

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of Henrico County,
2 held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the Government Center
3 at Parham and Hungary Spring Roads, beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, March 28,
4 2007.

5
6

Members Present: Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C. (Fairfield)
Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Acting Chairperson
(Brookland)
Mrs. Bonnie-Leigh Jones (Tuckahoe)
Mr. Frank Thornton (Fairfield)
Board of Supervisors Representative
Mr. Randall R. Silber, Director of Planning, Secretary

Members Absent: Mr. Tommy Branin, Chairperson (Three Chopt)
Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C. (Varina)

Others Present: Mr. David D. O'Kelly, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Leslie A. News, CLA, Principal Planner
Mr. James P. Strauss, CLA, County Planner
Mr. Kevin D. Wilhite, C.P.C., AICP, County Planner
Mr. Michael F. Kennedy, County Planner
Ms. Christina L. Goggin, AICP, County Planner
Mr. Tony Greulich, C.P.C., County Planner
Mr. Gregory Garrison, County Planner
Mr. Matt Ward, County Planner
Mr. Michael Jennings, Traffic Engineer
Ms. Diana B. Carver, Recording Secretary

7
8
9
10

Mr. Frank J. Thornton, the Board of Supervisors representative, abstains from voting on all cases unless otherwise noted.

11 Mr. Silber - The Planning Commission's policies require that the
12 Planning Commission have a quorum. A quorum is four of the six members of the
13 Planning Commission. We have one Planning Commission member who is on vacation.
14 We have one Planning Commission member who had to leave yesterday because of a
15 death in his family. The Board member, Mr. Thornton, will be here momentarily, but
16 he's having to make a short presentation up the road. He will be here shortly. You can
17 see that we have three members of the Planning Commission. When the fourth one, Mr.
18 Thornton, arrives, we will begin the meeting, but we will need to wait until he arrives.
19 We anticipate him shortly. We appreciate your patience and we'll start momentarily.

20 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning everybody. The Commission will now come to
21 order. I think Mr. Secretary said it wouldn't be long and we apologize for that. It just
22 couldn't be helped. Good morning fellow Commissioners and good morning Mr.
23 Thornton. We have a lot on the plate this morning, so I'll turn this over to our Secretary,
24 Mr. Silber.

25
26 Mr. Silber - Thank you, Mr. Vanarsdall. As I mentioned earlier, we do
27 have a quorum now. We appreciate Mr. Thornton's efforts to get here quickly. He had a
28 speaking engagement up the road, so he's been hustling today with recent knee
29 surgery. We appreciate you making it here, Mr. Thornton, so quickly. We do have two
30 members of the Planning Commission that are not here today and Mr. Vanarsdall is
31 sitting in as our Chairman today since the Chairman and Vice Chairman are not here.
32 We're working the best we can with what we have available. We have several deferrals
33 this morning, a withdrawal, and a number of items on the expedited agenda, so I think
34 this meeting will probably move along quickly anyway. Ms. News, can you tell us about
35 the deferrals, please.

36
37 Ms. News - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.
38 We have six items for deferrals and withdrawals on the agenda, as well as an additional
39 request for deferral that we received late last night, which I'll get to in a moment. The
40 first item is on page 2 of your agenda and located in the Three Chopt District. This is a
41 Transfer of Approval for POD-36-88, Chem Treat Building. The applicant is requesting
42 a deferral to the April 25, 2007 meeting.

43
44 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL**

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

POD-36-88
Chem Treat Building –
4301 Dominion Boulevard

William Homiller for 4301 Dominion Boulevard, LLC:
Request for transfer of approval as required by Chapter
24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code from
Lakefront Associates, L.P. to 4301 Dominion Boulevard,
LLC. The 2.457-acre site is located at 4301 Dominion
Boulevard, on the west line of Dominion Boulevard,
approximately 450 feet north of its intersection with
Innslake Drive on parcel 747-762-9548. The zoning is O-
3C, Office District (Conditional) and C-1, Conservation
District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

46
47 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to deferral of
48 the transfer of approval request for POD-36-88, Chem Treat Building? No opposition.

49
50 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for the deferral of POD-36-88 to the
51 April 25, 2007 meeting at the applicant's request.

52
53 Mrs. Jones - Second.

55 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mrs. Jones. All in
56 favor say aye. Those opposed say no. The motion carries.

57
58 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-36-88, Chem
59 Treat Building, to its April 25, 2007 meeting.

60
61 Ms. News - The next item is on page 6 of your agenda and located in the
62 Three Chopt District. This is POD-12-07, Circuit City Headquarters Additional Parking.
63 The applicant has requested that this project be withdrawn.

64
65 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & TRANSITIONAL BUFFER DEVIATION**
66 **(Deferred from the February 28, 2007 Meeting)**
67

POD-12-07 **Foster & Miller, P.C. for Circuit City Stores, Inc.:**
Circuit City Headquarters Request for approval of a plan of development and
Additional Parking – transitional buffer deviation, as required by Chapter 24,
Terminus of Deep Rock Road Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County
Code, to construct a parking lot for an existing building.
The 5.20-acre site is located at the terminus of Deep Rock
Road, approximately 1,800 feet south of W. Broad Street
(U.S. Route 250) on parcel 750-758-0974, part of 7092
and part of 3831. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial
District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three
Chopt)**

68
69 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the
70 withdrawal of POD-12-07, Circuit City Headquarters Additional Parking – Terminus of
71 Deep Rock Road in the Three Chopt District? No opposition.

72
73 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for withdrawal of POD-12-07, Circuit
74 City Headquarters Additional Parking, at the applicant's request.

75
76 Mrs. Jones - Second.

77
78 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones.
79 All in favor say aye. Those opposed say no. The motion carries.

80
81 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission withdrew POD-12-07, Circuit
82 City Headquarters Additional Parking – Terminus of Deep Rock Road, from further
83 consideration by the Commission.

84
85 Ms. News - Next on page 14 of your agenda and located in the
86 Brookland District is POD-16-07, Common Endodontics. The applicant is requesting a
87 deferral to the April 25, 2007 meeting.

88 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

89
POD-16-07
Commonwealth
Endodontics -3107
Hungary Spring Road
(POD-85-82 Revised)

Koontz-Bryant, P.C. for Sowers Construction and Formanas, 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, 5,177 square foot medical office building. The 0.87-acre site is located on the southeast corner of Hungary Spring Road and Somoa Drive on parcel 766-753-7462. The zoning is O-1C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

90
91 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral
92 of POD-16-07, Commonwealth Endodontics in the Brookland District? No opposition. I
93 would like to move for deferral of POD-16-07, Commonwealth Endodontics, to the April
94 25, 2007 meeting, per the applicant’s request.

95
96 Mrs. Jones - Second.

97
98 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mrs.
99 Jones. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.

100
101 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-16-07,
102 Commonwealth Endodontics, to its April 25, 2007 meeting.

103
104 Ms. News - Next on page 16 of your agenda and located in the Three
105 Chopt District is POD-17-07, Westmark Four. The applicant requests deferral to the
106 April 25, 2007 meeting

107
108 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

109
POD-17-07
Westmark Four-Cox Road
and I-64

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. for RER/New Boston Cox Road, 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 building pad and parking for a future 100,000 square foot office building. The 5.43-acre site is located on the west line of Cox Road approximately 1,200 feet south of the intersection of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) and Cox Road on parcel 747-759-4312. The zoning is O-3C, Office District (Conditional) and O-3, Office District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

110
111 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral
112 of POD-17-07, Westmark Four - Cox Road and I-64 in the Three Chopt District? No
113 opposition.

114
115 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for deferral of POD-17-07, Westmark
116 Four - Cox Road and I-64, to the April 25, 2007 meeting at the applicant's request.

117
118 Mrs. Jones - Second.

119
120 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
121 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

122
123 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-17-07,
124 Westmark Four - Cox Road and I-64, to its April 25, 2007 meeting.

125
126 Ms. News - On page 18 of your agenda and located in the Three Chopt
127 District is POD-18-07, Westmark II, Phase II. The applicant has requested deferral to
128 the April 25, 2007 meeting.

129
130 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

131
132
133 **POD-18-07 Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. for RER/New Boston W.**
134 **Westmark II, Phase II – Broad Street LLC:** Request for approval of a plan of
135 **W. Broad Street** development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106
of the Henrico County Code, to construct two building pads
for future restaurants of 8,400 square feet and 8,125
square feet with parking areas, and a 3,000 square foot
pad for a future bank. The 4.38-acre site is located at the
intersection of I-64 and W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250)
on parcel 746-760-8608. The zoning is O-3, Office District
and B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water
and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

136
137 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral
138 of POD-18-07, Westmark II, Phase II in the Three Chopt District? No opposition.

139
140 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for deferral of POD-18-07, Westmark
141 II, Phase II, to the April 25, 2007 meeting at the applicant's request.

142
143 Mrs. Jones - Second.

144
145 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
146 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-18-07,
Westmark II, Phase II, to its April 25, 2007 meeting.

147 Ms. News - On page 22 of your agenda and located in the Varina District
148 is SUB-14-07, Village @ Olde Colony (February 2007 Plan) for six lots. The applicant
149 has requested a deferral to the April 25, 2007 meeting.

150
151 **SUBDIVISION (Deferred from the February 28, 2007 Meeting)**

152
SUB-14-07 **Bay Design Group, P.C. for Shurm Construction, Inc.**
Village @ Olde Colony **and Sydney and Sydney Development, LLC:** The 3.673-
(February 2007 Plan) - acre site proposed for a subdivision of 6 single-family
Harmony Avenue homes is located along the south line of Harmony Avenue
and the northern terminus of Woodside Street on parcel
803-696-9576. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence
District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Varina) 6**
Lots

153
154 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the deferral
155 of SUB-14-07, Village @ Olde Colony (February 2007 Plan) in the Varina District? No
156 opposition.

157
158 Mrs. Jones - Mr. Chairman, I move for the deferral of SUB-14-07, Village
159 @ Olde Colony (February 2007 Plan) to the April 25, 2007 meeting by the applicant's
160 request.

161
162 Mr. Archer - Second.

163
164 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer. All
165 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

166
167 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred SUB-14-07, Village
168 @ Olde Colony (February 2007 Plan) to its April 25, 2007 meeting.

169
170 Ms. News - We have an added item on page 28 of your agenda. This is
171 SUB-22-07, Tredinnock Farm (March 2007 Plan) for 20 lots. The applicant has
172 requested a deferral to the April 25, 2007 meeting.

- 237 25. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be
238 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any
239 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required
240 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty
241 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 242 26. The entrances and drainage facilities on Airport Drive (State Route 156) and
243 Nine Mile Road (State Route 33) shall be approved by the Virginia Department of
244 Transportation and the County.
- 245 27. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
246 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 247 28. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-46C-06 shall be incorporated in
248 this approval.
- 249 29. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of
250 occupancy permits for individual units shall be based on the number of parking
251 spaces required for the proposed uses and the amount of parking available
252 according to approved plans.
- 253 30. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be
254 obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the
255 construction plans.
- 256 31. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design
257 shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction
258 plans by the Department of Public Works.
- 259 32. In the event of any traffic backup which blocks the public right-of-way as a result
260 of congestion caused by the drive-up delivery facilities, the owner/occupant shall
261 close the drive-up delivery facilities until a solution can be designed to prevent
262 traffic backup.
- 263 33. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
264 drainage plans.
- 265 34. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
266 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
267 issuance of a building permit.
- 268 35. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
269 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of
270 Transportation maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the
271 contractor and approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation.
- 272 36. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be
273 submitted to the Department of Planning and approved prior to issuance of a
274 certificate of occupancy for this development.
- 275 37. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
276 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
277 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
278 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
279 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

281 Ms. News - The next item is on page 21 of your agenda and is located in
282 the Varina District. This is SUB-57-06, New Market Village (November 2006 Plan) for

353 **SUBDIVISION**

354

SUB-20-07 **Balzer & Associates, P.C. for Rogers-Chenault, Inc.:**
Jenkins Bluff The 4.450-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 2 single-
(March 2007 Plan) family homes is located at the northwest corner of Windsor
6048 Jenkins Bluff Lane Road and Jenkins Bluff Lane on parcel 859-706-1647. The
zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well and
septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 2 Lots**

355

356 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to SUB-20-07,
357 Jenkins Bluff (March 2007 Plan) in the Varina District? No opposition.

358

359 Mrs. Jones - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of SUB-20-07, Jenkins
360 Bluff (March 2007 Plan) on the expedited agenda subject to annotations on the plans,
361 standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities, and the additional
362 conditions 11 and 12, as listed on the agenda.

363

364 Mr. Archer - Second.

365

366 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer. All
367 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

368

369 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Jenkins Bluff
370 (March 2007 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
371 subdivisions not served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans, and the
372 following additional conditions:

373

- 374 11. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of
- 375 the construction plan by the Department of Public Works.
- 376 12. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located within
- 377 the buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be
- 378 developed with engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in
- 379 accordance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical
- 380 guidelines established by a professional engineer. A detailed engineering report
- 381 shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Building Official prior to the
- 382 issuance of a building permit on the affected lot. A copy of the report and
- 383 recommendations shall be furnished to the Directors of Planning and Public Works.

384

385 Ms. News - The next item is on page 27 of your agenda and located in the
386 Three Chopt District. This is a landscape plan LP/SUB-6-05 for Englewood, Sections 1
387 and 2. There is an addendum item on page 7 of the addendum indicating that there's a
388 revised plan in the addendum addressing staff's concerns regarding provision of street
389 trees and a continuous hedgerow of Leyland Cyprus on Three Chopt Road as proffered.
390 Staff can recommend approval.

391

392 **SUBDIVISION LANDSCAPE PLAN**

LP/SUB-6-05
Englewood, Sections 1
and 2 – Three Chopt Road
and Barrington Hill Drive

Michael E. Doczi & Associates for Beach Village Development: Request for approval of a landscape plan for a subdivision as required by the proffers for zoning case C-71C-03. Henrico County Code. The 4.076-acre site is located at the southwest corner of Three Chopt Road and Barrington Hill Drive on parcels 741-759-9653 and 742-759-4953, 3054 and 2339. The zoning is R-2C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional) and R-5C, General District (Conditional). County water and sewer.
(Three Chopt)

395 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to LP/SUB-6-
396 05, Englewood, Sections 1 and 2, in the Three Chopt District? No opposition.

398 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of LP/SUB-6-05,
399 Englewood, Sections 1 and 2, Three Chopt and Barrington Hill Drive, subject to the
400 annotations on the plans, the additional condition #4 which concerns the proffers
401 approved as a part of zoning case C-716-03, and the addendum item.

403 Mrs. Jones - Second.

405 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones.
406 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

408 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/SUB-06-05, Englewood,
409 Sections 1 and 2, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
410 landscape plans, and the following additional condition:

412 4. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-71C-03 shall be incorporated in
413 this approval.

415 Ms. News - The final item is on page 30 of your agenda and located in
416 the Varina District. This is SUB-6-07, Buena Vista II (January 2007 Plan) for five lots.
417 Staff can recommend approval.

419 **SUBDIVISION**

SUB-6-07
Buena Vista II
(January 2007 Plan)
1638-1644 Old Oakland
Rd. and 1609 Eden Ave.

Edwards, Kretz, Lohr & Associates for Lot & Lands, LLC: The 1.629-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 5 single-family homes is located on the west side of Ada Street in between Old Oakland Road and Eden Avenue on parcels 806-706-4319, 3834 and 2233. The zoning is R-3, One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer.
(Varina) 5 Lots

421 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the
422 landscape plan SUB-6-07, Buena Vista II (January 2007 Plan) in the Varina District? No
423 opposition.

424
425 Mrs. Jones - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of SUB-6-07, Buena
426 Vista II (January 2007 Plan) on the expedited agenda subject to the annotations on the
427 plans, standard conditions for subdivisions served by public utilities, and the additional
428 conditions numbers 12 and 13 on the agenda.

429
430 Mr. Archer - Second.

431
432 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer. All in
433 favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.

434
435 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Buena Vista II
436 (January 2007 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
437 subdivisions served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following
438 additional conditions:

- 439
440 12. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of
441 the construction plan by the Department of Public Works.
442 13. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located within
443 the buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be
444 developed with engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in
445 accordance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical
446 guidelines established by a professional engineer. A detailed engineering report
447 shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Building Official prior to the
448 issuance of a building permit on the affected lot. A copy of the report and
449 recommendations shall be furnished to the Directors of Planning and Public Works.

450
451 Mr. Silber - Next on the agenda would be consideration of extensions of
452 conditional subdivision approvals. You can see on your agenda that one requires
453 Planning Commission action and the other two are for informational purposes; they can
454 be approved administratively. If you have any questions on those listed for informational
455 purposes we can answer those, otherwise, Ms. Goggin is here to tell you about Effinger
456 Drive, which is up for extension of conditional approval.

457

458 **SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**
 459
 460 **FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**
 461

Subdivision	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Magisterial District	Year(s) Extended Recommended
Effinger Drive (A Ded of a Portion of Effinger Dr.) (June 1998 Plan)	0	0	6	Fairfield	1 Year 3/26/08

462 **FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY**
 463
 464

Subdivision	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Magisterial District	Year(s) Extended Recommended
Glasswyck (March 2006 Plan)	9	9	0	Brookland	1 Year 3/26/08
Mansfield Woods (March 2006 Plan)	105	105	0	Varina	1 Year 3/26/08

465 Ms. Goggin - Good morning. The applicant requests extension of
 466 conditional approval for Effinger Drive. He feels that this is not a good economic time
 467 for him to build the road, but due to the intense negotiations with VDOT, he does not
 468 want to lose the entrance to the state highway. So, he respectfully requests extension.
 469

470
 471 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do we have any opposition on the extension of conditional
 472 approval for Effinger Drive from the audience? Mr. Archer.

473
 474 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I will move for approval of the one-year
 475 extension for Effinger Drive.
 476

477 Mrs. Jones - Second.
 478

479 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones.
 480 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries
 481

482 Mr. Silber - Thank you very much.
 483

484 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. Goggin.
 485

486 The Planning Commission approved extension of conditional approval of Effinger Drive
 487 for one year, March 26, 2008.

488 Mr. Silber - Moving on to the main agenda.

489

490 **LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN**

491

LP/POD-3-05 **Balzer & Associates, P.C. for HHHunt Corporation and R. Earl Johnson:** 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 6.80-acre site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Wyndham Park Drive and Nuckols Road on parcel 741-776-3595. The zoning is O-1C, Office District (Conditional), R-4AC, One-Family Residence District (Conditional) and C-1C, Conservation District (Conditional). **(Three Chopt)**

492

493 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to LP/POD-3-05,
494 Rainbow Station in the Three Chopt District? No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Kennedy.

495

496 Mr. Kennedy - Good morning members of the Commission. I'm sorry, I have
497 allergies and I sound kind of hoarse. There is a revised plan in the addendum which
498 provides for additional interior parking area landscaping trees which were requested by
499 staff. With that, staff can recommend approval. We received a letter from the Wyndham
500 Homeowners Association the Architectural Review Committee and they have
501 recommended approval as well.

502

503 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Kennedy from the Commission?

504

505 Mr. Archer - Mr. Kennedy, with this new plan, do we need to waive any
506 limits on it?

507

508 Mr. Kennedy - No you don't.

509

510 Mr. Archer - It's in time?

511

512 Mr. Kennedy - It's in time.

513

514 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. I'll entertain a motion.

515

516 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I will move for approval of LP/POD-3-05,
517 Rainbow Station, Wyndham Park Drive subject to the annotations on the plan and the
518 revised plan that was in this morning's addendum.

519

520 Mrs. Jones - Second.

521

522 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
523 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

524
525 The Planning Commission approved the landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-3-05,
526 Rainbow Station, Wyndam Park Drive, subject to the standard conditions attached to
527 these minutes for landscape and lighting plans.

528

529 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the February 28, 2007 Meeting)**

530

POD-3-07 Country Inn & Suites (POD-110-83 Revised) 8006 W. Broad Street	Dean E. Hawkins, ASLA for YSJ, LLC and Monument Hospitality, 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 three-story, 43,854 square foot, 74-room hotel. The 1.33-acre site is a portion of the total 2.871 acre site and located in the rear of 8006 W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) adjacent to Schrader Road, approximately 900 feet northwest of the intersection of Schrader and Hungary Spring Roads on part of parcel 764-752-4572. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Brookland)
--	---

531

532 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-3-07,
533 Country Inn & Suites (POD-110-83 Revised) in the Brookland District? We do have
534 opposition. Good morning, Mr. Greulich.

535

536 Mr. Greulich - Good morning, Planning Commissioners. This case was
537 originally heard at the January 24, 2007 Planning Commission hearing. At that meeting,
538 it was deferred by the applicant to the February 28, 2007 meeting, and then from that
539 meeting to today's meeting. The deferrals were so the applicant could present to staff
540 revised elevations that address the comments previously made by staff and the
541 Planning Commission. Staff has received and reviewed the revised elevations and they
542 have been annotated and included in your addendum packet. Staff is now in a position
543 to be able to recommend approval of the plan. This approval is subject to the
544 annotations on the plans and the elevations, the annotations on the elevations in the
545 addendum, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and the additional
546 conditions 24 through 37, as stated in the packet. Staff and representatives of the
547 applicant are present this morning to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

548

549 Mr. Archer - Any questions by Commission members for Mr. Greulich?
550 Thank you. I don't need to hear from the applicant, but I'd like to hear from that
551 gentleman there. Come on up to the mike and identify yourself.

552

553 Mr. Sullivan - I'm Neil Sullivan. I represent Sunburst Hospitality. We are
554 the owner/operators of the Quality Inn that sits north of the property. One issue we
555 have with the site plan that they presented is the ingress and egress on the northern
556 part of that site plan. Access is through a road that is actually owned by Sunburst. It's
557 not a public road that runs north of the property. There it is on the survey (pointing to

558 own copy of a survey.) I think, in the site plan that they provided no reference of an
559 easement that exists for them to have cross use of that. That leaves them, really, with
560 only one ingress and egress in the southwestern portion of the property.

561
562 Mr. Vanarsdall - Are you speaking of the road that comes down by Piccadilly
563 from Broad?

564
565 Mr. Sullivan - Exactly.

566
567 Mr. Vanarsdall - In front of your place?

568
569 Mr. Sullivan - And the second that goes between the Quality Inn and the
570 furniture store—

571
572 Mr. Vanarsdall - Shrader Road.

573
574 Mr. Sullivan - —and then leads back to Shrader Road, that is owned by
575 Sunburst.

576
577 Mr. Vanarsdall - That's a private road?

578
579 Mr. Sullivan - That is a private road. The existing access there has never
580 been an issue for us because the uses of the property were uses that we had no
581 problem with. Current aspects of the hotel industry in Richmond are not this Planning
582 Commission's concern, but we feel that adding another hotel into this area is
583 detrimental to this industry, specifically in the Brookland area.

584
585 Mr. Silber - Mr. Sullivan, Sunburst is the owner of that right-of-way?

586
587 Mr. Sullivan - The owner and operator. I have a survey right here that
588 shows our property line.

589
590 Mr. Silber - Are you not in agreement to others accessing that?

591
592 Mr. Sullivan - There may or may not be an easement that exists. How it's
593 transferred with the property, I don't know. It's not my obligation to show that; it's not
594 the County's obligation to show that. It's the applicant's responsibility to show that he
595 has an easement into that roadway.

596
597 Mrs. Jones - Have there been discussions about joint access agreements
598 and this kind of thing, or is this a brand new discussion point?

599
600 Mr. Sullivan - There have been discussions with us regarding this hotel. In
601 fact, the initial notification about this was actually incorrect. It referenced a whole other
602 issue. It referenced a three-story, two-story difference in what would be allowed. I
603 believe it referenced zoning case C-35C-97 and that was in the public notice. That's

604 incorrect. That's not even in Brookland. It's been acknowledged by staff that that is
605 incorrect. We ask that it be deferred until proper notification be delivered and that this
606 easement access be addressed.

607
608 Mrs. Jones - Okay.

609
610 Mr. Silber - I'd like to hear what the applicant has to say.

611
612 Mr. Archer - All right.

613
614 Mrs. Jones - [Unintelligible.]

615
616 Mr. Archer - All right. I guess I'll ask the question. I understand what
617 you're saying, but what does Mega Furniture do? Don't they use the road?

618
619 Mr. Sullivan - They use the road right now.

620
621 Mr. Archer - I know the times I've been to Piccadilly, I've used that road
622 many times.

623
624 Mr. Sullivan - People use it left and right, but if the Country Inn & Suites
625 went up there, that access would be blocked.

626
627 Mr. Archer - You'd feel better if the easement part was cleared up.

628
629 Mr. Sullivan - If there's an easement, we'd deal with it then, but if it's not
630 on the site plan, I don't understand how the County could approve a site plan that hasn't
631 acknowledged an easement there.

632
633 Mr. Silber - Let me ask staff what knowledge they have of this and what
634 they can share on this matter. Then we may need to hear from the applicant as to how
635 they propose to address this.

636
637 Mr. Archer - Yes, I want to hear from the applicant. Were you aware of
638 this, Mr. Greulich?

639
640 Mr. Greulich - Planning Commissioners, staff was aware of the concerns
641 from Mr. Sullivan, but from the layout that was presented to staff, there will be no
642 additional work proposed on their private road and the applicant currently does have a
643 county road through this entrance down here, as Mr. Sullivan pointed at. Therefore,
644 staff felt comfortable recommending approval of the plan and has advised the applicant
645 that if work does need to be done on the private road to the north, that they would need
646 to discuss that and get the appropriate agreements with the other property owner. At
647 the moment, the property does have access to a county road. The people staying at the
648 hotel would have access to a county road through this other entrance (pointing to the
649 southern entrance).

650
651 Mr. Silber - If for some reason access was denied to this subject
652 property, to this access to the north, have the traffic engineers weighed in as to whether
653 there would be any issues with all the traffic exiting to the west?
654 Mr. Greulich - I briefly discussed this with Mike Jennings this morning. I
655 can let him speak to this, but he implied that one form of county access is sufficient.
656
657 Mr. Silber - Mr. Vanarsdall, I guess I would like to hear from the
658 applicant.
659
660 Mr. Archer - I would like to also.
661
662 Mr. Silber - Are they aware of this and how do they intend to address it.
663
664 Mr. Archer - We'd like to hear from the applicant on this issue. This is
665 something that hasn't come forward before.
666
667 Mr. Patel - My name is Amir Patel. I'm with Monument Hospitality. I
668 came here before and we got it deferred. We got all the drawings and everything in
669 order. When I came to this meeting, that's why I brought my architect in case there
670 were any concerns about the elevations, the architectural side of it. I learned about this
671 issue very recently because we're getting ready to close on the property. I was getting
672 everything ready with my attorney's at Williams Mullen and this was pointed out to me. I
673 have a drawing here that shows where the line is for this property. We actually have
674 two entrances/exits still because we have one on I guess it would be the west side and
675 over by the Mega Furniture store right, and then right in here. There's a little line that
676 draws the property line, which the gentleman was speaking of. I can show you this, if
677 you'd like. I don't think it's on this one, but it's pretty clear on here. That's what the
678 situation is with the entrances/exits. As you stated, Mr. Vanarsdall, I go to Aunt Sarah's
679 a lot, right across the street, with my family. Before this site ever came into account,
680 I've always been around this area and grew up in this area, so I've used that road plenty
681 of times. You go to Bennigan's, you use that road. This was nothing I even thought of
682 and I've worked a lot on this project with you, Mr. Vanarsdall, so I've looked into
683 everything that you've asked for and this was never something that crossed my mind. It
684 was something that never came up. I figured the utility easements and everything are in
685 place. We've got all these restaurants here. I did it the way you wanted to see it to
686 match the area and try to help the area. I've got reports showing what type of business
687 these hotels in the surrounding area are doing that are 10 and 15 years old, which his
688 property is like 25 years old. I'm trying to add new inventory in the middle of this and
689 make it conform to the way you like to still represent the area.
690
691 Mr. Vanarsdall - We know that and I appreciate all you have done and what
692 we've asked you to do. This is an issue we didn't realize we were going to have to face
693 this morning.

694 Mrs. Jones - May I ask a question? Am I hearing you correctly that you
695 say that your title work shows you that you do have access without crossing any other
696 private property to get to the second ingress/egress, or not?
697

698 Mr. Patel - Yes ma'am. There's a little island there right now. If you
699 look at it, there's this island right here (pointing at screen). The property line that goes
700 from Shrader Road comes to about right here and it curves just like that. That's what it
701 does right there and this is what this line depicts now. I didn't realize this until after
702 hearing what has happened. Then my attorney's were looking into it more and more
703 before getting all the title work and everything together. That's why I have this drawing.
704 This is not even a site plan or anything. This is from—
705

706 Mrs. Jones - You could create a second entrance without having to have
707 an easement on other private property?
708

709 Mr. Patel - Yes ma'am.
710

711 Mrs. Jones - We seem to have a discrepancy here.
712

713 Mr. Silber - I think it's going to be difficult for us to sort through that here.
714 There are a couple of options I see available. One is we could pass this by and allow
715 you all to go out in the lobby, discuss this, and see if you can come to terms as to what
716 the situation is. That's one option I can present to the Planning Commission. If they
717 come back in and still have differences of information, then the Commission will have to
718 take some action, either deferring this or moving it forward. There is a condition I will
719 point out, condition #34, that does indicate that, "Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and
720 maintenance agreement must be submitted to the Planning Department and approved
721 prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy" for this property. If this continues
722 to be a concern, and at the time of construction of this site if this is not resolved, you
723 should be mindful this could impact your certificates of occupancy. Of course, you do
724 have access to Fountain Avenue and the traffic engineers are comfortable with that.
725 You don't have to have access to this other easement property that's of concern. I
726 would suggest, perhaps, let them go out in the lobby and talk about this and see if
727 something can be resolved.
728

729 Mr. Archer - Would you like to try that?
730

731 [Off Mike] - [Unintelligible.]
732

733 Mr. Archer - Would you like to go out in the lobby with them and see if
734 you can work it out and then we'll talk about it further?
735

736 Mrs. Jones - He wants to make one more comment.
737

738 Mr. Patel - The thing is, I'm showing you this because, not that we have
739 to use this as an entrance/exit, because we have an entrance/exit and we have an

740 easement in place with the seller that's selling us the property where it's this
741 entrance/exit. We have that in order because we had to get an easement around this
742 line for the underwater retention system as well. So, we have that in place. Now what
743 I'm stating is that's fine, whatever the gentleman says is his property line. I have an
744 entrance/exit and I have another entrance/exit off Broad Street, too. So, I'm here asking
745 the question, would this site plan and elevation drawings that I've submitted be
746 approved if this issue wasn't there, because I do have entrances/exits. He and I, we
747 can speak later. I came here to get my POD approval and I've done everything that I
748 need to do to get that POD approval. I do have an entrance/exit. So, I'm not even sure
749 this is 100% correct, because I just got my hands on it. We never knew of this issue
750 until—I really found out last night and have been speaking to my attorney this morning
751 about what I should say here.

752
753 Mr. Vanarsdall - Amir, you understand #34 that the Secretary read, don't
754 you? You can't get a CO until that's satisfied. I would suggest you do this. I would
755 suggest you go out into the lobby.

756
757 Mr. Patel - Okay. Yes sir.

758
759 Mr. Vanarsdall - Discuss this. We'll go on with the meeting and then come on
760 back in.

761
762 Mr. Patel - Yes sir. Okay.

763
764 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

765
766 Mrs. Jones - I do think we need to discuss this when they come back. I
767 have further questions, and probably for Mr. Jennings.

768
769 Mr. Vanarsdall - I'm not going to take any action on it until it's satisfied.

770
771 **THIS CASE WAS REMOVED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION & TO BE HEARD LATER**
772 **DURING THIS MEETING (SEE PAGE 35 OF THESE MINUTES).**

773

774 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT - ARCHITECTURAL PLANS & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

775

POD-74-05 **Rummel Klepper & Kahl, LLP for Reynolds Holdings, LLC:** Request for approval of architectural plans and a special exception for a plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-2 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a four-story, 106,300 square foot office building with a height of 70 feet. The special exception would authorize a building height exceeding 45 feet. The 9.55-acre site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Glenside Drive and Forest Avenue on part of parcel 765-744-6557. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional) and O-3C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

776

777 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-74-05,
778 Reynolds Crossing West (Formerly Reynolds Crossing One) in the Three Chopt District?
779 No opposition.

780

781 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. This
782 is a request for approval of the building architectural plans for the Reynolds Crossing
783 West project, which is located at the intersection of Forest Avenue and Glenside Drive.
784 The Commission may recall that Reynolds Crossing is a portion of the Reynolds tract,
785 which was rezoned in December 2004 to allow for redevelopment under B2, B3, and O3
786 Districts for construction of a hotel, office, and retail uses. Reynolds Crossing West
787 consists of the western most portion of this tract adjacent to the Charles Glen subdivision.
788 Last November, the applicant received approval of a revised Plan of Development, which
789 proposed three buildings. At that time, the building was to be located within 75 feet of the
790 property line of Charles Glen. Recently, the applicant proposed a consolidated single
791 relocated building footprint, which would be located over 200 feet away. However, the
792 building will now be four stories rather than three stories. Staff was concerned about the
793 amount of building that may be exposed relative to the adjacent neighborhood, as this
794 was the subject of concern in the past. The applicant has prepared a cross-section
795 exhibit, which indicates that the exposed face of the building relative to the ground plane
796 of Charles Glen subdivision is 26 feet. I'm going to try and show you that section now.
797 It's also in the packet we've handed out this morning.

798

799 The original proffers of the case indicated that the limit of exposure of the building to the
800 adjacent neighborhood was 32 feet. What this cross section shows is that relative to the
801 Charles Glen subdivision over here, across the ground plane is only 26 feet of exposed
802 building. So, in fact, this case does comply with the old proffer, although it doesn't need to
803 because the building is now over 200 feet away. That was good news in terms of the
804 exhibit the architect proposed. The building will, however, need a special exemption, as it
805 is primarily located in the B-2 District. A special exception is required for buildings over
806 three stores or 45 feet tall. The building is of modern design, primarily architectural metal
807 and glass. The architect is here today to answer questions with respect to the building.

808 Staff is aware that there are still some concerns from the neighborhood regarding the
809 amount of landscaping in the buffer area. You may recall last fall we approved a Phase 1
810 landscape plan to install the first phase of buffering, and previous to that, we approved an
811 8-foot screen wall, which is part of the original zoning case. Those are now installed.
812 There are some additional questions the neighborhood has about additional buffering.
813 Today is not a landscape plan; it's a building plan only. We're going to come back to the
814 Commission as soon as the landscaping plan is prepared and we'll be talking about
815 landscaping here in the future. With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions you may
816 have.

817
818 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Strauss by a Commission member?

819
820 Mrs. Jones - Yes, I do. Mr. Strauss, have you heard from the neighborhood
821 as to the proposed height?

822
823 Mr. Strauss - I know there was a neighborhood meeting. Primarily, most of
824 our discussions, honestly, were landscaping issues. I didn't get that they had any concern
825 about the height.

826
827 Mrs. Jones - With the way in which this building is situated and the visual
828 affect, you feel that this is not going to be overly intrusive on Charles Glen.

829
830 Mr. Strauss - Staff doesn't and I discussed that in e-mails with the two
831 representatives of the Charles Glen neighborhood. The exhibit indicated that there was
832 not—it sounds like adding a story is adding a lot, but the building is actually depressed
833 eight feet further into the ground plane, and with the screen we have, I don't think that
834 that's a concern. We do have a representative from the neighborhood who could speak to
835 that as well.

836
837 Mrs. Jones - The neighborhood's been very involved and that's been a
838 wonderful thing for this project, so I just want to make sure that they are well aware of
839 what's happening.

840
841 Mr. Thornton - Mr. Chairman, I believe the sound needs to be turned up a
842 little bit, if you'd be so kind. Maybe persons in the office down there could turn the sound
843 system up a little bit.

844
845 Mr. Strauss - Are you all hearing me here?

846
847 Mr. Silber - Can we adjust the sound in the back? Okay. Mr. Strauss,
848 maybe if you can just pull the microphone towards you a little bit.

849
850 Mr. Strauss - How's that?

851
852 Mrs. Jones - I would like to make sure that the neighborhood is fine with the
853 height of this building and the revised plan.

854 Mr. Vanarsdall - Anybody from the neighborhood here? Come on down and
855 state your name. You've been here before. Glad to have you again.
856

857 Ms. Kuester - I'm Courtney Kuester. I'm the head of the steering committee
858 for Charles Glen. We have discussed the height with the neighbors who sit along the wall
859 that separates them from this building. They are fine with it after speaking to Mr. Strauss
860 about them setting the building down slightly lower and it being further away from the
861 neighborhood.
862

863 Mrs. Jones - Okay. I needed to know that. Thank you.
864

865 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, thank you. We're going to need a motion on this.
866

867 Mr. Archer - All right, Mr. Chairman. I will move for approval of POD-74-05
868 Reynolds Crossing West (Formerly Reynolds Crossing One) subject to the plan
869 annotations, and the addendum contains some additional conditions in addition to the
870 one that's shown on the plan, so as Mr. Strauss indicated, 9 amended, 24, 25, 26, 27,
871 28, 29, 30, and 31.
872

873 Mrs. Jones - Second.
874

875 Mr. Vanarsdall - How about the special exception?
876

877 Mr. Archer - Is that required for this one or the next one?
878

879 Mr. Silber - This one as well, sir.
880

881 Mr. Archer - Okay. You want to do this motion first and then I'll come
882 back?
883

884 Mr. Silber - This is a motion by Mr. Archer and was there a second?
885

886 Mrs. Jones - Mmm-hmm.
887

888 Mr. Silber - Mrs. Jones? Okay, thank you.
889

890 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All in
891 favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries
892

893 Mr. Archer - Then I will move for the special exception for building
894 heights.
895

896 Mrs. Jones - Second.
897

898 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones.
899 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

900 The Planning Commission approved the building height special exception for POD-74-
901 05 Reynolds Crossing West (Formerly Reynolds Crossing One).

902
903 The Planning Commission approved the revised architectural plans for POD-74-05,
904 Reynolds Crossing West (Formerly Reynolds Crossing One) subject to the standard
905 conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type and the following
906 additional conditions:
907

- 908 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Department of
909 Planning for review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of
910 any occupancy permits.
- 911 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be
912 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any
913 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required
914 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty
915 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 916 25. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously
917 noted on the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated
918 100-year floodplain must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility
919 Easement." The easement shall be granted to the County prior to the issuance of
920 any occupancy permits.
- 921 26. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
922 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 923 27. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-13C-07 shall be incorporated in
924 this approval.
- 925 28. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be
926 obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the
927 construction plans.
- 928 29. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
929 drainage plans.
- 930 30. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
931 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
932 issuance of a building permit.
- 933 31. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
934 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
935 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
936 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
937 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

938 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT, SPECIAL EXCEPTION & TRANSITIONAL BUFFER**
939 **DEVIATION**

940
941 **POD-13-07**
942 **Reynolds Office Building**
943 **@ Reynolds Crossing –**
944 **Forest Avenue**
945 **Vanasse, Hangen, Brustlin, Inc. for Reynolds**
946 **Holdings, LLC and Clear Springs Development, LLC:**
947 Request for approval of a plan of development, special
948 exception and transitional buffer deviation, as required by
949 Chapter 24, Sections 24-106, 24-2 and 24-106.2 of the
950 Henrico County Code, to construct a seven-story, 206,233
951 square foot office building with a height of 100.33 feet.
952 The special exception would authorize a building height
953 exceeding 45 feet. The 8.43-acre site is located on W.
954 Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) on parcel 766-745-8230
955 and part of parcels 766-744-5757, 767-744-3162 and 767-
956 745-5402. The zoning is B-2C, Business District
957 (Conditional), O-3C, Office District (Conditional) and M-1,
958 Light Industrial District. County water and sewer.
959 **(Three Chopt)**

941
942 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-13-07,
943 Reynolds Office Building @ Reynolds Crossing West, in the Three Chopt District? No
944 opposition.

945
946 Mr. Strauss - Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. This
947 proposal is for a new seven-story office building for the Reynolds tract to be located
948 behind the general office building, referred to by some as the old Alcoa building. The site
949 is to be located on Forest Avenue across from the Phillip Morris site. It's zoned O-3, M-1,
950 and B-2. The applicant is requesting approval of the architectural plans for the seven-
951 story building, which is in the B-2 District and requires a special exception for height over
952 45 feet. They are also requesting approval of the Plan of Development.

953
954 The Commission may recall that the Reynolds tract was recently the subject of rezoning
955 to allow for proffer amendments of the original case, some of which are necessary to
956 allow for an aggressive construction program to meet the tenant requirements of future
957 development on this site. The various agencies are all recommending approval of the
958 Plan of Development. Staff is recommending approval of the transitional buffer deviation
959 between the B-2 and O-3 portions of the property, as the project is being developed under
960 one site plan and a buffer between these districts for office use is not applicable. The
961 applicant's architect is here today to answer questions regarding building height and
962 design. With that, staff is recommending approval of this case in accordance with the
963 revised condition in your amendment this morning. I'll be happy to answer any questions
964 you may have.

965
966 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Strauss by Commission members? Mr.
967 Archer? Can you unscramble this one?

968

969 Mr. Archer - I think so. Mr. Reynolds, would you want to speak to this? I
970 thought you might. Don't want you to have to if you don't want to.

971
972 Mr. Vanarsdall - What we have is a POD, a special exception, and transitional
973 buffer.

974
975 Mr. Archer - Can we do the special exception and transitional in one
976 motion?

977
978 Mr. Silber - I think we can do them in one if you make mention of it.

979
980 Mr. Archer - Well, let's do that part first, then. I move to approve the
981 special exception and the transitional buffer associated with POD-13-07, Reynolds Office
982 Building @ Reynolds Crossing.

983
984 Mrs. Jones - Second.

985
986 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
987 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.

988
989 The Planning Commission approved the special exception and transitional buffer
990 associated with POD-13-07, Reynolds Office Building @ Reynolds Crossing in the Three
991 Chopt District.

992
993 Mr. Archer - Then I will move for approval of POD-13-07, Reynolds Office
994 Building @ Reynolds Crossing, subject to the standard conditions for developments of
995 this type, the annotations on the plans, and the additional conditions 24 through 33 with
996 the revised #28 as shown on the addendum.

997
998 Mrs. Jones - Second.

999
1000 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
1001 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries Thank you, Mr. Strauss.

1002
1003 Mr. Strauss - Thank you.

1004
1005 The Planning Commission approved POD-13-07, Reynolds Office Building @ Reynolds
1006 Crossing, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to
1007 these minutes for developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:

1008
1009 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be
1010 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any
1011 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required
1012 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty
1013 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

- 1014 25. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously
 1015 noted on the plan "Limits of 100 Year Floodplain." In addition, the delineated
 1016 100-year floodplain must be labeled "Variable Width Drainage and Utility
 1017 Easement." The easement shall be granted to the County prior to the issuance of
 1018 any occupancy permits.
- 1019 26. The entrances and drainage facilities on Interstate 64 shall be approved by the
 1020 Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.
- 1021 27. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
 1022 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 1023 28. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-13C-07 shall be incorporated in
 1024 this approval.
- 1025 28. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-22C-04 and C-86C-89 shall be
 1026 incorporated in this approval.
- 1027 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be
 1028 obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the
 1029 construction plans.
- 1030 30. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
 1031 drainage plans.
- 1032 31. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
 1033 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
 1034 issuance of a building permit.
- 1035 32. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be
 1036 submitted to the Department of Planning and approved prior to issuance of a
 1037 certificate of occupancy for this development.
- 1038 33. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
 1039 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
 1040 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
 1041 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
 1042 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
 1043

1044 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200

Carter Design for Franchise Realty Interstate 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 one-story, 3,900 square foot restaurant with drive-thru facilities. The 1.19-acre site is located at the southeast intersection of Staples Mill Road (U.S. Route 33) and Bremner Boulevard on parcel 772-750-9430. The zoning is B-2, Business District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

1047 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-15-07,
1048 McDonald's @ Staples Mill Road and Bremner Boulevard (POD-81-75 Revised) in the
1049 Brookland District? No opposition. Are we having changing of the guards back there or
1050 something? Matt, how are you doing?

1051
1052 Mr. Ward - Great. How are you doing? Good morning, Mr. Chairman
1053 members of the Planning Commission. I'm presenting POD-15-07. This is a McDonald's
1054 redevelopment located at the southeast corner of Staples Mills and Bremner Boulevard.
1055 A waiver of time limits is required for this revised plan. Staff has included the revised plan
1056 in the addendum, along with the building elevations in the slide show. The revised plan
1057 shows the placement of the two parking islands that were requested by the Traffic
1058 Engineer and the Planning Department. The one island closest to the building separates
1059 the loading area from the handicapped spaces, and the second island, located on the
1060 northwestern side of the site, eliminates a paved striped area in the parking lot. The color
1061 rendering of the building is comprised mostly of brick. Staff has recommended different
1062 colors for the awnings to be used here, but the applicant is proposing yellow and striped
1063 awnings. The applicant has agreed to conditions as noted in your addendum on page 6,
1064 numbers 34 and 35. These conditions will require all exposed utility and mechanical
1065 equipment, including junction boxes, be painted to match the building and will prohibit
1066 painting of any brick on the building in the future. At this time, staff can recommend
1067 approval subject to the revised plans, standard comments, and any additional conditions
1068 as noted in the addendum.

1069
1070 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Ward by Commission members? I don't
1071 need to hear from the applicant unless you all do. I see Michelle Carter is in the
1072 audience. Thank you, Matt.

1073
1074 Mr. Ward - You're welcome

1075
1076 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is anyone here from McDonald's? I'll tell you one thing, I
1077 don't know that anymore is needed to be shown for this one. I am so tickled about that.
1078 I recommend approval of POD-15-07 McDonald's @ Staples Mill Road and Bremner
1079 Boulevard (POD-81-75 Revised) subject to standard conditions of developments of this
1080 type and the following additional conditions. I want to add #9 amended and #11
1081 amended, and then we have 24 through 35, and 34 has been revised. This is something
1082 new that some of the rest of the Commissioners may want to have in theirs. I've always
1083 been after this in mine. The new wording in it says, "All building mounted equipment
1084 shall be painted to match the building and screened." I went over and looked at the new
1085 McDonald's at Virginia Center Commons and it didn't have the electrical boxes and
1086 everything that stuck out like a sore thumb. Just happens to be one of mine, whatever
1087 you call it. Therefore, #34 is revised and #35 is added, "Any building area that is
1088 constructed of brick shall not be painted at any time." Mrs. Jones wasn't with us at the
1089 time, but Mr. Archer was. We had a lot of pretty McDonald's restaurants in the area and
1090 they were all brick and nice, and all of a sudden overnight they were painted white. It
1091 looked like a red, white, and blue flag, which there's nothing wrong with that as patriotic
1092 in our flag, but it didn't look right on McDonald's. That's why we have, "Any building area

1093 that is constructed of brick shall not be painted at any time.” With that, that’s the end of
1094 my motion.

1095
1096 Mrs. Jones - Second.

1097
1098 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mrs.
1099 Jones. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries

1100
1101 The Planning Commission approved POD-15-07, McDonald’s @ Staples Mill Road and
1102 Bremner Boulevard (POD-81-75 Revised), subject to the annotations on the plans, the
1103 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the
1104 following additional conditions:

- 1105
1106 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Department of
1107 Planning for review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of
1108 any occupancy permits.
- 1109 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan
1110 including depictions of light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture and
1111 specifications and mounting height details shall be submitted for Department of
1112 Planning review and Planning Commission approval.
- 1113 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be
1114 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any
1115 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required
1116 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty
1117 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 1118 25. The entrances and drainage facilities on U. S. Route 33 shall be approved by the
1119 Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.
- 1120 26. A notice of completion form, certifying that the requirements of the Virginia
1121 Department of Transportation entrances permit have been completed, shall be
1122 submitted to the Department of Planning prior to any occupancy permits being
1123 issued.
- 1124 27. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
1125 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 1126 28. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
- 1127 29. The developer shall install an adequate restaurant ventilating and exhaust
1128 system to minimize smoke, odors, and grease vapors. The plans and
1129 specifications shall be included with the building permit application for review and
1130 approval. If, in the opinion of the County, the type system provided is not
1131 effective, the Commission retains the rights to review and direct the type of
1132 system to be used.
- 1133 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design
1134 shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the
1135 construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
- 1136 31. The loading areas shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 24, Section
1137 24-97(b) of the Henrico County Code.

- 1138 32. In the event of any traffic backup which blocks the public right-of-way as a result
 1139 of congestion caused by the drive-up delivery facilities, the owner/occupant shall
 1140 close the drive-up delivery facilities until a solution can be designed to prevent
 1141 traffic backup.
- 1142 33. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
 1143 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
 1144 issuance of a building permit.
- 1145 34. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
 1146 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
 1147 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
 1148 building mounted equipment shall be painted to match the building and screened
 1149 by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the
 1150 Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
- 1151 35. Any building area that is constructed of brick shall not be painted at any time.
 1152

1153 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT – ARCHITECTURALS (Buildings A9, A10 and P3)**
 1154

POD-42-06 West Broad Village – Architecturals (Buildings A9, A10 and P3) W. Broad St./Three Chopt Road	Timmons Group and Antunovich Associates for West Broad Village, LLS, West Broad Village II, LLC and Unicorp National Developments, Inc.: Request for approval of architectural plans, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a four-story, 57,800 square foot retail/office building (A9), a five-story, 102,000 square foot retail/hotel building with 135 rooms (A10) and a four-level, 435 space, parking garage (P3) in an urban mixed use development. The 115.04-acre site is located along the south line of W. Broad Street (U. S. Route 250), the north line of Three Chopt Road, and the east line of the future John Rolfe Parkway on parcel 742-760-7866. The zoning is UMUC, Urban Mixed Use District (Conditional) and WBSO, West Broad Street Overlay District. County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)
---	---

1155
 1156 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-42-06
 1157 West Broad Village – Architecturals (Buildings A9, A10 and P3) in the Three Chopt
 1158 District? No opposition. Good morning, Kevin.

1159
 1160 Mr. Wilhite - Good morning Commission members. The package of
 1161 architectural plans before you now is very similar in concept to what was approved last
 1162 month. The retail/office/hotel portion of the block is facing the south line. It's on the south
 1163 line of the main east/west commercial street in the West Broad Village development. In
 1164 the rendering that you see before you, the hotel occupies the right-hand half of this
 1165 building, which is the western part of the block. The eastern part of the block is the office
 1166 space. All of that is on the upper floors, above the retail and restaurant uses. The
 1167 parking garage occupies the middle of the block behind the façade of buildings that you

1207 wetlands concerns. Since that time, the applicant has agreed to provide the additional
1208 setbacks as requested by Public Works, which is shown on the revised plan. With that,
1209 staff can recommend approval of the revised plan with the standard conditions for
1210 subdivisions serviced by public utilities and condition #12 on page 26 in your agenda.

1211
1212 Mr. Vanarsdall - This plan is dated today.

1213
1214 Ms. Goggin - It was received Friday. It is an old plan that I re-annotated.
1215 It was in on time.

1216
1217 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Ms. Goggin?

1218
1219 Mr. Archer - So, there's no timing issue with this, then.

1220
1221 Ms. Goggin - No time limit problem.

1222
1223 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right.

1224
1225 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I will move for approval of SUB-21-07,
1226 Barrington West (March 2007 Plan), subject to the standard conditions for subdivisions
1227 of this type and subdivisions served by public utilities, the additional condition 12, and
1228 this revised plan, which was received last Friday.

1229
1230 Mrs. Jones - Second.

1231
1232 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Archer and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All
1233 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries Thank you, Ms. Goggin.

1234
1235 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Barrington West
1236 (March 2007 Plan), subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
1237 subdivisions served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following
1238 additional condition:

1239
1240 12. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of
1241 the construction plan by the Department of Public Works.

1242

1243 **CONTINUATION OF CASE POD-3-07, COUNTRY INN & SUITES (POD-110-83**
1244 **REVISED) 8006 W. BROAD STREET FROM PAGE 17.**

1245
1246 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the February 28, 2007 Meeting)**
1247

POD-3-07
Country Inn & Suites
(POD-110-83 Revised)
8006 W. Broad Street

Dean E. Hawkins, ASLA for YSJ, LLC and Monument Hospitality, 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 three-story, 43,854 square foot, 74-room hotel. The 1.33-acre site is a portion of the total 2.871 acre site and located in the rear of 8006 W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) adjacent to Schrader Road, approximately 900 feet northwest of the intersection of Schrader and Hungary Spring Roads on part of parcel 764-752-4572. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

1248
1249 Mr. Vanarsdall - I have a note here that says the issue has been resolved and
1250 they have left and it can be voted upon. The note wasn't signed or dated, but I would
1251 assume that everything is all right or they would not have left the boardroom.

1252
1253 Mr. Silber - Let's see if staff can elaborate on that.

1254
1255 Mr. Greulich - Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members, the applicant
1256 and the opposition have agreed that if this is an issue in the future, it will be resolved
1257 before the construction plans have been approved and before the CO can be granted.
1258 Staff believes that, at this point, for the Planning Commission approval, since they do
1259 already have access to a county road, that it could be voted upon for approval.

1260
1261 Mrs. Jones - I have one question and I guess it may have to be for Mr.
1262 Jennings. Given the volume of traffic with the uses in this area, although the one entrance
1263 could be sufficient, is it minimally sufficient? Would it be clearly much, much better to
1264 have two ingress/egress areas, and how much of a difference is that?

1265
1266 Mr. Jennings - Mike Jennings, Traffic Engineer for Henrico County. It would
1267 be minimally sufficient if there was just the one point of access. Obviously, traffic and fire
1268 would prefer two points of access into this facility, especially with the Mega Furniture there
1269 right in the same complex. Traffic-wise, they could probably get by volume-wise out of the
1270 one entrance, but we prefer access to that with the ability to get to Shrader Road, too.

1271
1272 Mrs. Jones - It would be my interpretation from your comments and the
1273 presentation that it would be in the County's best interest to urge the applicant to make
1274 sure that they have two points of ingress/egress as opposed to one.

1275
1276 Mr. Jennings - Yes, Mrs. Jones.

1277
1278 Mrs. Jones - Thank you.
1279
1280 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right, thank you, Mike.
1281
1282 Mr. Greulich - We have one more thing. The existing owner for the Mega
1283 Furniture does have an exiting ingress/egress easement with the hotel. The point that the
1284 hotel owner, or Mr. Sullivan is trying to bring up is that he's not sure if the granting of the
1285 easement can be granted to the new hotel owner. That's something that they would need
1286 to figure out.
1287
1288 Mr. Vanarsdall - We can address that when the construction plans and so forth
1289 get going.
1290
1291 Mr. Silber - Would it be necessary to have an additional condition that
1292 they need to find a resolution to this issue before the County signs construction plans?
1293
1294 Mr. Greulich - I suppose we could.
1295
1296 Mr. Vanarsdall - It wouldn't hurt anything.
1297
1298 Mrs. Jones - I would feel more comfortable having the condition. I really
1299 would.
1300
1301 Mr. Silber - We can either expand condition #34 or else we can come up
1302 with another condition.
1303
1304 Mr. Vanarsdall - You want to make it condition 38?
1305
1306 Mr. Silber - Yes, I think it would be condition 38. Staff may need to work
1307 on the wording of that, but I think it basically would read something like the access
1308 agreement or access to this easement to the north needs to be resolved to the
1309 satisfaction of the County prior to the signing of construction plans.
1310
1311 Mr. Greulich - We could probably just modify condition 34 to that affect, I
1312 would think.
1313
1314 Mr. Silber - Let's make that part of the motion that staff will modify
1315 condition 34 to address that.
1316
1317 Mrs. Jones - By being resolved, we still leave the possibility open that there
1318 will be no ingress/egress granted for that other location.
1319

1320 Mr. Silber - That's the way we're leaving it at this point. Now, if the
1321 Commission would prefer to have this POD come back to you if there is not this second
1322 point of access, it can be phrased that way. Right now, it sounds like from the discussion
1323 I hear, it's being left open.
1324
1325 Mr. Vanarsdall - It's going to come back anyway for landscaping.
1326
1327 Mrs. Jones - But the ingress/egress may or may not be part of that plan.
1328
1329 Mr. Vanarsdall - It can be.
1330
1331 Mr. Silber - I think the landscape plan would be something that would
1332 come much later in the process. If there are still some issues associated with access and
1333 the traffic engineer has some concerns with that, it may be something the Planning
1334 Commission may want to give—
1335
1336 Mr. Vanarsdall - At what point in time do we want it back?
1337
1338 Mr. Silber - I guess maybe what I'm thinking at this point is, if a second
1339 point of access cannot be obtained, then it may be prudent for the Planning Commission
1340 to reconsider this plan with the input of the traffic engineer. If access is obtained from
1341 another point, the layout may change slightly. There may be something the Planning
1342 Commission wants to revisit prior to signature of the construction plans.
1343
1344 Mrs. Jones - Mmm-hmm.
1345
1346 Mr. Vanarsdall - You wan to say something Amir? Come on down to the mike
1347 and identify yourself again.
1348
1349 Mr. Patel - Hello. My name is Amir Patel with Monument Hospitality. I
1350 understand your concerns, ma'am. I think from talking to the owner of the Quality Inn, the
1351 entrance/exit behind the Mega Furniture store behind it is there no matter what. He even
1352 stated out there that if he and I can't work something out—We do have everything
1353 according to the Code and doing everything by the book, we have the one entrance on
1354 one side, and the one behind this he would not be able to close off because this has to be
1355 open for this. The only place he said he could put a fence is up to this island. He said,
1356 "Well, then, I'd have to block if off." I said, "If that's what you have to do, then that's what
1357 you have to do." He couldn't close the whole entrance/exit there.
1358
1359 Mrs. Jones - You'd be comfortable with saying that there will be two points
1360 of ingress/egress for your property.
1361
1362 Mr. Patel - I don't want to state anything like, "Okay, I'll be comfortable
1363 doing this." I'm just doing everything according to the Code and I'm trying to follow the
1364 rules. Whatever I've been advised and the information I've taken, that's how I came up
1365 with what we came up with, that we could do this, even when we found out that this

1366 gentleman owned a piece of the property. Of course, we want to have it resolved before I
1367 would even start digging a ditch out there because it could become a very big mess.

1368
1369 Mrs. Jones - Yes.

1370
1371 Mr. Patel - And I understand that.

1372
1373 Mrs. Jones - It will affect your site plan.

1374
1375 Mr. Vanarsdall - Amir, let me ask you a question. The street that comes in
1376 behind Suburban, isn't that Colyer Street? That's the street that comes off Broad and
1377 comes down there. It's a public street. It comes in to Suburban.

1378
1379 Mr. Patel - Yes.

1380
1381 Mr. Vanarsdall - Then that street connects in front of the Mega Furniture store
1382 and goes out to the private road.

1383
1384 Mr. Patel - Yes.

1385
1386 Mr. Vanarsdall - That portion belongs to Bennington's, the restaurant
1387 Bennington's that's on Broad facing north. The people who own the Mega Furniture had it
1388 paved all the way to a certain point and then Bennington's paved it from there to there.
1389 What I'm leading up to is, can't you get from this hotel to here? That's the second
1390 ingress/egress.

1391
1392 Mr. Silber - Mr. Vanarsdall, I'm not sure if I follow that. Maybe if you could
1393 put the—Let someone show what he's talking about on the screen.

1394
1395 Mr. Vanarsdall - Maybe I'm wrong.

1396
1397 Mr. Patel - Colyer Street goes down to the one entrance that Suburban
1398 Lodge has for their property on that side. Then right on the other side of Suburban Lodge
1399 is the entrance there on Fountain, right here on Fountain Avenue right here. This
1400 entrance is the entrance I'm speaking of that Mega Furniture has the easement on to use
1401 this entrance/exit. This gentleman is saying that he would be able to, if he wanted to, put
1402 a fence up to here, but this entrance would still be here. That's what he's even saying out
1403 there. If I'm incorrect, please correct me. That's what I heard when we were talking out
1404 there. Is that what you got from his story as well? This is exactly what he was saying is
1405 that, "I could build a fence up to here if I want to." We were like, "What about the Mega
1406 Furniture store? They have that easement. They use that; that's part of it." The seller,
1407 Mr. Yancey Jones, this is something we talked about when this all started a year and a
1408 half ago, that he's going to give us the easements, no problem. This is already an open
1409 area. This is his access right here and this is one of his other accesses right here.

1410

1411 Mr. Silber - Mr. Patel, I understand where you're coming from. I
1412 understand what Mr. Sullivan is saying as far as he could block your access to this right-
1413 of-way. I also understand the Commission's concerns with approving something that they
1414 don't entirely know what they're approving. If he does not give you access as you have
1415 shown on your plan, then you will have to obtain some other form of access. It looks like
1416 it's achievable, but you would likely have to change your layout somewhat. Your parking
1417 would have to be adjusted. I don't know where you are with meeting your minimum
1418 parking requirements, if you have extra parking or not. You're asking the Planning
1419 Commission to approve something here that they don't have a lot of assurances as to
1420 how it's going to end up. I feel confident that you do have a way of getting access to this
1421 driveway that has been talked about. You do have means of access back over to
1422 Fountain Avenue. If it's developed differently from what we have before us now, I think
1423 there should be some additional consideration of at least the Planning Commissioner from
1424 that District or the full Planning Commission if you cannot work out the access the way
1425 you have it shown on this plan today.

1426
1427 Mr. Patel - Okay. I agree with that. You're right. I know that we can
1428 make this work out. If we have to block that off and he still has this access here and we
1429 need extra parking spaces, we can just build a few extra less rooms. Then you can
1430 review that again. The thing is, this wouldn't hold anything up from being able to have
1431 correct ingress/egress into the property. Whether he blocks it off or not, we could do
1432 any changes that we need to do to satisfy the Commission.

1433
1434 Mr. Silber - Right. Mr. Greulich, is there any extra parking? It looks like
1435 if I'm reading this correctly, there are 74 required and they're providing 74.

1436
1437 Mr. Greulich - The required number of parking spaces provided is based on
1438 the site plan that they gave us. The total site has extra parking spaces that they could
1439 give over to the hotel.

1440
1441 Mr. Silber - Shared parking?

1442
1443 Mr. Greulich - Not even necessarily shared parking. The number of parking
1444 spaces for Mega Furniture far exceeds what is required. It would just be a matter of
1445 adjusting the property line or a proposed property line to show that the hotel had extra
1446 parking spaces.

1447
1448 Mr. Silber - Well, that further complicates the situation if you're talking
1449 about adjusting a property line.

1450
1451 Mr. Greulich - It's all owned by the one owner at the moment. One of the
1452 things we asked the applicant to show is if they were to divide the property where that
1453 property line would be and to make sure that parking spaces were adequate for both
1454 sites if that were to happen.

1455

1456 Mrs. Jones - Mr. Patel, I hope you understand that our concerns here are
1457 not in your use or your design. I think you've done a nice job of coming up with a
1458 design that is pleasing and hopefully will be a successful venture. My only concern is
1459 that we need to be mindful of the service to the public for use of these facilities and it
1460 seems to me that a problem with a second point of access could be, in my mind, a
1461 difficulty for use of this site. I think we need to have at least two ways to come and go
1462 from your property. Without knowing where that is or how you're going to set up your
1463 plan to achieve that, it's a little difficult for us to just grant blanket approval. Somehow,
1464 this has to come back to someone.
1465

1466 Mr. Silber - Or else be deferred today.
1467

1468 Mrs. Jones - Right. I just want you to understand where my concerns are.
1469

1470 Mr. Silber - Does staff have a condition that's written that addresses
1471 this? My suggestion would be that if there is a change to the access that's shown on
1472 this plan—and this might be overly restrictive—it needs to come back to the Planning
1473 Commission for approval.
1474

1475 Mr. Vanarsdall - Right.
1476

1477 Mr. Patel - Okay.
1478

1479 Mr. Silber - It needs to be a separate condition.
1480

1481 Mr. Patel - Sir, if we're able to achieve two entrances/exits, and we do
1482 have to say if there's a change made in the parking lot structure, like maybe this island
1483 or what have you, whatever it may be, but we're able to still have two entrances/exits,
1484 that's still okay as long as everything is being followed?
1485

1486 Mr. Silber - No.
1487

1488 Mr. Patel - No.
1489

1490 Mr. Silber - If you can't obtain the access as shown on this plan—
1491

1492 Mr. Patel - Okay.
1493

1494 Mr. Silber - —then you need to come back to the Planning Commission,
1495 or you can ask for a deferral today.
1496

1497 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. You know we have to do that, so why don't we get
1498 on with this.
1499

1500 Mrs. Jones - Add it as a condition.
1501

1502 Mr. Patel - Okay, okay.
1503
1504 Mr. Vanarsdall - Add a condition.
1505
1506 Mr. Patel - Thank you.
1507
1508 Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't know what the condition is going to be, so I can't word
1509 it.
1510
1511 Mr. Silber - We will revise it. I'm recommending to the Planning
1512 Commission an additional condition #38 that would say—
1513
1514 Mr. Vanarsdall - If there's nothing else, then I'll go ahead with a motion. I
1515 move that POD-3-07, Country Inn & Suites be approved with annotations on the plans
1516 and standard conditions of developments of this type and the following conditions, #9
1517 amended and 11 amended. Then we'll go from 24 down to 34, and then we'll go to 35,
1518 36, 37, and add 38. Thirty-eight will be worded by staff so if the second ingress/egress
1519 cannot be obtained, it will come back to the Planning Commission for another review.
1520 Something of that nature. I would like to add the same thing it had before on 35 where it
1521 says, "the transformers, generators shall be identified on the landscape plans," I want to
1522 put the same thing we put on McDonald's, "All building mounted equipment shall be
1523 painted to match the building," and then it goes ahead with, "and screen by such
1524 measures," and so forth. You know what talking about, Tony. I think that will do it.
1525
1526 Mrs. Jones - Second.
1527
1528 Mr. Vanarsdall - Oh, excuse me. What are we going to mark those
1529 renderings? Are we going to mark that Exhibit A and Exhibit B?
1530
1531 Mr. Greulich - I think they would just simply replace the ones that are
1532 currently in the—The elevations in the addendum would replace the ones that were
1533 handed out in the packet.
1534
1535 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is one marked Exhibit A and one marked Exhibit B? I want it
1536 dated today, the 28th.
1537
1538 Mr. Greulich - It will be dated today, absolutely.
1539
1540 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mrs.
1541 Jones. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.
1542
1543 The Planning Commission approved POD-3-07, Country Inn & Suites (POD-110-83
1544 Revised), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to
1545 these minutes for developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:
1546

- 1547 9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Department of
1548 Planning for review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of
1549 any occupancy permits.
- 1550 11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan
1551 including depictions of light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture and
1552 specifications and mounting height details shall be submitted for Department of
1553 Planning review and Planning Commission approval.
- 1554 24. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be
1555 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any
1556 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required
1557 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty
1558 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 1559 25. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public
1560 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 1561 26. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the west side of Shrader
1562 Road.
- 1563 27. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-16C-88 shall be incorporated in
1564 this approval.
- 1565 28. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of
1566 occupancy permits for individual units shall be based on the number of parking
1567 spaces required for the proposed uses and the amount of parking available
1568 according to approved plans.
- 1569 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be
1570 obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the
1571 construction plans.
- 1572 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design
1573 shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the
1574 construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
- 1575 31. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the
1576 drainage plans.
- 1577 32. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and
1578 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the
1579 issuance of a building permit.
- 1580 33. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
1581 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained
1582 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 1583 34. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be
1584 submitted to the Department of Planning and approved prior to issuance of a
1585 certificate of occupancy for this development.
- 1586 35. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
1587 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
1588 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
1589 building mounted equipment shall be painted to match the building and screened
1590 by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the
1591 Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

- 1592 36. Except for junction boxes, meters, and existing overhead utility lines, and for
1593 technical or environmental reasons, all utility lines shall be underground.
1594 37. Except during construction, no cargo containers shall be placed on this site.
1595 38. If the ingress and egress to the site is not in conformance with the plan approved
1596 by the Planning Commission, then the POD will be required to go back before the
1597 Planning Commission for approval before construction plan approval.
1598

1599 Mr. Silber - Next on the agenda is a work session to discuss a proposed
1600 zoning ordinance amendment to increase residential building heights.
1601

1602 **WORK SESSION: Work session to discuss a proposed zoning ordinance**
1603 **amendment to increase the heights of residential buildings.**
1604

1605 Mr. Silber - Mr. Blankinship is here to inform you of this proposed
1606 amendment. At the end, I would like to have the Planning Commission consider setting
1607 a public hearing on this at your April 25, 2007 meeting.
1608

1609 Mr. Vanarsdall - What time?
1610

1611 Mr. Silber - I think we would set it for like 11:00, maybe 10:30. We would
1612 do it at the conclusion of your POD meeting.
1613

1614 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is that a.m.?
1615

1616 Mr. Silber - Yes, a.m.
1617

1618 Mr. Vanarsdall - Eastern Time?
1619

1620 Mr. Silber - Yes. Daylight Savings Time.
1621

1622 Mr. Vanarsdall - Good morning, Ben.
1623

1624 Mr. Blankinship - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.
1625 The subject of this work session is a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to
1626 increase certain building heights in residential districts from 35 feet to 40 feet. Since
1627 1960, as you all know, the Zoning Ordinance has limited the height of all one-family
1628 dwellings, townhouse, and those condominiums that are not multi-family. They have
1629 been limited in height to 35 feet, which has served the County well for 47 years now.
1630 However, we have seen consistent progress and change in the housing market over
1631 that time. Houses, as everyone knows, have grown larger and larger, and it's become
1632 more and more common to have high ceilings, 9- and 10-foot ceilings on the first floor
1633 and sometimes even on the upper floors. Our developers and homebuilders are finding
1634 that they're bumping their heads on that 35-foot height limit. They have asked us about
1635 changing it and they have asked us about getting variances from it. As I think
1636 Commission members are aware, since the Cochran Decision by the Virginia Supreme
1637 Court a couple years ago, variances are no longer the appropriate form of relief for that

1638 sort of an issue where someone just wishes to build a taller building than would
1639 otherwise be allowed. That's not something that should be in the Board of Zoning
1640 Appeals' hands unless they are specifically authorized to change it by the Board of
1641 Supervisors. There was a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors asking that
1642 we prepare an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that would allow taller residential
1643 building heights.

1644
1645 What we have proposed is that for the one-family districts where the lot widths are 100
1646 feet and wider, and where the lot areas are 18,000 square feet and larger—as you see
1647 on the table before you there, the R-0, R-0A, R-1, R-1A, and R-2, and the A-1 district—
1648 that the maximum building height for one-family dwellings be increased to 40 feet. We
1649 feel like that can be done by right. There's no need for individual review of each plan on
1650 a lot that large to raise the building height by five feet. However, on the old exception
1651 lots, as we call the lots that were approved prior to 1960, even in those zoning districts,
1652 the lot widths and the lot areas tend to be smaller. Also, you have older established
1653 neighborhoods where there may be smaller homes built already throughout the
1654 subdivision. There was some concern that allowing taller buildings by right in those
1655 subdivisions could lead to conflict with the existing neighbors. However, we do believe
1656 that they should have the option of going to 40 feet, so this amendment proposes that
1657 the taller building height up to 40 feet be allowed by special exception from the Board of
1658 Zoning Appeals. So, once the Board of Supervisors has enacted an amendment like
1659 this one and specifically authorized the BZA to grant taller building heights, then they
1660 can do that and you don't run into the problems that we've run into since the Cochran
1661 Decision. That's why that would be done by special exception rather than a variance.

1662
1663 In the smaller lot areas, the R-2A, R-3, R-3A, R-4, and R-4A, we would recommend that
1664 this always be allowed by special exception, that they do not have the option of the
1665 taller buildings by right, again, because where you have an established neighborhood of
1666 smaller homes, it might be overwhelming to some of the established neighbors, or even
1667 people buying into a newer subdivision. With those smaller lots, we just believe that it
1668 should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The Board of Zoning Appeals is the
1669 appropriate forum, we believe, to do that under a special exception. We're showing
1670 there both the current standards and the exception standards for those lot sizes so you
1671 can see why we've selected that cutoff point between the R-2 and the R-2A. The lot
1672 sizes and the lot widths do get substantially smaller at that point.

1673
1674 Finally, increase the height in townhouses and condominiums by right from 35 feet to 40
1675 feet. Townhouse and condominium projects are normally built as a unified whole. You
1676 don't have one builder building on this lot and another builder on the next lot, and then
1677 someone building a custom home on the third one. Normally, you have one
1678 builder/developer coming in and doing the whole site, so he's either going to do them all
1679 at 35 or all at 40, and we weren't concerned with the compatibility issue there.

1680
1681 Zero lot lines. We would again recommend doing that by special exception just
1682 because the zero lot line was designed to allow smaller lots, narrower lots, only having

1683 the side yard on one side. Again, we're just concerned that the taller building height
1684 there could create incompatibility issues.

1685
1686 The last note that I want to make is how we measure the building height. Any building
1687 that has a gable roof or a shed roof or a gambrel roof, we measure the building height to
1688 the midpoint between the ridge and the eaves. In some cases, moving that midpoint by
1689 5 feet could result in moving the ridge by 10 feet. If the eave stays at the same height,
1690 but the ridge moves up 10 feet, that would be a 5-foot increase. When you picture this
1691 in your mind, at first blush, 35 feet, 40 feet, seems like a very small change, but this
1692 could result in the ridgeline of the roof being 10 feet higher than was previously allowed.
1693 So, it is a significant change and does bear consideration. I'd be happy to answer any
1694 questions.

1695
1696 Mr. Vanarsdall - Any questions for Mr. Blankinship by Commission members?

1697
1698 Mr. Silber - Just to reiterate what Mr. Blankinship has reviewed, what
1699 we're trying to do is to allow an increase for the single-family zoning classifications that
1700 allow larger lots. The smaller lot zoning classifications, we're not encouraging the taller
1701 structures except by special exception. We're trying to keep some parameters here
1702 relative to lot size and house size, and we are dealing with the situation of townhouses
1703 and condominiums because we are aware of some townhouses that are proposed to
1704 exceed 35 feet. Those would be by right as well. This is a work session, so we would
1705 like your input and feedback for setting a public hearing and opening this up to the
1706 public.

1707
1708 Mr. Vanarsdall - Ceiling heights being bigger over the years is what has
1709 caused it.

1710
1711 Mr. Blankinship - One of the factors, yes.

1712
1713 Mr. Vanarsdall - My question is, how are we involved in this, the Planning
1714 Commission?

1715
1716 Mr. Silber - By virtue of the buildings changing in design, taller ceilings,
1717 multiple roof line changing, houses just generally being larger, Mr. Vanarsdall, they are
1718 pushing up against the 35-foot limitation, height limitation. So, the Zoning Ordinance, we
1719 feel, needs to be amended. To amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow a taller structure
1720 requires Planning Commission consideration and Board approval.

1721
1722 Mr. Vanarsdall - That would be a new subdivision.

1723
1724 Mr. Silber - Maybe I'm missing your point.

1725
1726 Mr. Vanarsdall - The BZA makes exceptions.

1727
1728 Mr. Silber - No. Much of this is by right.

1729
1730 Mr. Vanarsdall - Other than by right. Other than by right, the BZA makes it
1731 and we don't.
1732
1733 Mr. Silber - That's correct. If this ordinance goes through, this does not
1734 impact the Planning Commission's review and approval of building permits or anything
1735 like that.
1736
1737 Mrs. Jones - I have a question. Were you finished? I'm sorry; I didn't
1738 mean to cut you off. Mr. Blankinship, let me make sure I understand. Your proposed
1739 wording here applies only to new construction or is it also renovations and additions and
1740 this kind of thing? It's been a common thing in my district, I know, for ranchers to have
1741 second or more stories added and, of course, the height limitations really are important
1742 in established neighborhoods, as you mentioned. What is your thought about that?
1743
1744 Mr. Blankinship - Yes ma'am. This would allow for renovations and teardowns
1745 and reconstructions as well. The same regulations would apply. Again, we feel that by
1746 allowing it by right only in the zoning districts that allow the largest lots, that we have
1747 gotten around that compatibility issue. If you have two small houses on relatively small
1748 lots and the house in between them wants to tear down and rebuilt at 40 feet, that would
1749 have to go, in most of these cases, to the Board of Zoning Appeals. So, there would be
1750 a case-by-case review, unless it's on the larger lots where we feel it's less likely to raise
1751 the issue.
1752
1753 Mrs. Jones - I will tell you we've had a bit of a to-do in my district about
1754 one of these kinds of situations. The neighbors' comments were there were impacts on
1755 their lights and air and enjoyment of their space and this kind of thing. I realize there
1756 are some protections because these larger lots will give more space, obviously,
1757 between homes, but I'm a little hesitant to include R-2 in this. However, that is open to
1758 opinion, I guess.
1759
1760 Mr. Silber - Let me just understand. You have some concern with the R-
1761 2.
1762
1763 Mrs. Jones - That's the smallest lot of the proposed by-right
1764 developments. I just don't have a whole lot of experience, being one of the newer
1765 Planning Commission members, as to how this has gone over the past number of
1766 years. I do think we are going to have to reflect a change in building styles and,
1767 obviously, the higher ceilings, I understand where that's an issue. I just want to make
1768 sure that we do cover these situations that could be really difficult.
1769
1770 Mr. Thornton - Mr. Blankinship, as you have delineated and suggested
1771 some of these changes, what has the research shown in other localities similar to
1772 Henrico and in other areas? Some of this is promoted by tradition, of course, and
1773 tradition is hard to change sometimes. What has the research shown? Has it shown

1774 that taller buildings may have been, in some case, deleterious to some of the social
1775 fabric of subdivisions? Have you maybe come across any of that data at all?

1776
1777 Mr. Blankinship - I haven't read or heard of anything where I would say they
1778 found taller buildings really damaging the social fabric, as you say. I think there's more
1779 of the sort of concern that Mrs. Jones is describing, anecdotal cases where a teardown
1780 and rebuild has resulted in neighbors being shocked that, say, a one-story bungalow
1781 was replaced by a large three-story dwelling. Part of the impetus to this, as you may be
1782 aware, came from our neighbors to the north where there were some allegations that
1783 the 35-foot building height was not being enforced properly. We began at that time a
1784 very thorough review of how we were enforcing it both at the design and review phase,
1785 and on the ground at construction approval. We found that we did not have the
1786 problems that they were having up there where things were being approved that should
1787 not have been. We were finding that we had requests to build, specifically, some
1788 townhouses in the 38-foot range. We were, in one sense, following their lead,
1789 observing the issues that they were running into in Fairfax County, and Prince Georges'
1790 and Montgomery County, Maryland.

1791
1792 Mr. Thornton - You also mentioned in your deliberations to us another facet,
1793 that is that I think you're tangentially mentioning conformity of 40 feet, of 35 feet. Do we
1794 need to take a look at that in the future if we're going to make some of these changes?
1795 Might conformity be helpful in some cases in some subdivisions? I'm trying to look
1796 toward the future a little bit, but you have a subdivision where you have variances like
1797 that or what would be—Since this is your particular area, what would be a subdivision of
1798 the future? Would you have some 40, some 35 and all that, or would we go for more
1799 conformity, all of them being similar? How would something like that be perceived for
1800 future building like that?

1801
1802 Mr. Blankinship - I don't know if Mr. Silber would rather answer that question.
1803 My personal view is that I see the market really driving that. The builders appear to have
1804 found that building subdivisions of fairly consistent designs does the best in our market.
1805 Therefore, that's what they choose to build. They have the freedom now to build some
1806 smaller and some larger, and to do more variety and they choose not to do that.

1807
1808 Mr. Silber - I think I might add to that by simply saying that I agree with
1809 Mr. Blankinship. I think the market is driving so much of what we're now seeing, Mr.
1810 Thornton. We're seeing houses being proposed that are much larger than we would
1811 have seen 15, 20 years ago. The number of pitched roofs that are being designed into
1812 a single-family house doesn't match what we saw 15, 20 years ago. I think many
1813 subdivisions that are coming on line now, many of the houses within an individual
1814 subdivision would be very consistent in and of itself. Those houses will be about the
1815 same size. I think Mrs. Jones has a good point that in our more established
1816 subdivisions, we're finding that the land values now have caused people to reevaluate
1817 their properties and build up with an existing house. Raise roofs and go from one story
1818 to two stories, or even two to three stories. What we're trying to do is make sure that
1819 there is a proportionality between the size of the house and the lot size so we don't

1820 have situations where you're building sort of the "McMansions" next to modest-sized
1821 houses. It's a balancing act of trying to deal with the changing market conditions and
1822 existing subdivisions with houses of a certain size.

1823
1824 Mr. Thornton - Also, Mr. Silber, I think another concern for the Planning
1825 Commission and the Board of Supervisors is this whole topic of affordability. The whole
1826 idea of being in America everybody, if they can afford it, is deserving of a home, their
1827 own castle. As we kind of look at what's happening now in the market, I'm very much
1828 concerned for young couples starting out, will they be able to have affordable housing. I
1829 think all these things also impinge on that a little bit, too. I do know there will be
1830 challenges for all of us in making decisions about housing and planning for the future
1831 there. I'm very much concerned about that.

1832
1833 Mr. Silber - That's a very good point. It's a concern of the Administration
1834 as well.

1835
1836 Mrs. Jones - I'd like to raise one more question, if I could. I realize that we
1837 are discussing measuring in a way that involves the ridgeline, the eaves, this kind of
1838 thing, and I realize that our ordinances have been written with that as the standard. As
1839 we debate roof heights, why is it not something to consider to measure to the highest
1840 point, as opposed to the current standard?

1841
1842 Mr. Blankinship - We had a lengthy debate on that specific subject. It has
1843 been suggested to us that it would make other people's jobs a lot easier if we measured
1844 to the ridge instead. I think the concern that we saw with that is that, as you say, the
1845 ordinance has been administered and enforced one way for 47 years. If we were to
1846 change that provision without really thorough and careful study, it could have a lot of
1847 unintended consequences. The first of those that occurs to me is that, say, we decided
1848 to measure to the ridge and so increase the height 10 feet to allow for the additional
1849 distance there. Well, now you've raised the height for flat roof buildings an additional
1850 story. It's that sort of unintended consequence that as we kicked that idea around, we
1851 stepped back from it and decided this may not be the time to take on that issue.

1852
1853 Mrs. Jones - Fair enough. Okay.

1854
1855 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Any more questions for Mr. Blankinship? I think we
1856 want to set a public hearing now, Mr. Secretary, for April 25th, you said, around 11:00.
1857 11 a.m.

1858
1859 Mr. Silber - I was maybe reconsidering the time. If we set maybe at like
1860 10:00, then if the Commission happens to get finished earlier, we can move right into it.
1861 If it's 11:00, you may have to wait around, so I would suggest maybe setting it for 10:00.

1862
1863 Mr. Vanarsdall - Let's have a motion to do this on the 25th of April.
1864 Mrs. Jones - I so move.

1865

1866 Mr. Archer - I second.
1867
1868 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer.
1869 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.
1870
1871 The Planning Commission voted to have a public hearing on April 25, 2007, at 10:00 to
1872 consider an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.
1873
1874 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 28, 2007 Minutes**
1875
1876 Mr. Vanarsdall - Now we have the minutes.
1877
1878 Mrs. Jones - I move approval of the minutes as printed.
1879
1880 Mr. Archer - I second.
1881
1882 Mr. Vanarsdall - Motion made by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Archer to
1883 approve the minutes of Wednesday, February 28, 2007. All in favor say aye. All
1884 opposed say no. The motion carries. Mrs. Jones, you didn't have any changes?
1885
1886 Mrs. Jones - They were wonderful.
1887
1888 Mr. Vanarsdall - We're making progress.
1889
1890 The Planning Commission approved the February 28, 2007 minutes.
1891
1892 Mr. Thornton - Mr. Chairman, the director mentioned something this
1893 morning. I hope people didn't take it as a plea for sympathy.
1894
1895 Mrs. Jones - Good-bye, Mr. Archer.
1896
1897 Mr. Thornton - I accelerated my speed coming in here this morning.
1898 Someone did say, "Well, I've never seen anybody quite walk that fast with a cane." So,
1899 I was trying to hurry up and get here.
1900
1901 Mr. Vanarsdall - We appreciate it, Frank, we really do. This meeting is
1902 adjourned.
1903
1904 Mrs. Jones - Thank you. You made the difference for sure. Adjourned.

1905 On a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mrs. Jones, the Planning Commission
1906 adjourned its March 28, 2007 meeting at 10:58 a.m.

1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919

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

Randall R. Silber, Secretary