 600 feet east of its intersection with Shrader Road on part of parcel 764-754-6996. The zoning is O-3, Office District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

407

408 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this case, POD-29-05,
409 Children's Choice Daycare @ Henrico Doctor's Hospital, in the Brookland District? No
410 opposition. We already had one gentleman come in, and Jim had the plans out front showing
411 them to me, and Jim very nicely took care of him and he left. So, that's a good sign.

412

413 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This application is for approval of a child care
414 center to be located in the relatively unused parking area of the rear of the hospital. The
415 applicant proposes to remove an existing metal storage building and restripe the parking area and
416 construct a single-story daycare building. This case was deferred last month in order to allow
417 staff and the applicant to resolve questions about the parking and the architectural finish of the
418 new building. Since our last meeting, staff has received a revised plan and architectural
419 elevations, which we have included in this morning's addendum. As you will see from the colors
420 of the elevation, the building finish reflects those of the existing hospital. And, there are revised
421 parking tabulations which indicate that there will be ample parking spaces after removal of the
422 spaces where the new daycare center is to be constructed. So, with that, staff is recommending
423 approval, and I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

424

425 Mr. Vanarsdall - You took the blue out, didn't you?

426

427 Mr. Strauss - There was a, I guess you could say, a little bit of a riot of primary colors
428 at the entrance of the other building. Actually, to be fair, the architectural elevations were in
429 black and white and there was no color shown. But, I did go on the architect's web site and there
430 was quite a bit of primary color at the entrance and very festive. That's okay for the kids, I
431 guess, but it was not in keeping with what the rest of the hospital looked like, so staff worked
432 with the architect and he is very happy to provide this revised elevation.

433

434 Mr. Vanarsdall - Although it is behind the hospital, Jim made sure that it would match the
435 hospital's materials as much as possible, which he has done a good job on. Thank you, Jim.

436

437 Mr. Strauss - Thank you.

438

439 Mr. Vanarsdall - Now, one of the things was parking and that was settled.

440 Mr. Strauss - Yes.

441

442 Mr. Vanarsdall - One of the things I wanted to ask you this morning.... It started out just as
443 a daycare center for employees for the hospital.

444

445 Mr. Strauss - Yes, I did get a letter from Draper Aden indicating that they still intend to
446 have this just for the hospital employees. That's the most recent information that I've received.

447

448 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you, Jim. Anybody have any questions for Mr. Strauss? If not,
449 I'll move that POD-29-05, Childrens' Choice Daycare @ Henrico Doctor's Hospital, be
450 approved with the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this type,
451 and then we have on the addendum we have additional conditions Nos. 23 through 31.

452

453 Mr. Jernigan - Second.

454

455 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Jernigan.
456 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

457

458 The Planning Commission approved POD-29-05, Childrens' Choice Daycare @ Henrico
459 Doctor's Hospital - E. Parham Road (POD-14-00 Revised) subject to the standard conditions
460 attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plan, and the
461 following additional conditions:

462

463 23. The site including paving, pavement markings, signage, curb and gutter, dumpster
464 screens, walls, fences, lighting and other site improvements shall be properly
465 maintained in good condition at all times. Any necessary repairs shall be made in a
466 timely manner.

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

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

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

477 27. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
478 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by
479 the Department of Public Works.

480 28. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
481 drainage plans.

482 29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
483 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
484 issuance of a building permit.

485 30. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
486 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-
487 way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.

488 31. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment (including
489 HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes, transformers, and
490 generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All equipment shall be screened
491 by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the
492 Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

493

494 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, before we go any farther, Mr. Archer's screen has died
495 on him here. Can they boot him up?

496

497 Mr. Archer - No, boot the screen up.

498

499 Mr. Jernigan - Boot the screen up, don't boot Mr. Archer.

500

501 Mr. Vanarsdall - What died on him?

502

503 Mr. Jernigan - His screen.

504

505 Mr. Vanarsdall - Oh, his screen.

506

507 Mr. Archer - My monitor is not working.

508

509 Mr. Vanarsdall - Who is in charge of the screens?

510

511 Mr. Jernigan - He's coming right now.

512

513 Mr. Vanarsdall - Here he comes. All right we will take a two-minute sitting break while
514 the technician work on Mr. Archer's monitor.

515

516 **AT THIS TIME, THE PLANNING COMMISSION STOPPED THE MEETING TO**
517 **HAVE THE TECHNICIAN TAKE A LOOK AT MR. ARCHER'S MONITOR, WHICH**
518 **COULDN'T BE FIXED AT THE TIME, SO THEY CONTINUED WITH THE**
519 **MEETING.**

520

521 Mr. Silber - Are we ready to move on?

522

523 Mr. Archer - Yes.

524

525 Mr. Silber - Is it working?

526

527 Mr. Archer - No, but we can go on. I don't need it.

528

529 Mr. Vanarsdall - Please note that Mr. Archer monitor isn't working.

565 Mr. Shirley - Good morning, my name is Bruce Shirley and I am the architect for the
566 building. The owner could not make it and apologizes, they are out of town. We have not
567 done any investigation as far as signage right now, but anything that we will do in the future
568 will certainly meet all of the County guidelines and issues.

569

570 Mrs. Jones - Well, I understand that it will be within Code requirements, but with
571 residential properties on two of the four sides, it is important to me that the signage be non-
572 intrusive.

573

574 Mr. Shirley - I'm not exactly sure how specifically to address that today but we can
575 certainly do it in the future. I know the Police Department recommended that we put an eight-
576 foot fence to three of the adjoining properties so that's probably going to be more intrusive
577 than any signage we do, which will certainly be lower, by the guidelines. So, we are trying to
578 work with that with plantings and landscaping versus fencing, and the signage, obviously, will
579 be worked into that at some point.

580

581 Mrs. Jones - Well, signage, that doesn't have a lot of light associated with it at night
582 or these kinds of things certainly are appropriate for making sure that it doesn't impact the
583 residential all around.

584

585 Mr. Shirley - I'll let the owner know.

586

587 Mrs. Jones - Okay. Thank you. And I have another question. Mr. Secretary, help
588 me out. With the use and the parking spaces, once this particular POD, for instance, moves
589 forward, if the property changes hand or whatever, does that restriction go along with the
590 property or... How does that work?

591

592 Mr. Silber - Yes, ma'am. That restriction would still apply no matter who owns the
593 property. The staff is bringing to the Commission's attention the fact that this property is
594 going to be used partially for medical uses and partially for general office. General Office
595 doesn't carry the parking demand that medical offices carries. So, my concern is that if it
596 became all medical office, it would have a higher parking demand and the parking can be
597 provided on the site as currently laid out. We do have a condition that addresses this, and any
598 future owner of this property has to comply with those parking requirements. If they do
599 provide all medical, then they will have to provide more parking on the site. So, to answer
600 your question in short, yes. No matter when the property is sold, who owns it will have to
601 comply with those regulations.

602

603 Mrs. Jones - And is there an accompanying letter to go along with this POD, as
604 originally envisioned, or no?

605

606 Mr. Silber - No. The letter would be the approval letter that goes to the applicant.

607

608 Mrs. Jones - I thought the applicant was going to sign a letter and return it to us.

609

610 Mr. Greulich - The applicant was attempting to provide a letter. They don't have it
611 available for this meeting today, but they can.

612

613 Mr. Shirley - They will agree to do so.

614

615 Mr. Silber - So, they have agreed to provide us with a letter but have not done it yet,
616 but will do that. When will that letter be provided?

617

618 Mr. Shirley - Most likely, by the end of the week. They are out of town and we were
619 just informed late Friday that we were to have the letter and it just couldn't happen by this
620 morning.

621

622 Mr. Silber The letter I think will just simply reinforce this point. But, if this
623 property transfer to another owner, that transfer of approval would have to come back to the
624 Planning Commission, and that new owner will become aware of these conditions and this
625 issue will be raised again.

626

627 Mrs. Jones - Okay. Do we need to add any other condition to address the letter?

628

629 Mr. Silber - I don't think we need to. Staff will just make sure that we get that letter.

630

631 Mrs. Jones - Okay. Thank you. With that, I move for approval of POD-39-05,
632 Arcorp II Office Building at 1521 Starling Drive, subject to the annotations on the plan, the
633 standard conditions for developments of this type, and the additional conditions Nos. 23
634 through 35.

635

636 Mr. Archer - Second.

637

638 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer. All
639 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

640

641 The Planning Commission approved POD-39-05, Arcorp II Office Building, subject to the
642 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on
643 the plan, and the following additional conditions?

644

645 23. The site including paving, pavement markings, signage, curb and gutter, dumpster
646 screens, walls, fences, lighting and other site improvements shall be properly
647 maintained in good condition at all times. Any necessary repairs shall be made in a
648 timely manner.

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

654 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public

- 655 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 656 26. The right-of-way for widening of Starling Drive as shown on approved plans shall be
 657 dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way
 658 dedication plat and any other required information shall be submitted to the County
 659 Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 660 27. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
- 661 28. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in
 662 a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction
 663 plans.
- 664 29. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be
 665 approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by
 666 the Department of Public Works.
- 667 30. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
 668 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
 669 issuance of a building permit.
- 670 31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
 671 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-
 672 way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 673 32. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment (including
 674 HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes, transformers, and
 675 generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All equipment shall be screened
 676 by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the
 677 Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
- 678 33. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the east side of Starling Drive.
- 679 34. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of occupancy
 680 permits for individual units shall be based on the number of parking spaces required for
 681 the proposed uses and the amount of parking available according to approved plans.
- 682 35. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
 683 drainage plans.

684
 685 **SUBDIVISION**
 686

Techpark
 (June 2005 Plan) -
 Technology Boulevard

Timmons Group for Earl Thompson, Inc.: The 111.0-acre site proposed for an industrial park is located on the south line of Technology Boulevard and the north line of Portugee Road, approximately 2,500 feet east of Memorial Drive on parcel 844-704-6523. The zoning is M-2C, General Industrial District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Varina) 0 Lot**

687
 688 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to Techpark (June 2005
 689 Plan), in the Varina District? No opposition. Good morning, again, Kevin.

690
 691 Mr. Wilhite - Good morning, again. The revised plan that you just received does not
 692 contain any changes to the layout of the subdivision. The original plan was missing some basic
 693 zoning information that was required and the plan that you received has provided this

694 information. This property was originally zoned in 1997 to industrial use. At that time, it
695 included a conceptual master plan that showed a single cul-de-sac street running from
696 Technology Boulevard to the south. The subdivision plan that you have before you today,
697 constitutes a revision to that conceptual plan that the Planning Commission would have to
698 specifically approve. It provides two additional interior cul-de-sac streets in the development
699 and also proposes two stub streets to the adjacent parcels to the west. The larger parcel to the
700 west was rezoned to industrial, as well, in the year 2000. The conceptual master plan included
701 with it does show connection to this site at the location of the northernmost stub street
702 proposed in this subdivision. The southernmost stub street on this plan was not reflected on
703 that original plan back in 2000 for the adjacent property.

704

705 In addition, when Technology Boulevard was constructed, the property to the north, a portion
706 of the corners were cut off. That appears as triangular pieces of leftover property at the
707 northwest and northeast corners of this property. Staff recommend that the applicant talk to
708 the property owner and try to get these pieces of land incorporated into the development,
709 otherwise they will be left over and there is no real use for them as separate parcels. It is our
710 understanding that the applicant has not approached the property owner about these specific
711 pieces of property.

712

713 Recreation & Parks has indicated that there is evidence of seasonal camp sites of Native North
714 Americans on this property as well as indication of settlement back into the 19th century and
715 they have recommended that a Phase I archeology study be done on the site. We have not
716 received any confirmation from the applicant that they are willing to do this type of study.

717

718 The bigger issue remaining is the fact that there is only one point of access into this proposed
719 development. Staff has a condition recommending a second point of access be provided when
720 the floor area of this project gets to 100,000 square feet. It's possible it may come from the
721 adjacent property by way of the stub streets. It was also a recommendation made by Traffic
722 during the zoning case, but it doesn't seem to have received a lot of attention. The only
723 mention of it was that a boulevard entrance was being provided with the Conceptual Master
724 Plan and there was no other discussion during the minutes of the zoning case. Staff is still
725 proposing that as a condition. I'll be happy to answer any question that you may have at this
726 time.

727

728 Mr. Jernigan - Mike, I see you here today. Did you want to say anything along with
729 Kevin, or did you come to answer questions today?

730

731 Mr. Jennings - I'm here to answer questions, if you need me to.

732

733 Mr. Jernigan - Kevin, let me ask you this, and I'm sure that the applicant is here.
734 Explain to them, in case they don't know. Are you familiar with the Phase I Archeology
735 Study?

736

737 Mr. Wilhite - No.

738 Mr. Jernigan - Okay. I don't need any more. I do need to speak to the applicant.

739

740 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Will the applicant come down?

741

742 Mr. Rodriguez - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My name
743 is Roger Rodriguez and I'm with Timmons Group representing on behalf of the applicant. We
744 received staff's comments and we are in agreement with all of them with two exceptions, and
745 one being the archeological study. We have tried to contact staff to discuss that comment and
746 that currently remains in a (bans?) we haven't received, return correspondence from them yet.
747 And it's not that we are in opposition to it, we just haven't had an opportunity to discuss it
748 with staff as of this point, with Parks & Recreation. But, we have made a couple of attempts
749 to call him. The other issue resorting to the access point, the single access point. We are
750 trying to keep as close as possible to the generalized development plan that was proffered back
751 in 1997. They showed one access point and that's why we are currently still showing one
752 access point. There are a couple of issues that create hardships for providing a second access
753 point. The first being, a minimal 1000-foot separation between entrances on Technology
754 Boulevard. And, with the narrow frontage of the property, here, (referring to map on the
755 screen) along Technology Boulevard, it's geometrically prohibited to have two entrances along
756 Technology Boulevard with the frontage that we currently have under control.

757

758 We are providing these stub streets in case property to the west does develop and the inter-
759 parcel connection as Mr. Wilhite mentioned would at that point provide the second point of
760 access. The property to the rear on Portugee Road, it is our understanding, based on staff's
761 recollection during the zoning case, the residents were in opposition to a connection along
762 Portugee Road. And the area back here (referring to map) in the southeast corner of the site,
763 is inundated with wetlands. It's environmentally prohibitive at this point to pursue an access
764 along this corner. We stand on the fact that we are providing these stub streets for future inter-
765 parcel connections and we do have the boulevard, style entrance. We've got two lanes going
766 out of the subdivision, one lane coming in with a divided median.

767

768 Mr. Silber - Mr. Rodriguez, I think staff's primary concern is, and we may need to
769 get Mr. Jennings up here to express this, but I think for office or industrial development the
770 point is that the traffic needs to be distributed and a boulevard entrance, in our minds, doesn't
771 provide the distribution that's necessary. I understand the concerns about access limitation to
772 the south to Portugee with environmental conditions. And I understand you are proving a stub
773 to the west. I think our point is that we would like to see a second point of access provided,
774 probably to Technology Boulevard, by way of future development of the property to the west.
775 I realize that you don't control that. You don't have the ability to know when that might take
776 place, but to have unlimited amount of square footage provided with one point of access,
777 provides the County with concerns. My recommendation might be.... Let me ask you this.
778 How many square feet of space are you proposing on this property? Can you give us some
779 estimation?

780

781 Mr. Rodriguez - Well, with the current zoning, the product type will allow for
782 distribution and trucking and storage type facilities. So, it's likely that one building could
783 exceed the 100,000 square feet. We would get up to it rather quickly is what I'm getting at.

784

785 Mr. Silber - Do you know how much total square footage would this entire property
786 yield?

787

788 Mr. Rodriguez - I haven't examined that as of yet. Six or seven hundred thousand.

789

790 Mr. Jernigan - What was that?

791

792 Mr. Rodriguez - Six or seven hundred thousand square feet total property yield.

793

794 Mr. Silber - On 111 acres?

795

796 Mr. Jernigan - Well, actually I think it could be more than that. In the conceptual plan
797 of the zoning case, it shows more than that.

798

799 Mr. Rodriguez - It very well could be. It's all depending on the actually end user that
800 does get in there and what their specific needs are.

801

802 Mr. Silber - I may want to ask Mr. Jennings what he thinks about allowing something
803 greater than 100,000. A hundred thousand, like you said, may not even allow the first
804 building. But, I think the concern is that perhaps this entire site should not develop out on one
805 point of access. We may have close to or over a million square feet in here on one point of
806 access and I think that that could be a concern.

807

808 Mr. Rodriguez - Okay.

809

810 Mr. Silber- Mr. Jernigan, would you mind if we hear from Mr. Jennings?

811

812 Mr. Jernigan - No, that would be fine.

813

814 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Mr. Jennings.

815

816 Mr. Jennings - Good morning, Planning Commission members. As stated, I'm Mike
817 Jennings, Assistant Traffic Engineer with the County. Yes, this has come up, since the zoning
818 case, to what we are looking at providing access. A second point of access can be provided at
819 Technology Boulevard. He stated 1000 feet between entrances. That's 1000 feet between
820 median breaks. He can provide another access point. It would just be a right in right out on
821 Technology Boulevard. So, it can be provided. We had a meeting back on May 6 and I
822 brought this up to them that we were concerned about this much development on one point of
823 access. And their comment was that they weren't allowed to have access to Portugee Road,
824 which I understand, but they were going to provide a second point through to the west there,
825 that M-1C piece. So, that would be their second point of access. They can provide another
826 point of access onto Technology Boulevard, 150/250 feet apart away from this one that they
827 are providing and meet our second of access. As you all know, a boulevard entrance does not
828 meet our standards as a second point of access.

829

830 Mr. Silber - Mr. Jennings, there are two slivers of property on Technology Boulevard
831 that's zoned A-1. I don't know if they control that or not but that has some zoning
832 implications that could cause them to have some, well, I guess if this is a public road that goes
833 through there, it wouldn't be a zoning situation. But, I don't know if they control that
834 property or not.

835

836 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mike, you are speaking of where the arrow points to A-1, that little
837 sliver right there (referring to the map). Is that where you are talking about where there could
838 be a second point of access?

839

840 Mr. Jennings - Well, they could actually provide one here which would be between the
841 entrances to what they are proposing in the Infineon Corporation, but it will just be a right in,
842 right out. We wouldn't allow another median break onto Technology Boulevard.

843

844 Mr. Jernigan - Mike, that's wet there. I mean, right in that portion, where you just had
845 the little indicator, that's wet.

846

847 Mr. Jennings - Well, I'm not sure about where the wetlands impacts and stuff would be,
848 but for safety purposes, having this much traffic on one point of access, we are very
849 concerned. Even for fire trucks just to access their property.

850

851 Mr. Jernigan - Mike, I know you all want the 100,000 square feet. Reading over this
852 case, when this case came through naturally they just showed that one point of access coming
853 in. It's tough to put two points on this small piece. Now going over to the M-1C, I can see,
854 you know, through there but at this point they don't have control of that. What I am
855 considering doing is widening up the boulevard entrance which I know you don't endorse
856 anyway, but limiting the amount of square footage going in there, at this point, until maybe
857 they can work out something with the M-1C piece, connect to that stub. What I'm going to
858 recommend is that we increase the island width of the boulevard entrance to 40 feet and that
859 we limit any square footage in there to 500,000 square feet before there is a second point of
860 access. This property is 111 acres and probably has about, you could probably get about a
861 million square feet of buildings on there. And I know that's not what you want, but at this
862 point I don't see.... If I owned this property, I wouldn't buy it if I had to put two points of
863 access in. And, when it came through the zoning case, it was, and Tim Foster checked, and it
864 was in the minutes, or it was in the case that they recommended two points of access but it
865 went on through it. If two points of access then would have been.... It might have changed
866 the way the case came out. So, Mr. Silber, that's what I'm feeling is that, I know that it is
867 over the limit that Public Works wants but I think that it is something that will restrict how
868 much traffic comes out of there until we have the second point.

869

870 Mr. Silber - Okay.

871 Mr. Jennings - Respectfully, I disagree with the 40-foot landscape island in the middle, I
872 would rather see it like it is because....

873

874 Mr. Jernigan - Ten feet.

875

876 Mr. Jennings - Yes. Leave it as 10 feet because it looks almost two roads and that
877 would be confusing with that much gap between the entrance, the egress and ingress.

878

879 Mr. Jernigan - The reason that I said that was because when I talked to Mr. Foster he
880 was also concerned if something happened on Technology Boulevard, not in the complex, it
881 may be jammed up there. That's the reason I was going to widen it out. But, if you think that
882 the 10 feet is ample.

883

884 Mr. Jennings - Well, that's a standard boulevard entrance. I mean, widening it to 15 to
885 20 feet maybe but 40 feet is just too much and it would be confusing. It would look like to
886 roads coming there.

887

888 Mr. Jernigan - Okay. Well then let's do 20 feet. Will that be okay? Well, I know you
889 are not endorsing it, period, but, I mean, 20 feet would be....

890

891 Mr. Jennings - How about 15, seriously, sir?

892

893 Mr. Jernigan - I'm going to work with you today. All right, let's do 15. Okay. Thank
894 you, Mike.

895

896 Mr. Silber - Mr. Jernigan, because it's hard to engineer this right here, can we say 15
897 unless another design is approved by the Director of Public Works or something because we
898 don't want to get into a situation that we end up with a design that will become a safety issue.

899

900 Mr. Jernigan - Well, until I talked with Mr. Foster, I always thought that they were
901 more concerned internally, not on the main road coming in. That's the reason we had the two
902 points. But, he was also concerned that if something did happen on Technology where you
903 wouldn't have access in. That's the reason why I was widening it. But, 15 feet is fine with
904 me unless y'all deem different.

905

906 Mr. Jennings - I think that will be sufficient.

907

908 Mr. Jernigan - The only other thing we do have to get straight is the archeological
909 study.

910

911 Mr. Vanarsdall - Where is the 15 feet going to show up, an annotation on the plan? There
912 is no condition here.

913

914 Mr. Jernigan - What do you want to do, Mr. Silber?

915

916 Mr. Silber - I think it needs to be a condition. Mr. Wilhite, do you have any thought
917 on that?
918
919 Mr. Wilhite - We can do that as a condition or as an annotation. The construction
920 plans for the road is not a part of this approval. That's typically handled administratively in
921 the future. We don't get into that much detail. I would think an annotation of 15 feet on the
922 island would probably be sufficient.
923
924 Mr. Jernigan - Okay.
925
926 Mr. Silber - With further consideration, if necessary, by the Director of Public
927 Works.
928
929 Mr. Wilhite - We could do it by condition or annotation, either way.
930
931 Mr. Silber - I think it will work either way. Why don't we do it with an annotation.
932
933 Mr. Jernigan - Let's do an annotation.
934
935 Mr. Rodriguez - Okay.
936
937 Mr. Jernigan - So, we do need to get the Phase I study. Are we okay on that?
938
939 Mr. Rodriguez - Yes. We are still trying to contact staff. And, again, it is not in
940 opposition to doing the study but just to discuss with them the extents of what's to be required
941 there. But, at this time we are not opposing the condition or opposing to do the study itself.
942
943 Mr. Jernigan - Okay, then we will put that on as a condition.
944
945 Mr. Rodriguez - That's acceptable.
946
947 Mr. Jernigan - Okay.
948
949 Mr. Silber - Okay.
950
951 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any more questions by Commission members?
952
953 Mr. Archer - I would like to ask the applicant a question. In the event the second
954 ingress/egress is required, what seems to be the most likely spot now, looking at what we have
955 here in front of us, through the A-1 or the stub that goes to the M-1C?
956
957 Mr. Rodriguez - Most likely, Mr. Archer, the stub that will go through the M-1C as it has
958 already been mentioned, I think in Mr. Wilhite's presentation....
959
960 Mr. Archer - And it will go back to Technology?

961 Mr. Rodriguez - This forms a leap road that does go back up to Technology Boulevard.
962

963 Mr. Archer - Okay.
964

965 Mr. Vanarsdall - Who owns that property (referring to map)?
966

967 Mr. Rodriguez - We currently do not have that under control. The owner right now, I do
968 not know.
969

970 Mr. Silber - This plat indicates Redford's Brick Company. I don't know if that is the
971 current owner but that's what this plat indicates.
972

973 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, at this point I understand Public Works situation, they
974 don't want to have a million square feet in there with all that traffic coming out like that, but I
975 also understand that the developer is in a position to where if he's limited to 100,000 square
976 feet he can't do much with his property, that's the reason I'm recommending that we do a half
977 a million and then that will take you for a couple of years and if you run short then you can
978 come back and we will re-evaluate it.
979

980 Mr. Rodriguez - You, actually dipped into my bags of tricks a little bit. I was going to
981 recommend an increase of the threshold and square footage to be approved as a condition,
982 because like you said, 100,000 square feet could be prohibitive for the economics of
983 developing the park.
984

985 Mr. Silber - So, Mr. Jernigan, if I maybe could just sum this up. You are
986 recommending that condition No. 14 be changed from 100,000 square feet to 500,000 square
987 feet.
988

989 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, sir.
990

991 Mr. Silber - You would be recommending additional condition No. 16 that would
992 require Phase I archeological study.
993

994 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, sir.
995

996 Mr. Silber - And you asked that there be an annotation placed on the plan that would
997 indicate that the boulevard at the entrance be widen to 15 feet unless otherwise approved by the
998 Director of Public Works.
999

1000 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, sir.
1001

1002 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, entertain a motion.
1003

1004 Mr. Jernigan - All right. With that, I will ask for approval of subdivision Techpark
1005 (June 2005 Plan) on Technology Boulevard, subject to the standard conditions for subdivisions

1006 served by public utilities and the following additional conditions Nos. 12 through 15, No. 16
1007 added, No. 14 changed to 500,000 square feet and the annotation on the plan to increase the
1008 island width to 15 feet.

1009

1010 Mrs. Jones - Second.

1011

1012 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
1013 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

1014

1015 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval subject to Techpark (June 2005 Plan)
1016 subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions served by public
1017 utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

1018

1019 12. The limits and elevation of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on
1020 the plat and construction plans and labeled "Limits of 100-year floodplain." Dedicate
1021 floodplain as a "Variable Width Drainage & Utilities Easement."

1022 13. The proffers approved as part of zoning case C-60C-97 shall be incorporated in this
1023 approval.

1024 14. A second point of vehicular access will be required when the development exceeds
1025 500,000 square feet of floor area.

1026 15. A revised conceptual master plan for this development shall be provided with the first
1027 Plan of Development submitted and updated with every subsequent POD submittal.

1028 16. The developer shall conduct a Phase I archaeological study of the property prior to
1029 County approval of the subdivision construction plans and shall provide copies to the
1030 Department of Planning and Recreation and Parks.

1031

1032 Mr. Silber - All right. The last thing on the agenda is the approval of the May 25,
1033 2005, minutes.

1034

1035 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 25, 2005 Minutes**

1036

1037 Mrs. Jones - I have some corrections. On page 12, just to make sure that it reads
1038 correctly, the last line should read: While we **were** waiting for the building to proceed.

1039

1040 Mr. Silber - Mrs. Jones, what line is that?

1041

1042 Mrs. Jones - Excuse me, line 412. On page 13, line 429. I am sure that I addressed Jim
1043 as "Mr. Strauss" instead of "Ms." And, also in that line it should be "be" as opposed to "we."
1044 Actually, I read them really closely this time. On page 27, line 972, insert the word "came" in
1045 between they and back. And one other thing, page 36, line 1406, I believe the word "enter"
1046 should be "under."

1047

1048 Mr. Silber - Okay.

1049

1050 Mr. Jernigan - Are you finished?

1051 Mrs. Jones - Yes.
1052
1053 Mr. Jernigan - On page 34, line 1308, I said “Let’s get it rolling, unless you want to... It
1054 says “deny” it. I didn’t mean to say that, if I said that, but it should be “defer it.”
1055
1056 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are there any more changes? If not, we need a motion.
1057
1058 Mr. Archer - I move approval of the minutes as corrected, Mr. Chairman.
1059
1060 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
1061
1062 Mr. Vanarsdall - The motion was made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All
1063 in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion passes.
1064
1065 The Planning Commission approved the May 25, 2005, minutes as corrected.
1066
1067 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Secretary, do we have anything else? Mr. Kaechele, I didn’t get to
1068 recognize you this morning. I’m sorry.
1069
1070 Mr. Kaechele - That’s all right. Good morning.
1071
1072 Mr. Silber - No, sir. I have no comments this morning.
1073
1074 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Secretary has no more. Anybody else have anything? Well, the
1075 Commission is now adjourned then.
1076
1077 Mr. Archer - Second.
1078
1079 On a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Archer, the Planning Commission adjourned
1080 its June 22, 2005, meeting at 9:58 a.m.
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085

Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Chairman
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090

Randall R. Silber, Secretary
1091