

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of Henrico County
2 held in the County Administration Building in the Government Center at Parham and
3 Hungary Springs Roads beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, March 22, 2017.
4

Members Present: Mr. Eric S. Leabough, C.P.C., Chairperson (Varina)
Mr. Robert H. Witte, Jr., Vice-Chairperson (Brookland)
Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C. (Fairfield)
Mr. Gregory R. Baka (Tuckahoe)
Mrs. Sandra M. Marshall (Three Chopt)
Mr. R. Joseph Emerson, Jr., AICP, Director of Planning,
Secretary

Member Absent: Mr. Tyrone E. Nelson, Board of Supervisors' Representative

Others Present: Ms. Jean Moore, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Leslie A. News, PLA, Senior Principal 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. Matt Ward, County Planner
Mr. Gregory Garrison, AICP, County Planner
Mr. Lee Pambid, C.P.C., County Planner
Ms. Aimee B. Crady, AICP, County Planner
Ms. Kate B. McMillion, County Planner
Ms. Sharon Smidler, P.E., Traffic Engineer
Mr. Gary A. DuVal, P.E., Traffic Engineer
Ms. Melissa Ferrante, Office Assistant / Recording Secretary

5
6 **Mr. Tyrone E. Nelson, the Board of Supervisors' representative, abstains on all**
7 **cases unless otherwise noted.**
8

9 Mr. Leabough - I call this March 22nd meeting of the Henrico County
10 Planning Commission to order. Everyone besides our Board member representative is
11 present, so we can conduct business today. Do we have anyone from the news media
12 in the audience? I don't see anyone.
13

14 With that, I ask that you all mute or silence your cell phones and stand with the
15 Commission for the Pledge of Allegiance.
16

17 Mr. Emerson, I hear there is some budget work going on this week.
18

19 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. That's why the Board member isn't
20 with us this morning. He is in budget meetings. That's going on all this week.
21

22 Mr. Leabough - We'll carry on in his absence then. With that I'd like to turn
23 the agenda over to you, sir.

24
25 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. First on your agenda this morning are
26 the requests for deferrals and withdrawals. Those will be presented by Ms. Leslie News.

27
28 Ms. News - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Good morning members of the
29 Commission. Staff has received one request for a deferral, and this is located on page 4
30 of your agenda, in the Varina District. This POD2017-00069, The Growers Exchange at
31 Techpark. The applicant has requested a deferral to the April 26, 2017 meeting.

32
33 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
POD2017-00069 **Sekiv Solutions, LLC for Agape Properties of Virginia, LLC and Briscoe White III:** 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, 29,185 square foot office warehouse and distribution center, including greenhouse facilities. The 3.95-acre site is located along the east line of Techpark Place, approximately 1,800 feet south of Technology Boulevard, on part of parcel 844-703-6690. The zoning is M-2C, General Industrial District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Varina)**

35
36 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to the deferral of
37 POD2017-00069, The Growers Exchange at Techpark? I see no opposition. So with
38 that, I move that POD2017-00069, The Growers Exchange at Techpark, be deferred to
39 the April 26, 2017, meeting at the request of the applicant.

40
41 Mrs. Marshall - Second.

42
43 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, a second by
44 Mrs. Marshall. All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There's no opposition; that motion
45 passes.

46
47 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD2017-00069,
48 The Growers Exchange at Techpark, to its April 26, 2017 meeting.

49
50 Ms. News - Staff is not aware of any further requests.

51
52 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to your expedited agenda.
53 Those items will also be presented by Ms. News.

54
55 Ms. News - We have three items on our expedited agenda this morning.
56 The first item is on page 3 of your agenda and located in the Three Chopt District. This

(U.S. Route 33), on parcels 766-763-2048, 766-763-3413, and 766-763-3804. The zoning is R-2, One-Family Residential District. County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

88

89 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00039,
90 Staples Mill Road Baptist Church Parking and Building Expansion? There is no
91 opposition.

92

93 Mr. Witte - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD2017-00039, Staples
94 Mill Road Baptist Church Parking and Building Expansion, as presented, subject to the
95 annotations on the plan, standard conditions for developments of this type, and
96 additional conditions 29 and 30 as shown on the agenda. And this is on the expedited
97 agenda.

98

99 Mr. Baka - Second.

100

101 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mr. Baka. All in
102 favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

103

104 The Planning Commission approved POD2017-00039, Staples Mill Road Baptist
105 Church Parking and Building Expansion, subject to the annotations on the plans, the
106 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the
107 following additional conditions:

108

109 29. Outside storage shall not be permitted.

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

115

116 Ms. News - The final item is located on page 17 of your agenda, and in
117 the Tuckahoe District. This is a landscape plan for POD2016-00525, John Rolfe
118 Square. Staff recommends approval.

119

120 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

121

POD2016-00525
John Rolfe Square –
11840 Church Road

HG Design Studio for Eagle Construction of VA and ME JRS, LLC: Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 10.8-acre site is located on the southeastern corner of the intersection of John Rolfe Parkway and Church Road, on parcel 740-755-3511. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Tuckahoe)**

122

123 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to the landscape
124 plan for POD2016-00525, John Rolfe Square? There is no opposition. Mr. Baka.

125
126 Mr. Baka - Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out that the applicant held a
127 community meeting led by the developer on March 7, 2016, and presented landscape
128 plan information to the adjacent property owners at that time. At this point, I will go
129 ahead and move for approval of POD2016-00525, John Rolfe Square, subject to the
130 annotations on the plan, the standard conditions of this type, and subject to the
131 standard conditions for landscaping plans.

132
133 Mr. Witte - Second.

134
135 Mrs. Marshall - We have a motion by Mr. Baka, second by Mr. Witte. All in
136 favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

137
138 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for POD2016-00525, John
139 Rolfe Square, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached
140 to these minutes for developments of this type.

141
142 Ms. News - That completes our expedited agenda.

143
144 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to Subdivision Extensions of
145 Conditional Approval. Those will be presented by Ms. Kate McMillion.

146
147 **EXTENSIONS - FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY**

148

Subdivision	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Magisterial District	Recommended Extension
SUB2015-00152 Castleton (November 2015 Plan)	325	244	0	Varina	March 22, 2018

149
150 Ms. McMillion - Good morning. There is one informational conditional
151 subdivision extension on the agenda this morning. The map indicates in red the location
152 of the subdivision, Castleton, November 2015 plan, which is presented for extension of
153 its conditional approval. The case, located in the Varina District, is eligible for a one-
154 year extension, which does not require Commission action, and is for informational
155 purposes only.

156
157 I am available for any questions you may have.

158
159 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from the Commission. There are no
160 questions. Thank you, Ms. McMillion.

161

162 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move into the regular agenda on
163 page 6 for POD2017-00067, Townes Site Engineering for JG Laburnum, LLC and
164 Robins Laburnum LLC and General Land Company. The staff report will be presented
165 by Mr. Matt Ward.
166

167 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT AND MASTER PLAN**
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	<p>POD2017-00067 Eubank and Laburnum Commercial Center Master Plan - South Laburnum Avenue</p> <p>Townes Site Engineering for JG Laburnum, LLC and Robins Laburnum, LLC and General Land Company: Request for approval of a plan of development and master plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct private roads, drainage, and utilities infrastructure for future retail and service buildings. The 8.96-acre site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Laburnum Avenue and Eubank Road on parcels 816-711-6950, 816-711-8151, 817-711-0454, and 817-711-0712. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional), B-3C, Business District (Conditional), and ASO, Airport Safety Overlay District. County water and sewer. (Varina)</p>
--	---

169 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00067,
170 Eubank and Laburnum Commercial Center Master Plan? There's no opposition. Good
171 morning, Mr. Ward.
172
173

174 Mr. Ward - Good morning. This plan does represent the first phase of
175 the Eubank and Laburnum Commercial Center Master Plan. As you can see, there are
176 two private roads, one accessing off South Laburnum and one accessing off of Eubank
177 Road. It will consist of infrastructure such as public utilities and storm sewer. Also, a six-
178 foot white vinyl fence will be installed along the entire eastern property line, which abuts
179 the Robinwood neighborhood. A 50-foot proffered buffer will remain intact.
180

181 Please note that all future development plans will come back to the Planning
182 Commission for review and approval. As presented this plan of development is in
183 compliance with zoning case C-63C-06. With that, staff does recommend approval of
184 this plan with conditions 29 through 33.
185

186 I'm happy to answer any questions. We also have Zachary Wilkins, engineer, and Jim
187 Kinter, owner, should you have any questions of them.
188

189 Mr. Leabough - Are there questions for Mr. Ward? Mr. Ward, could you
190 please show us the aerial of that site before you sit down?
191

192 Mr. Ward - This is the neighborhood where you have the 50-foot
193 proffered buffer that follows along the eastern property line.
194

195 Mr. Leabough - Okay.
196
197 Mr. Ward - You'll have basically all vegetation outside of buffer taken
198 out—
199
200 Mr. Leabough - There's not a lot of vegetation there now.
201
202 Mr. Ward - Correct.
203
204 Mr. Leabough - That's all I need to hear. I'd like to hear from the applicant.
205
206 Mr. Kinter - Good morning. My name is Jim Kinter. I'm here on behalf of
207 the property owner/developer. I also have—
208
209 Mr. Wilkins - Zach Wilkins, engineer.
210
211 Mr. Kinter - We'd like to thank staff for their support and their efforts and
212 their recommendation for approval. We accept the conditions of the staff report, and we
213 ask the Commission for approval today.
214
215 Mr. Leabough - Okay. I have no major concerns. I just wanted to have you
216 go on record, which you just did, to commit to the 50-foot buffer requirement, which is
217 sounds like you're okay with meeting, correct?
218
219 Mr. Kinter - We are.
220
221 Mr. Leabough - Okay, all right. That's all I have Thank you.
222
223 Mr. Kinter - Thank you.
224
225 Mr. Leabough - Any other questions from the Commission? There being no
226 questions, I move that POD2017-00067, Eubank and Laburnum Commercial Center
227 Master Plan be approved subject to annotations on the plan, standard conditions for
228 developments of this type, and additional conditions 29 through 33 as noted on the
229 agenda.
230
231 Mr. Witte - Second.
232
233 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, a second by Mr. Witte.
234 All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.
235
236 The Planning Commission approved the plan of development and master plan for
237 POD2017-00067, Eubank and Laburnum Commercial Center Master Plan, subject to
238 the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
239 developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:
240

- 241 29. The right-of-way for widening of South Laburnum as shown on approved plans
 242 shall be dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
 243 The right-of-way dedication plat and any other required information shall be
 244 submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to
 245 requesting occupancy permits.
- 246 30. A concrete sidewalk meeting County standards shall be provided along the east
 247 side of South Laburnum Avenue.
- 248 31. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-63-C-06 shall be incorporated
 249 in this approval.
- 250 32. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
 251 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained
 252 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 253 33. All subsequent detailed plans of development needed to implement this
 254 conceptual plan shall be submitted for staff review and Planning Commission
 255 approval, and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such
 256 subsequent plans are submitted for review/ approval.
 257

258 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 8 of your agenda for
 259 POD2017-00065, Timmons Group for HHHunt River Mill LLC. The staff report will be
 260 presented by Ms. Aimee Crady.
 261

262 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**
 263

264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273	<p>POD2017-00065 River Mill - Section 2 - Woodman Road</p> <p>Timmons Group for HHHunt River Mill, LLC: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct 142 three-story residential townhomes for sale and 100 detached dwellings for sale with zero-lot-lines. The 65.12-acre site is located on the north line of future Woodman Road extended, approximately 2,200 feet west of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1), on parts of parcels 782-773-0113, 780-772-8360, and 781-773-2686. The zoning is R-5AC, General Residential District and RTHC, Residential Townhouse District. County water and sewer. (Fairfield)</p>
--	--

264
 265 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00065,
 266 River Mill - Section 2? There's no opposition. Good morning, Ms. Crady.
 267

268 Ms. Crady - Good morning. At the November 2016 Planning Commission
 269 hearing, the conditional subdivision plan for the first phase of the River Mill development
 270 was granted approval for 146 townhomes and 150 zero-lot-line single-family homes for
 271 a total of 296 lots. Because residential townhomes and zero-lot-line single-family homes
 272 require subsequent plan of development approval, the applicant returns today seeking
 273 plan of development approval for the first 242 of those lots, which will consist of the first

274 100 zero-lot-line units and 142 residential townhomes. The site continues to be subject
275 to and consistent with the proffered conditions of zoning case REZ2016-00002.
276

277 The plan shows a pedestrian network exceeding County minimum standards and
278 exceeding proffered conditions. As site details are finalized, the exact locations of
279 additional segments of the network will be evaluated to complement this network. And
280 you can see the ten-foot multi-use path here, which will tie into the interior site.
281

282 Typical elevations are included in your staff report. They show two different widths of
283 units for the townhomes, 28 and 22 feet in width, as well as the typical elevations for
284 zero-lot-line units. And these are also consistent with the proffered elevations.
285

286 Staff recommends approval subject to the standard conditions for developments of this
287 type and conditions 29 through 43 listed with the staff report.
288

289 I can now answer any questions you have of staff. John Murray of Timmons Group is
290 here representing the applicant, and Craig Shelton is here from HHHunt, if you should
291 have any questions for them.
292

293 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions for Ms. Crady?
294

295 Mr. Archer - I don't have any, Mr. Chairman. As you all will note, these
296 conditions 29 through 43 appear complicated, and that's because they are. But
297 Ms. Crady has assured me that these are pretty standard for developments of this type.
298 If anybody needs explanation, we can hear them.
299

300 Mr. Leabough - I think we're good. Mr. Archer.
301

302 Mr. Archer - Okay. Thank you. Ms. Crady.
303

304 Ms. Crady - Thank you.
305

306 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, with that I will move for approval of POD2017-
307 00065, River Mill - Section 2, subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard
308 conditions for a development of this type, and the additional conditions 29 through 43.
309

310 Mr. Witte - Second.
311

312 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Archer, a second by Mr. Witte. All
313 in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.
314

315 The Planning Commission approved POD2017-00065, River Mill - Section 2, subject to
316 the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for
317 developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:
318

- 319 29. Roof edge ornamental features that extend over the zero lot line, and which are
320 permitted by Section 24-95(i)(1), must be authorized in the covenants.
- 321 30. Eight-foot easements for construction, drainage, and maintenance access for
322 abutting lots shall be provided and shown on the POD plans for zero lot line
323 units.
- 324 31. For zero lot line units, building permit request for individual dwellings shall each
325 include two (2) copies of a layout plan sheet as approved with the plan of
326 development. The developer may utilize alternate building types providing that
327 each may be located within the building footprint shown on the approved plan.
328 Any deviation in building footprint or infrastructure shall require submission and
329 approval of an administrative site plan.
- 330 32. Windows on the zero lot line side of the dwelling can only be approved with an
331 exception granted by the Building Official and the Director of Planning during the
332 building permit application process.
- 333 33. The mechanical equipment for each zero lot line building shall be located on its
334 respective lot. Except for wall-mounted electric meters, in no case shall the eight-
335 foot easement for construction, drainage, and maintenance access on the
336 abutting lot be used to locate other mechanical equipment (such as HVAC
337 equipment, generators, and the like) for the subject lot.
- 338 34. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.
- 339 35. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the
340 Richmond Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be
341 included on the construction plans prior to their approval. The standard street
342 name signs shall be installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.
- 343 36. The subdivision plat for River Mill Section 2 shall be recorded before any building
344 permits are issued.
- 345 37. The right-of-way for widening of Woodman Road as shown on approved plans
346 shall be dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
347 The right-of-way dedication plat and any other required information shall be
348 submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to
349 requesting occupancy permits.
- 350 38. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building in this
351 development, the engineer of record shall certify that the site has been graded in
352 accordance with the approved grading plans.
- 353 39. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case REZ2016-00002 shall be
354 incorporated in this approval.
- 355 40. A note in bold lettering shall be provided on the erosion control plan indicating
356 that sediment basins or traps located within buildable areas or building pads shall
357 be reclaimed with engineered fill. All materials shall be deposited and compacted
358 in accordance with the applicable sections of the state building code and
359 geotechnical guidelines established by the engineer. An engineer's report
360 certifying the suitability of the fill materials and its compaction shall be submitted
361 for review and approval by the Director of Planning and Director of Public Works
362 and the Building Official prior to the issuance of any building permit(s) on the
363 affected sites.

- 364 41. The pavement shall be of an SM-2A type and shall be constructed in accordance
365 with County standard and specifications. The developer shall post a defect bond
366 for all pavement with the Department of Planning - the exact type, amount and
367 implementation shall be determined by the Director of Planning, to protect the
368 interest of the members of the Homeowners Association. The defect bond shall
369 remain in effect for a period of three years from the date of the issuance of the
370 final occupancy permit. Prior to the issuance of the last Certificate of Occupancy,
371 a professional engineer must certify that the roads have been designed and
372 constructed in accordance with County standards.
- 373 42. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
374 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained
375 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 376 43. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
377 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,
378 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All
379 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
380 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

381
382 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 11 of your agenda
383 and page 1 of your amended agenda for POD2017-00066, Blakeway Corporation for
384 Southland Corporation and Vertical Construction. The staff report will be presented by
385 Mr. Lee Pambid.

386
387
388

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT AND LIGHTING PLAN

POD2017-00066
7-Eleven at 389 E
Williamsburg Road

Blakeway Corporation for Southland Corporation and Vertical Construction: Request for approval of a plan of development and lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to replace an existing convenience store and construct a one-story, 2,940 square foot convenience store and fuel center. The 2.17-acre site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection at East Williamsburg Road and Beulah Road, on parcels 830-715-0718 and 830-714-0194. The zoning is B-3, Business District, R-3, One Family Residential District, and ASO, Airport Safety Overlay District. County water and sewer. **(Varina)**

389
390 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00066,
391 7-Eleven at 389 E Williamsburg Road? We have opposition. All right. Before we get
392 started, Mr. Emerson, would you please share with the audience our guidelines for
393 speaking at our hearings?

394
395 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, I certainly will. As mentioned by the Chairman, the
396 Commission does have guidelines that govern their operation of their public hearings,
397 and they are as follows: The applicant is allowed ten minutes to present the request,

398 and time may be reserved for responses to testimony. Opposition is allowed a
399 cumulative ten minutes to present its concerns, meaning that everyone who wishes to
400 speak needs to fit within that ten minutes. Commission questions do not count into the
401 time limits. The Commission may waive the limits for either party at its discretion. All
402 comments must be directly related to the case under consideration.

403
404 Mr. Leabough - Thank you, sir. Mr. Pambid, good morning.

405
406 Mr. Pambid - Good morning. This request is for a one-story, 2,940-square-
407 foot convenience store with fuel pumps. The site is zoned B-3 and R-3 with no proffers.
408 A right-in/right-out access on Williamsburg Road, which is right here, is proposed and is
409 under review by VDOT. Two entrances are also proposed along Beulah Road here and
410 here. A BMP is proposed that is back here. And it will comply with the regular building
411 setbacks and transitional buffers. A 35-foot transitional buffer is required and provided
412 along the east and south property lines adjacent to the R-3 residential districts.

413
414 The proposed building features wall panels designed to simulate red brick and light
415 gray-colored CMU. The fuel canopy features gray wall panels on the columns and a
416 gray metal mansard roof.

417
418 The lighting plan illustrates 7 building-mounted wall packs at a height of 10 feet and 8
419 pole-mounted fixtures on 6 poles at a height of 20 feet. The fuel canopy will contain 30
420 recessed fixtures. All lights are flat lens LED fixtures. Staff has also recommended that
421 decorative streetlights to match those existing on East Williamsburg Road be provided.

422
423 Staff has received comments from three citizens citing the following items: security,
424 proximity of the BMP to the rear property line, removal of existing trees versus
425 additional buffering, the location of large trees and potential toppling in high winds, and
426 hours of operation.

427
428 Also in the addendum is an update to the staff report. Since the distribution of the
429 packets, the staff has completed its review of the lighting plan and conceptual
430 landscape plan. Those are the sheets that you received in your packet last week.

431
432 As previously stated, the lighting plan conforms to County lighting guidelines. The
433 conceptual landscape plan illustrates a full 35-foot transitional buffer with all the
434 required plantings. That's this sheet here. The applicant indicates the trees will be
435 saved where possible.

436
437 Staff recommends approval subject to the annotations on the plan, standard conditions
438 for a development of this type, and the additional conditions listed in the agenda.

439
440 This concludes my presentation. I can now field any questions you have regarding this.
441 We have applicant representatives here—Steve Blevins with Blakeway Corporation,
442 Larae Tucker with the developer, and several representatives from 7-Eleven.

443

444 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from the Commission? This is not
445 really a question, Mr. Pambid, I just wanted to confirm. So this is a B-3-zoned site,
446 which is allowed to operate 24/7.
447

448 Mr. Pambid - Most of the property is zoned B-3. There is a small portion to
449 the south that is zoned R-3 where the BMP will be located. But that is correct.
450

451 Mr. Leabough - The business, where it's located, it's allowed to operate 24/7.
452

453 Mr. Pambid - It is unrestricted hours.
454

455 Mr. Leabough - So it can operate 24/7.
456

457 Mr. Pambid - It currently operates 24 hours.
458

459 Mr. Leabough - It does now.
460

461 Mr. Pambid - Yes sir.
462

463 Mr. Leabough - Okay. So what's before us is the plan of development, not
464 anything related to the 24-hour operation.
465

466 Mr. Pambid - Just the plan of development.
467

468 Mr. Leabough - Okay. Thank you, sir.
469

470 Mr. Pambid - You're welcome.
471

472 Mr. Leabough - Whoever is in opposition, please approach the podium and
473 share your comments, concerns. We'll try our best to have the applicant come forward
474 to address those questions or concerns. These are recorded proceedings, so if you
475 don't mind, please state your name for the record.
476

477 Sergeant Brown - Good morning. My name is Sergeant Timothy Brown. I have
478 property very close to the proposed plan for this construction. I represent several of my
479 neighbors, but I don't see them right now. We're very concerned because this is a
480 residential area. We're concerned about the proposed building of this building. We're
481 concerned about the noise that it might generate. We're concerned about the increasing
482 crime in that area. It's a residential, family-oriented area. And the lighting.
483

484 I heard talk that there's going to be a buffer replaced. But as far as security, is there
485 going to be increase in police patrols? I understand also that there's going to be building
486 of a retention pond in that area. So we have to be concerned about mosquitoes and
487 insect increase.
488

489 So I'm very concerned. So I'm voicing my concern not only for myself but also for my
490 neighbors. We have young children, grandchildren. With this being a 24/7, 365-day-a-
491 year building, 7-Eleven, they never close even on holidays. I'm very concerned about
492 that. People staying out late at night, hanging around the retention pond just to hang
493 out. Drug usage and everything like that. So I'm very concerned about it, for someone to
494 build something like that in a residential area.

495
496 Mr. Leabough - Sir, are you aware that there is an existing store there now
497 currently?

498
499 Sergeant Brown - That is correct, yes.

500
501 Mr. Leabough - So what they would be doing would be putting in there
502 what's already there. So nothing would change as far as the use.

503
504 Sergeant Brown - From what I understand from the plan—there's vegetation in
505 the back of my yard. From what I understand, this is going to encroach upon my
506 backyard property. I was concerned about that.

507
508 Mr. Leabough - I understand that. I was just making clear that use that's
509 there now is currently operating 24/7. So are you having issues with noise or crime or
510 anything like that?

511
512 Sergeant Brown - Noise, crime, and also the building of this retention pond.

513
514 Mr. Leabough - Okay. We'll ask the applicant to come forward to address
515 those concerns.

516
517 Mr. Blevins - Hi, I'm Steve Blevins from Blakeway Corporation
518 representing 7-Eleven.

519
520 As you just discussed, the existing store is there now. The only reason why we're
521 encroaching into that back parcel is to add additional fuel pumps and kind of move the
522 store back a little bit.

523
524 As far as security, we do take that pretty seriously. 7-Eleven has cameras on the back
525 of the store. They don't tolerate any loitering, and they regulate that pretty seriously.
526 The lighting levels, although we're going to have full cutoff at the property lines, we take
527 lighting very seriously and provide enough to provide safe areas so people can't go and
528 hide.

529
530 As far as the buffering, we are intending to save as many trees as possible. Right now
531 we're in the process of looking at that as far as the existing trees versus what's required
532 in that 35-foot transitional buffer. Obviously, we have to provide that buffer along both of
533 those property lines.

534

535 As far as the BMP, the BMP is not going to be a wet pond. It's just a dry retention pond,
536 and it's very—from the street, it's just a depression and you won't really even see much
537 of anything. It's just there to kind of hold back the water a little bit. But everything will
538 drain, positive drainage, and you won't have standing water there.

539
540 Hopefully, we addressed those concerns. We are there now, and 24 hours is what
541 7-Eleven does, and that's obviously something that we need to maintain on this
542 application.

543
544 Mrs. Marshall - I have a question. If I understand correctly, you want to
545 move the pump further back so you're moving the store further back, and that will be
546 close to Sergeant Brown's property? Is that correct?

547
548 Mr. Blevins - Yes. In order to make this work with the site's—we have
549 certain site constraints, and we have to make sure that the trucks can get in and out of
550 the site. So we pushed the site back a little bit. That's why we're purchasing the
551 property behind us.

552
553 Mrs. Marshall - And the property that is behind you that you purchased, that
554 is between Sergeant Brown and you.

555
556 Mr. Blevins - I'm not sure where Sergeant Brown's property is located. We
557 have I'm guessing over 100 feet from the back of our store to the rear property line,
558 probably 120 feet.

559
560 Mr. Pambid - Sergeant Brown lives here.

561
562 Mr. Blevins - Okay.

563
564 Mr. Pambid - He is one of the adjacent property owners that I heard from
565 earlier this week. I also heard from this gentleman here.

566
567 Mr. Leabough - Okay. Thank you.

568
569 Mrs. Marshall - Thank you.

570
571 Mr. Blevins - So we won't have any lighting or anything back there. Trying
572 to maintain that buffer, that natural buffer that's out there now.

573
574 Mrs. Marshall - So there will be no lighting in the rear is what you're saying?

575
576 Mr. Blevins - There will be lighting in the rear of the store, but you won't
577 see it from that rear property line.

578
579 Mrs. Marshall - Will it be downcast lighting?

580

581 Mr. Blevins - Yes. Full cutoff.
582
583 Mr. Leabough - So it shouldn't provide too much overspill into the residential
584 area.
585
586 Mr. Blevins - Yes.
587
588 Mr. Witte - You've stated that it's going to be a dry BMP. How deep is it
589 going to be?
590
591 Mr. Blevins - I think we're looking at two feet.
592
593 Mr. Witte - So it's going to be a two-foot depression.
594
595 Mr. Blevins - Yes. It's just like a real gentle depression. The site's a little
596 challenging from a drainage standpoint.
597
598 Mr. Witte - No standing water.
599
600 Mr. Blevins - No sir. It'll collect, but it'll drain within 24 hours.
601
602 Mr. Witte - I have the same concerns as Sergeant Brown having to fight
603 mosquitoes.
604
605 Mr. Blevins - I understand, yes.
606
607 Mr. Witte - A dry one is much better.
608
609 Mr. Blevins - Yes sir.
610
611 Mr. Leabough - Knowing this area, this is a pretty challenging site. It's pretty
612 tight now. I'm sure parking is an issue for 7-Eleven. The pumps are right there at the
613 street. Can you speak to some of the enhancements as they relate to traffic circulation
614 and how that's been improved?
615
616 Mr. Blevins - Yes, if you want to go back. One of the biggest things is
617 we're adding a turn lane onto Beulah, which is going to create a little safer situation for
618 cars moving in and out. We do have better circulation with the two entrances in order for
619 people to get back onto Williamsburg Road. So the whole idea is we're enhancing the
620 property, adding additional landscaping in the front. It's going to be a more attractive
621 building, better site circulation, better and safer lighting with full cutoff. So you're not
622 going to spill light on the adjacent property. It is growing a little bit, but only with regards
623 to making those enhancements. We wouldn't be buying that property if we didn't need it
624 to make it adequate for all those improvements.
625

626 Mr. Leabough - Then also aren't you adding some—you're fixing the
627 drainage problem. There is not curb and gutter or anything there now.
628
629 Mr. Blevins - Correct. Yes, we'll be doing improvements along the right of
630 way. Right now it's just kind of wide open. The asphalt really doesn't define the road, so
631 it'll be a little more defined and a little safer because people will know where to go on
632 Beulah.
633
634 Mr. Leabough - Are there are any other questions from the Commission?
635
636 Mr. Baka - Just one. Sergeant Brown had a concern about the
637 buffering, but if I'm reading the plan correctly, this is a full 35-foot—
638
639 Mr. Blevins - Yes sir.
640
641 Mr. Baka - —landscape buffer, which is a typical standard for this type
642 of B-3 development, correct?
643
644 Mr. Blevins - Yes sir.
645
646 Mr. Emerson - That's correct, yes sir.
647
648 Mr. Blevins - And like I said, we're going to have to re-grade some of that
649 back area. Our intent is to try to save as many of those existing trees as possible.
650
651 Mr. Leabough - Before you head back to your seat, do you mind getting with
652 Mr. Brown—he raised some concerns about noise as well—so that he could have a
653 contact number for someone at 7-Eleven—
654
655 Mr. Blevins - Absolutely.
656
657 Mr. Leabough - —if he's having challenges with crime, noise, or anything
658 related to the operation of this property? Someone that he can call directly and get
659 immediate results.
660
661 Mr. Blevins - Yes sir. I'll be happy to.
662
663 Mr. Leabough - All right.
664
665 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I have one quick question. Mr. Blevins, for
666 that period of time that water might be present in the BMP, there are some pretty well-
667 known mosquito-repelling techniques that can be used in case that should occur. Had
668 you planned to or are you willing to use those techniques if necessary?
669
670 Mr. Blevins - I'll be happy to look at it, but the water's going to be come
671 and gone before they have a chance to nest. It's a typical County-standard retention

672 design. But we'll be happy to look at it if staff wants us to before we finalize our site
673 plan.

674

675 Mr. Archer - I just wanted to call it to your attention.

676

677 Mr. Blevins - Sure.

678

679 Mr. Leabough - I guess if there are problems that you all agree to work
680 with—

681

682 Mr. Blevins - Absolutely. 7-Eleven has a group that maintains their stores.
683 So if there are any issues, I'm sure they'll be happy to look at it.

684

685 Mr. Leabough - Okay. All right. I have no further questions. Thank you, sir.
686 Sergeant Brown, you're standing there. Do you have a comment to share with us?

687

688 Sergeant Brown - I do, should I come back up?

689

690 Mr. Leabough - Sure.

691

692 Sergeant Brown - Also, I'm concerned about property value. This is also a
693 school district. With the increase in traffic, that's a risk factor for the children in the area.
694 With this new building, I'm thinking it's going to be like a big Wawa or something like
695 that. So what is this going to do to our neighborhood? That's a deep concern.

696

697 Mr. Leabough - Okay, thank you, sir.

698

699 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, as you know, property values are not
700 something that the Commission can delve into. And again, this is a use by right. I'm
701 sure Public Works can address the traffic, but they reviewed it and find no problems.

702

703 Mr. Leabough - Yes, I agree with you, Mr. Emerson. Actually, that's exactly
704 what I was going to mention. We've heard a number of concerns, which I'm not saying
705 that they're not valid concerns, but the case before us is does this POD meet the
706 requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. From what I've heard from staff, because they're
707 recommending approval, it does meet the technical requirements of the ordinance.

708

709 If there are issues regarding noise or crime, there are enforcement actions that can be
710 taken. So I suggest you reach out to the owners of the property as well as the police to
711 have those items addressed.

712

713 To me, when you look at this in totality, it does look like an improvement to the situation
714 that's already allowed to operate 24/7. With that, I'd like to move that POD2017-00066,
715 7-Eleven at 389 E Williamsburg Road, be approved subject to annotations on the plan,
716 standard conditions for developments of this type, and additional conditions 11B and 29
717 through 37 as noted in the agenda.

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

Mr. Witte - Second.

Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, second by Mr. Witte. All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved the plan of development and lighting plan for POD2017-00066, 7-Eleven at 389 E Williamsburg Road, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:

- 11B. Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications and mounting heights details shall be revised as annotated on the staff plan and included with the construction plans for final signature.
- 29. Bulk storage of fuel shall be underground.
- 30. The right-of-way for widening of Beulah Road as shown on approved plans shall be dedicated to the County prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The right-of-way dedication plat and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
- 31. The entrances and drainage facilities on Williamsburg Road (State Route 60) shall be approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.
- 32. A notice of completion form, certifying that the requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation entrances permit have been completed, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning prior to any occupancy permits being issued.
- 33. A concrete sidewalk meeting VDOT standards shall be provided along the south side of Williamsburg Road (U.S. Route 60).
- 34. A concrete sidewalk meeting County standards shall be provided along the west side of Beulah Road.
- 35. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
- 36. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes, transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
- 37. The applicant shall use their best effort in working with the County, to the satisfaction of the County Attorney and the Director of Planning, to address the legal status of any portion of Casey Street, as shown on the plat of Sandston Block 7 Section A, which may exist within the boundary of this site as defined on the layout plan, prior to construction plan approval.

Mr. Witte - Mr. Chairman, I think we would be remiss if we didn't thank Sergeant Brown for his service.

764 Mr. Archer - Absolutely.

765

766 Mr. Leabough - Thank you, sir. And thank you, staff, for working on this
767 case.

768

769 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 14 of your agenda
770 for POD2016-00365, Townes Site Engineering, PC for Townhomes at Parham Place,
771 LLC. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Mike Kennedy.

772

773 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

774

POD2016-00365 **Townes Site Engineering, PC for Townhomes at**
Carriage Homes at **Parham Place, LLC:** Request for approval of a plan of
Parham Place – Section 2 development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106
– 2601 Hollybrook Avenue of the Henrico County Code, to construct 57 two-story,
residential townhouses for sale. The 8.95-acre site is
located on the east line of Hollybrook Avenue,
approximately 750 feet north of West Broad Street (U.S.
Route 250), on parcel 762-755-3882, and part of 763-755-
1261. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District
(Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

775

776 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2016-00365,
777 Carriage Homes at Parham Place – Section 2? There is no opposition. Mr. Kennedy,
778 good morning.

779

780 Mr. Kennedy - Good morning, members of the Commission.

781

782 The proposed plan of development would authorize construction of 57 residential
783 townhouses for sale in addition to the 130 townhouses previously approved in Carriage
784 Homes at Parham Place, Section 1, which was approved by the Planning Commission
785 in May. The 130 would be here, and 57 is the new section.

786

787 The case is generally consistent with the conceptual layout contained in zoning case
788 REZ2015-00004. Proffer #20 of that zoning case authorized a maximum of 196
789 townhouses on the overall site. With the additional 57 townhouses, a total of 187
790 townhouses will be built. In addition, the developer has removed some townhouses and
791 added a community center and pool here that was presented as part of the first phase.
792 The community center and pool are un-proffered amenities being offered by the
793 developer in addition to the things they promised the County.

794

795 Proffer #26 of the zoning case requires permanent fencing around the entire
796 development. The fencing was approved with phase 1. Around this section will be a
797 primarily six-foot-high vinyl, white picket fence, around the exterior, with a metal chain
798 link fence crossing the Virginia Power easement.

799

800 Proffer #2 of that case prohibits permanent access or construction access to the site
801 from Hollybrook Avenue here. The only construction that will occur on Hollybrook
802 Avenue is the utility connections. Otherwise, all construction traffic will be from the
803 interior, and no permanent access is provided from Hollybrook.

804
805 The proposed elevations and floor plans for Section 2 match the elevations and floor
806 plans approved by the Planning Commission for Section 1. Staff is not aware of any
807 opposition at this time.

808
809 Staff recommends approval of the plan of development subject to the annotations on
810 the plan, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and conditions 29
811 through 38 on the agenda.

812
813 Representatives of Kotarides Construction and Brian Mitchell, the engineer for the
814 project, are present to answer any questions you may have.

815
816 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from the Commission for
817 Mr. Kennedy? No questions. Mr. Witte, would you like to hear from the applicant?

818
819 Mr. Witte - I don't see the need unless the applicant would like to add
820 something that's not on the agenda.

821
822 Mr. Leabough - I think they're good, Mr. Witte.

823
824 Mr. Witte - I think they're good. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. With
825 that, Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD2016-00365, Carriage Homes at Parham
826 Place – Section 2, as presented, subject to annotations on the plan, standard conditions
827 for developments of this type, and additional conditions 29 through 38 as shown on the
828 agenda.

829
830 Mr. Baka - Second.

831
832 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mr. Baka. All in
833 favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

834
835 The Planning Commission approved POD2016-00365, Carriage Homes at Parham
836 Place – Section 2, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions
837 attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the following additional
838 conditions:

839
840 29. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.

841 30. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the
842 Richmond Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be
843 included on the construction plans prior to their approval. The standard street
844 name signs shall be installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.

- 845 31. The subdivision plat for Carriage Homes at Parham Place – Section 2 shall be
846 recorded before any building permits are issued.
- 847 32. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building in this
848 development, the engineer of record shall certify that the site has been graded in
849 accordance with the approved grading plans.
- 850 33. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case REZ2015-00004 shall be
851 incorporated in this approval.
- 852 34. A note in bold lettering shall be provided on the erosion control plan indicating
853 that sediment basins or traps located within buildable areas or building pads shall
854 be reclaimed with engineered fill. All materials shall be deposited and compacted
855 in accordance with the applicable sections of the state building code and
856 geotechnical guidelines established by the engineer. An engineer's report
857 certifying the suitability of the fill materials and its compaction shall be submitted
858 for review and approval by the Director of Planning and Director of Public Works
859 and the Building Official prior to the issuance of any building permit(s) on the
860 affected sites.
- 861 35. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer must furnish a letter from
862 Dominion Virginia Power stating that this proposed development does not conflict
863 with their facilities.
- 864 36. The pavement shall be of an SM-2A type and shall be constructed in accordance
865 with County standard and specifications. The developer shall post a defect bond
866 for all pavement with the Department of Planning - the exact type, amount and
867 implementation shall be determined by the Director of Planning, to protect the
868 interest of the members of the Homeowners Association. The defect bond shall
869 remain in effect for a period of three years from the date of the issuance of the
870 final occupancy permit. Prior to the issuance of the last Certificate of Occupancy,
871 a professional engineer must certify that the roads have been designed and
872 constructed in accordance with County standards.
- 873 37. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
874 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained
875 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 876 38. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
877 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junctions and accessory boxes,
878 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plan. All
879 building mounted equipment shall be painted to match the building, and all
880 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
881 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
882

883 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 16 of your agenda
884 and page 2 of your amended agenda for POD2017-00070, VHB for Goddin Street, LLC
885 and Fulton Hill Properties. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Greg Garrison.
886
887
888
889
890

891 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

892

POD2017-00070
Warehouse at 511 Ohio
Street

VHB for Goddin Street, LLC and Fulton Hill Properties:
Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to renovate two existing warehouse buildings and a parking area, and construct a one-story, 10,000 square foot warehouse building. The 1.15-acre portion of a 1.25-acre site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection at Ohio Street and Williamsburg Road **Avenue** on parcel 799-713-0439 and 798-713-9039. An additional 0.10-acre portion of the site is located in the City of Richmond along Williamsburg Road **Avenue** and will remain green space. The zoning is M-2, General Industrial District. County water and sewer. **(Varina)**

893

894 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00070,
895 Warehouse at 511 Ohio Street? There's no opposition. Good morning, Mr. Garrison.

896

897 Mr. Garrison - Good morning. This is a request to renovate two existing
898 warehouse buildings, a parking area, and construct a one-story, 10,000-square-foot tan
899 metal warehouse building. The front portion of this site does lie within the City of
900 Richmond, adjacent to Williamsburg Avenue, and will remain green space.

901

902 Staff has received a conceptual landscape plan, located in your addendum, which
903 mitigates views of the stormwater management facility that's right here at the northwest
904 portion of the property.

905

906 Staff can now recommend approval subject to the standard conditions for developments
907 of this type, the annotations on the plan, and added conditions 29 through 31. Staff is
908 available to answer any questions that you may have.

909

910 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions for Mr. Garrison? No questions?
911 Would the applicant please come forward? Good morning.

912

913 Ms. Halpaus - Good morning.

914

915 Mr. Leabough - Could you please state your name for the record?

916

917 Mr. Mackie - Hi, my name is Carter Mackie. I'm representing Fulton Hill
918 Properties.

919

920 Ms. Halpaus - And I'm Kathy Halpaus with VHB.

921

922 Mr. Leabough - Okay. I just wanted to have you come before us to just give
923 us a little insight in terms of what you're proposing to do in the building.

924
925 Mr. Mackie - Sure. The plan predominately is going to be a 10,000-
926 square-foot warehouse, and 7,500 square feet is going to be occupied by a
927 cabinetmaker. The front 2,500 square feet is going to be for artists that are going to be
928 working, as a studio, essentially.

929
930 Mr. Leabough - Okay. All right. Anything else you want to share with us
931 about your case?

932
933 Mr. Mackie - The only exception that we take to the comments was we did
934 take into consideration the request for a masonry watertable. We went back and looked
935 at our pro forma. Unfortunately, we would request an exception to this request just
936 based on our budget and the fact that we have a cabinetmaker and four artists that are
937 pretty basic in their rent.

938
939 Mr. Leabough - Was there a requirement for a watertable? Mr. Garrison.

940
941 Mr. Garrison - No, there is no requirement. This is unconditioned M-2
942 zoning. It was just a request. The applicant didn't—

943
944 Mr. Leabough - That's why I was looking like where is that condition. Okay.
945 Thank you.

946
947 If there are no other questions from the Commission, I move that POD2017-00070,
948 Warehouse at 511 Ohio Street, be approved subject to standard conditions for
949 developments of this type, annotations on the plan, and also additional conditions 29
950 through 31 noted in the agenda.

951
952 Mr. Witte - Second.

953
954 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Leabough, second by Mr. Witte. All
955 in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

956
957 The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD2017-
958 00070, Warehouse at 511 Ohio Street, subject to the annotations on the plans, the
959 standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and the
960 following additional conditions:

- 961
962 29. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not
963 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained
964 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
965 30. The certification of building permits, occupancy permits and change of
966 occupancy permits for individual units shall be based on the number of parking
967 spaces required for the proposed uses and the amount of parking available
968 according to approved plans.

969 31. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment
970 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junctions and accessory boxes,
971 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plan. All
972 building mounted equipment shall be painted to match the building, and all
973 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by
974 the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

975
976 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 18 of your agenda
977 and page 2 of your amended agenda for POD2017-00082, Eagle Construction of VA for
978 ME Nuckols, LLC. The staff report will be presented by Mr. Greg Garrison.

979
980 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

981
982 **POD2017-00082 Eagle Construction of VA for ME Nuckols, LLC:**
983 GreenGate Residential Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by
984 Section 1 – 12121 West Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico
985 Broad Street County Code. The 9.88-acre site is located on the northern
986 line of Graham Meadows Drive, approximately 1,300 feet
987 west of its intersection with North Gayton Road, on parcels
988 732-764-4403, 732-764-8806, 732-764-2538, 732-764-
989 0512, and 732-764-1421. The zoning is UMUC, Urban
990 Mixed Use District (Conditional) and WBSO, West Broad
991 Street Overlay District. County water and sewer. **(Three**
992 **Chopt)**

982
983 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to POD2017-00082,
984 GreenGate Residential Section 1? There is no opposition. Mr. Garrison.

985
986 Mr. Garrison - This landscape plan includes internal streetscaping, along a
987 portion of Graham Meadows Drive, landscaping of common areas and 77 individual
988 lots. Staff has requested additional plant material between the Commercial West
989 parking area and the rear of the townhouse units—that would be in this area here—to
990 better mitigate views of the parking field. The applicant has agreed to tighten the
991 spacing on the proposed magnolia species to essentially create a visual barrier. The
992 applicant has also provided a landscape plan for the individual lots. Both of these items
993 are in your addendum.

994
995 The landscape plan does meet the minimum requirements and proffers conditions from
996 REZ2014-00009 and PUP2014-00006. Staff recommends approval subject to the
997 standard conditions for landscape plans. I'm available to answer any questions that you
998 have. Mark Kukoski and Natalie Croft are available as well.

999
1000 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from Mr. Garrison?
1001

1002 Mrs. Marshall - I just have a quick question. So with the movement of the
1003 magnolia trees it is actually doing what we were considering doing with smaller shrubs.
1004 Is that correct?
1005

1006 Mr. Garrison - Right. The concept that the applicant has envisioned is—let
1007 me get—something along this look is what they’re going for. Tighter spacing with these
1008 Little Gem Magnolias. They aren’t the typical magnolia gradiflora that you see that’s
1009 native to this area. That’s very large. This is a dwarf version, if you will. They get about
1010 15 feet wide at maximum in optimum growing conditions. But the applicant didn’t want
1011 to do smaller shrubs between the trees for the reason that eventually they would get
1012 choked out.
1013

1014 Mrs. Marshall - Okay, thank you.
1015

1016 Mr. Leabough - Are there any other questions for Mr. Garrison? Okay.
1017 Mrs. Marshall, would you like to hear from the applicant?
1018

1019 Mrs. Marshall - No, thank you.
1020

1021 Mr. Leabough - Okay. We’ll entertain a motion.
1022

1023 Mrs. Marshall - Mr. Chairman, I move that the landscape plan POD2017-
1024 00082, GreenGate Residential Section 1, be approved subject to the standard
1025 conditions for landscape plans.
1026

1027 Mr. Baka - Second.
1028

1029 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mrs. Marshall, a second by Mr. Baka.
1030 All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.
1031

1032 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for POD2017-00082,
1033 GreenGate Residential Section 1, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard
1034 conditions attached to these minutes for landscape plans.
1035

1036 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now move on to page 19 of your agenda.
1037 These are companion cases so I will call them together. They will be presented
1038 together; however, they will require separate motions. And they are as follows:
1039 REZ2017-00006, James W. Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC. The companion case
1040 is PUP2017-00004, James W. Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC. The staff reports
1041 will be presented by Mr. Livingston Lewis.
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047

1048 *(Deferred from the February 22, 2017 Meeting)*
1049 **REZ2017-00006 James W. Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC:** Request
1050 to conditionally rezone from O-3C Office District (Conditional) to UMUC Urban Mixed
1051 Use District (Conditional) Parcel 747-761-9275 containing 4.081 acres located at the
1052 southeast intersection of Innslake Drive and Dominion Boulevard. The applicant
1053 proposes a mixed-use development of residential apartments and office uses. The uses
1054 will be controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The 2026
1055 Comprehensive Plan recommends Urban Mixed-Use. The site is in the Innsbrook
1056 Redevelopment Overlay District.

1057
1058
1059 *(Deferred from the February 22, 2017 Meeting)*
1060 **PUP2017-00004 James W. Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC:** Request
1061 for a Provisional Use Permit Under Sections 24-32.1(a)(n)(s)(t)(v)(z) and (aa), 24-120
1062 and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow for the following on Parcel 747-
1063 761-9275: outdoor vending; parking garages without ground floor retail uses; heights
1064 greater than 60'; density greater than 30 dwelling units per acre; open space less than
1065 20%; commercial or office square footage less than 25% of total square footage; for-
1066 lease multifamily dwellings to exceed 30% of total units; and a parking plan, located at
1067 the southeast intersection of Innslake Drive and Dominion Boulevard. The existing
1068 zoning is O-3C Business District (Conditional). The 2026 Comprehensive Plan
1069 recommends Urban Mixed-Use. The site is in the Innsbrook Redevelopment Overlay
1070 District.

1071
1072 Mr. Leabough - Is there anyone present who is opposed to REZ2017-00006,
1073 James W. Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC or PUP2017-00004, James W. Theobald
1074 for WAM Associates, LLC? We have opposition. Mr. Lewis, good morning.

1075
1076 Mr. Lewis - Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

1077
1078 These companion cases were presented in detail at the Commission's February 9th
1079 evening meeting and have been deferred twice at the Commission's request to give the
1080 applicant time to discuss traffic, residential density, and other concerns raised by
1081 adjacent property owners and tenants.

1082
1083 Since the February 9th hearing, the applicant has met with interested parties and made
1084 correction to state code reference in the proffers. Also, two of the PUP conditions have
1085 been revised to address questions about vendor hours and building height. Condition 2
1086 now requires outdoor vendor areas to close by 10 p.m. And condition 4 limits building
1087 height to a maximum of 200 feet with an additional 15 feet allowed for certain
1088 architectural features. All of these revisions are covered in the staff reports.

1089
1090 Because of consistency with the 2026 Comprehensive Plan and compatibility with
1091 surrounding office and commercial uses, staff supports these requests subject to the
1092 revised proffers and PUP conditions.

1093

1094 This concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions.
1095
1096 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions for Mr. Lewis from the Commission?
1097
1098 Mrs. Marshall - Do you have the most recent additions to the information of
1099 our changes we're going to make on Dominion Boulevard that you can provide on the
1100 screen?
1101
1102 Mr. Lewis - I don't have those on the screen. I do have a paper copy that
1103 was given to me; we could try to project over there.
1104
1105 Mr. Emerson - Mrs. Marshall, we don't have those in the show. But possibly
1106 Mr. Cejka may want to address those potential improvements—
1107
1108 Mrs. Marshall - Okay.
1109
1110 Mr. Emerson - —versus Mr. Lewis.
1111
1112 Mrs. Marshall - Right, thank you.
1113
1114 Mr. Leabough - Don't rush up to the podium, Mr. Cejka. How are you doing,
1115 sir?
1116
1117 Mr. Cejka - Good morning. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, I'm
1118 John Cejka, traffic engineer. To address Mrs. Marshall's comment, at Dominion and
1119 Broad Street, is that the improvement you're speaking of?
1120
1121 Mrs. Marshall - Yes.
1122
1123 Mr. Cejka - Right now we're in the conceptual stage of adding an
1124 additional lane southbound on Dominion at Broad Street. The hope is to get it designed
1125 and constructed fairly soon. We've just hired a consultant to start designing it.
1126
1127 Mrs. Marshall - Okay. My understanding is Dominion headed towards Broad
1128 Street we're looking at having two right turn lanes onto West Broad Street with a median
1129 in between the opposite side and also a straight lane that will also have a left lane that
1130 can turn onto Broad Street. Is that correct?
1131
1132 Mr. Cejka - Correct. What we have envisioned is taking the existing
1133 median that's shown here and moving it over 12 feet to allow the additional southbound
1134 lane. We did traffic counts for 48 hours and determined that over 60 percent of the cars
1135 are turning right on southbound Dominion, so we're going to add a second right-turn
1136 lane to assist that movement. And that will help alleviate the backups in p.m. peak when
1137 people are trying to leave in the evening.
1138

1139 Mrs. Marshall - We are extending the barrier between the two lanes, is that
1140 correct?
1141
1142 Mr. Cejka - This current median here? We actually are going to reduce
1143 it. We're proposing to reduce it. Again, this is all conceptual right now. But we are
1144 proposing to reduce it 20 to 30 feet to allow a left-turn lane to get into the shopping
1145 center on the west side.
1146
1147 Mrs. Marshall - Okay. And as far as Innslake Drive and Dominion Boulevard
1148 goes, at this time does traffic warrant a stoplight, a roundabout—anything at that
1149 intersection?
1150
1151 Mr. Cejka - As of right now, no, a traffic signal is not warranted. We did a
1152 study in 2015 and 2016.
1153
1154 Mrs. Marshall - Okay, thank you.
1155
1156 Mr. Leabough - Are there any other questions for Mr. Cejka?
1157
1158 Mr. Baka - Just one. On the northwest side of Dominion and West
1159 Broad, approximately how many feet would you need to come onto that property to
1160 acquire additional right of way for an additional right-turn lane southbound?
1161
1162 Mr. Cejka - We would not acquire the right of way.
1163
1164 Mr. Baka - Just moving the median only. To clarify, there would be no
1165 additional right of way needed on that private property.
1166
1167 Mr. Cejka - That is correct.
1168
1169 Mr. Baka - Okay, just clarifying. Thanks.
1170
1171 Mr. Leabough - That will alleviate some of the concerns related to traffic that
1172 was shared by the opposition at the last meeting.
1173
1174 Mr. Cejka - That is correct.
1175
1176 Mr. Leabough - So what about the Innslake Drive backup or traffic? How will
1177 that be addressed?
1178
1179 Mr. Cejka - Once this is constructed, it will reduce the queue on
1180 Dominion Boulevard in the p.m. and hopefully during lunchtime hours. And that will give
1181 a greater opportunity for people exiting Innslake Drive to get onto Dominion.
1182
1183 Mr. Leabough - Okay.
1184

1185 Mrs. Marshall - Mr. Cejka, the County is committed to building these lanes,
1186 correct?
1187

1188 Mr. Cejka - As I know right now, they're still investigating the funding
1189 source. But we are definitely looking into it. I have not been told when it would be built,
1190 but yes, it is one of our priorities to do right now, yes.
1191

1192 Mrs. Marshall - Okay, thank you.
1193

1194 Mr. Emerson - We have hired a design engineer, though.
1195

1196 Mr. Cejka - That is correct.
1197

1198 Mr. Emerson - So we are investing funds in the design.
1199

1200 Mr. Cejka - Yes.
1201

1202 Mr. Leabough - Other questions for Mr. Cejka? If not, Mrs. Marshall, would
1203 you like to hear from the opposition first or the applicant?
1204

1205 Mrs. Marshall - Opposition, please.
1206

1207 Mr. Leabough - Okay. Would the opposition please come forward?
1208 Remember to state your name for the record, please.
1209

1210 Mr. Andrews - Good morning, good to see you again. My name is Jay
1211 Andrews. I'm with the Virginia Hospital and Healthcare Association. We are the property
1212 owners and represent the tenants that are at 4200 Innslake, which is about 50 yards to
1213 the right looking at the entrance where this new development is going to take place.
1214

1215 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, for letting me speak again this
1216 morning. We appreciate the County's desire to enhance the space in Innsbrook Office
1217 Park. Our concern is not necessarily the project itself and a change to mixed use, but
1218 the community impact that will occur due to not having the proper infrastructure in place
1219 prior to construction and the magnitude and the units involved.
1220

1221 Again, when I first moved here in 1992, the Cedar Sub subdivision, which is off of
1222 Sadler Road, had some traffic issues. Twenty-five years later there are still traffic issues
1223 there. We don't want to see the same issue there at Innslake and Dominion Boulevard.
1224 Currently, there are traffic issues within Innslake Office Park that need to be addressed
1225 prior to construction.
1226

1227 For those exiting onto Innslake and Dominion Boulevards south, especially in the
1228 evening and at lunchtime, there are significant traffic issues on a frequent basis. As a
1229 matter of fact, after our last meeting on February 9th, there was an accident there at
1230 Dominion and Innslake, which was fairly serious, at about noon. And then last week just

1231 before 5:00 on March 16th there was another accident there at Dominion and Innslake.
1232 These are just the accidents I'm aware of. Throughout the lunch hour there are issues
1233 with people trying to get out of Innsbrook and also trying to come back in with many
1234 accidents there on Broad Street where people are trying to back from the eastbound
1235 lane of Broad Street into Dominion Boulevard.

1236
1237 The plan of development includes presently 250 units in the first phase and another 125
1238 to 150 in the second phase for a total of 350 units, which is a density of over 85 units
1239 per acre. As envisioned by the developer, both of the entrances would dump into
1240 Innslake Drive. Based on the 2015 traffic study when it was presented before, there
1241 were 2,605 vehicles at Innslake Drive for the 24-hour period. If the 350 units were built,
1242 it would add another 2,250 cars, which is an 86 percent increase where we already
1243 have an issue. If the 220 units are built, the estimate in increase is 1,450 cars, which is
1244 still a 55 percent increase. We can talk about reverse flow all you want, but there is
1245 already an existing traffic problem. This is just going to exacerbate the problem.

1246
1247 The other issue is school buses. I talked about that before. Currently, as far as I know,
1248 there are no school buses that stop within the Innslake Office Park. There would be a
1249 requirement for buses to stop there if anyone had a house with children there.

1250
1251 For the Henrico County study approved by the Board September 14, 2010, the
1252 Keystone policies, developments within the areas can support residential densities up to
1253 40 units per acre, not counting the footprint of the building that's existing. This is four
1254 acres and can support 160 units. Again, we're looking at 85 units per acre versus 40
1255 units per acre.

1256
1257 This project is supposed to support the city approach. And I understand that. They're
1258 mimicking it after what's taking place in Asheville, Virginia Beach, and other places. The
1259 issue is there are no sidewalks, there are no bike paths, there are no grocery stores or
1260 even convenience stores that are going to be accessible unless you cross Cox, Broad,
1261 or Dominion Boulevard.

1262
1263 Henrico County has approved a plethora of construction over the last several years.
1264 Unfortunately, the necessary road improvements have not taken place. In both the
1265 County and Innsbrook are concerned that Innsbrook will not remain vibrant and
1266 attractive to outside companies. This is a concern. Please create the road infrastructure
1267 including sidewalks and bike lanes now so that when clients do visit and consider the
1268 property with Innsbrook, they don't find that there's a complex that has current traffic
1269 issues, and by them adding their business here that'll it just exacerbate the problem.

1270
1271 My understanding is Premier has reached out, which is managed care company, to
1272 lease 125,000 square feet of office space within Innsbrook. That's going to significantly
1273 add to the traffic issue. I know there's the Banks Brothers' building, which I think is 60 to
1274 80,000 square feet at least that is vacant. So at some point hopefully that will be leased,
1275 which will also increase the traffic flow issue.

1276

1277 Given these number of issues, we ask that the Planning Commission defer any decision
1278 on the property until the proper road infrastructure can be in place prior to construction
1279 and any traffic construction vehicles going through here. We don't want to be an
1280 impediment to progress. We want it done completely and appropriately for the citizens
1281 and workers of Henrico County.

1282
1283 I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

1284
1285 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions from the Commission? All right.
1286 Thank you, sir.

1287
1288 Mr. Andrews - All right, thank you.

1289
1290 Mr. Leabough - I just wanted to remind everyone that the opposition has a
1291 cumulative ten minutes to share information with the Commission. I think we're at the
1292 five-minute mark. So there are about five minutes for the rest of the speakers in
1293 opposition. So please be mindful of the time as you're presenting. Whoever is next,
1294 that's fine. Do we have three more speakers or four more speakers in opposition?

1295
1296 Mr. Hudgins - Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Board,
1297 appreciate the opportunity to speak. The issues that were brought up Mr. Andrews I'm
1298 not going to repeat.

1299
1300 Mr. Witte - Can you state your name for the record?

1301
1302 Mr. Hudgins - David Hudgins.

1303
1304 Mr. Witte - David Hudgins.

1305
1306 Mr. Hudgins - Right.

1307
1308 Mr. Witte - Thank you.

1309
1310 Mr. Hudgins - I'm not going to repeat what Jay said. Our concern is our
1311 business at Old Dominion. We've been there for 30 years. The way that Wachovia has
1312 grown, we're growing, the hospital association is growing, and the traffic is there today
1313 and is already being generated. We're averaging an accident a month at that
1314 interchange. Three this year already. It is one of these things that my employees when
1315 they—we don't go down Dominion anymore at these times. We take a left and go to the
1316 stoplight, which then backs up off of Cox. It's the only way that you can get through that
1317 interchange in the prime time.

1318
1319 In the interest of time, I'm not going to reiterate what Jay said. But it's the traffic. And if
1320 we're really going to be competitive in economic development—and by the way, I've
1321 served on the Virginia Economic Development Board for the last eight years. Very
1322 familiar with all the issues. Part of it is the quality of life when are companies are shown

1323 Innsbrook. It does not help the selling of Innsbrook to have traffic backed up at these
1324 points when you're having the CEO of a company.

1325
1326 So it behooves the County to increase the competitiveness of Innsbrook to move the
1327 traffic, which is an obvious impediment when you're trying to show a new company an
1328 expansion, and to address the problems become they become so severe and it's
1329 fraught with multiple accidents. That's not where you want to be as far as being a
1330 progressive County. Again, 30 years here. I don't think a roundabout at that interchange
1331 is unreasonable with today's traffic. But putting in the density that they're talking about
1332 with these apartments and adding 2200 trips on a two-lane road in Innslake is
1333 unreasonable.

1334
1335 So what we're asking the Commission to do is if they want that kind of density, and if
1336 the County wants that kind of density, you've got to address that interchange. Thank
1337 you.

1338
1339 Mr. Leabough - Thank you. You have about three minutes left for the rest of
1340 the speakers. Ma'am, are you all here to speak in opposition?

1341
1342 Ms. Richards - Good morning. I want to thank the Board for having us here
1343 this morning. My name is Deborah Richards. I'm with the MS Society. We do have a lot
1344 of concern about—we have a walk that we use coming out of where Innslake is and
1345 going along Dominion that would house over 1,000 walkers. As an employee there, we
1346 do have a problem. There needs to be a light there. We can't get across from Innslake
1347 over Dominion going up. We have to take some kind of shortcut and go by Wawa to get
1348 out. There is a big traffic problem there. And there have been a lot of accidents. We
1349 have a big concern. Thank you.

1350
1351 Mr. Leabough - Thank you. Anyone else here to speak in opposition? Speak
1352 now or forever hold your peace. All right. Is there anyone here to speak in favor of the
1353 case? I know you are, Jim. Go ahead, sir. He jumped up when I said that.

1354
1355 Mr. Theobald - I wasn't sure if I was being invited to sit down or stand up.

1356
1357 Mr. Leabough - Good morning.

1358
1359 Mr. Theobald - Good morning. I'm Jim Theobald. I'm here on behalf of WAM
1360 Associates, the principal of which is Joe Marchetti, who's with us today. We are
1361 requesting this rezoning from O-3C to UMUC under the recently revised UMU
1362 Ordinance.

1363
1364 I made a full presentation at last month's meeting. Unless you would like, I will try to
1365 shorten this a little bit. The reason that—rationale behind, I guess, the request is that we
1366 have actively participated in the creation of this land use plan, the Innsbrook area plan
1367 over a couple of years. And we've also participated in the revisions to the UMU
1368 Ordinance, the idea being to make sure that Innsbrook remains competitive and it was

1369 consistent with a movement to more urbanize some of our rural office parks so that they
1370 don't become like some of the older, suburban office parks that you see not only in
1371 Henrico but Chesterfield and elsewhere.

1372
1373 The small area plan that was developed with input from staff and you all caused a
1374 transition of density from the edges of Innsbrook where there was residential
1375 development to sort of focus the height, if you will, into the middle portion of Innsbrook,
1376 and this request is consistent with that.

1377
1378 We've received approval from the Innsbrook Owners' Association, Architectural Review
1379 Board, which is pursuant now to its covenants. We'll be reviewing every single zoning
1380 application and POD application within Innsbrook. And of course your staff has
1381 recommended approval.

1382
1383 Since the last meeting here—and we've had a couple of meetings—there were about
1384 three issues that I recall that were the major issues. One was putting a height limitation
1385 on the buildings rather than leaving it open-ended, and we've done that consistent with
1386 the Highwoods-Markel UMU zoning case. The hours for outdoor vending, which would
1387 in essence include outdoor activities, we've also limited to 10 p.m. at night. Again,
1388 consistent with the previous Highwoods-Markel rezoning.

1389
1390 The last issue was dealing with traffic. And we have spent most of our time discussing
1391 this issue. We did meet Mr. Hudgins and Mr. Andrews at Innsbrook. Mr. Yob and
1392 Mr. Cejka were present at that meeting, as was Mrs. Marshall. It was really all about
1393 traffic. I think what came out of that meeting were a couple a things. One, the County's
1394 sincere interest in making the Broad Street improvements. I understand why Mr. Cejka
1395 doesn't feel like he can say that they've been committed, but I believe functionally they
1396 have been. I know Mr. Foster had a subsequent meeting with the Innsbrook Owners'
1397 Association where these were discussed. And I believe this will result in improvements
1398 being made to Dominion.

1399
1400 The problem with Dominion is there is not enough flow off to the right. It backs up during
1401 p.m. peak. The other problem that was identified was speeding along Dominion. And I
1402 understand the next day they did send out police. I don't know what the results of that
1403 were, but the people that are speeding are the people that—

1404
1405 Mrs. Marshall - It was about a seven-day study.

1406
1407 Mr. Theobald - Okay. The people who work in Innsbrook, I'm sure that didn't
1408 make anybody happy.

1409
1410 So the County is also considering plans to—they're looking at that intersection of
1411 Innslake and Dominion. The first thing that I think came out of the meetings was that
1412 there's not even close to being the necessary warrants to produce a traffic light there.
1413 Not only that, but a traffic light there would not give Mr. Hudgins' or Mr. Andrews'
1414 employees any green time. They're coming out turning right on Innslake and then trying

1415 to go left up to Broad onto Dominion. The traffic light didn't meet warrants and probably
1416 wouldn't have solved their problems.

1417
1418 The thing that was discussed was a single lane roundabout. Mr. Foster attended a
1419 meeting at the Innsbrook Association Board meeting last week at which this was
1420 discussed at some length. I believe it's being seriously studied. Perhaps Mr. Cejka has
1421 more detail on that.

1422
1423 But the idea was a single lane roundabout would have a capacity of up to almost 25,000
1424 cars a day. I think there are about 10,000 cars today on Dominion Boulevard. This was
1425 just a diagram of a 110-foot diameter, which would be the absolute largest single lane
1426 that you would do. I understand what was being discussed was possibly a 90-foot
1427 diameter or perhaps a 100-foot diameter. But you can see even at the 100-foot
1428 diameter, minimal additional right of way. We just clip these corners a little bit, and I
1429 believe we're able to stay out of a lot of the underground infrastructure were this to
1430 occur.

1431
1432 But the notion is that this would be a potential additional relief mechanism for this
1433 intersection. I don't know what the cost of that is. I will tell you that on completion our
1434 project would contribute between \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year in real estate taxes.
1435 One of the strategies that we've suggested to the County is to sort of create their own
1436 little synthetic TIF, if you will, tax incremental financing, where they isolate tax revenues
1437 from a given project and then move them into improvements. That's hopefully the kind
1438 of innovative strategies that are being considered by administration in these instances.

1439
1440 I should also weigh in that Mr. Foster explained the current County projects up on
1441 Nuckols Road, that the County's funding to increase a lane that goes into 295, a future
1442 lane on the south side of Nuckols Road coming towards Cox, and future improvements
1443 on Sadler Road where another roundabout had been discussed as part of the zoning
1444 case.

1445
1446 So my understanding is that Mr. Foster relayed to the group that met—that I think
1447 included Mr. Andrews and Mr. Hudgins, or at least their representatives—last week that
1448 at least in his opinion he thought that these measures would substantially help the traffic
1449 on Dominion Boulevard. I don't think the answer is to stop development in Innsbrook
1450 until all traffic problems are solved. The issues are there today. I don't think that's how
1451 we've traditionally grown.

1452
1453 I will say that I think Mr. Yob and Mr. Cejka reported that in terms of vehicle crashes—
1454 you know, one is too many, but in all of 2015 there were five and in 2016 there were six.
1455 Apparently there's been maybe three this year; I'm not aware of that. There is a traffic
1456 issue there. I'm not here to tell you that there isn't. There is a rush-hour issue at
1457 Innsbrook. Every place is trying to get out. And I think the County working with the
1458 Innsbrook Owners' Association is attempting to do those things that can be done to
1459 improve that condition.

1460

1461 I am happy to answer any questions that you might have. But I would request that you
1462 recommend approval of this case to the Board of Supervisors.

1463

1464 Mr. Leabough - Are there questions for Mr. Theobald?

1465

1466 Mr. Witte - I have a question for Mr. Emerson. These are County roads,
1467 correct?

1468

1469 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir, they are.

1470

1471 Mr. Witte - Would we normally delay approval of something like this
1472 because of the County issue with the roads?

1473

1474 Mr. Emerson - In this case, you have a positive recommendation from
1475 Public Works based on the existing roads. While we understand there is a backup
1476 issue, that's not necessarily been an issue brought forth in terms of this case making
1477 that worse. I know there are varying opinions on that based on the users of Innsbrook,
1478 and Mr. Cejka may be able to address that more. But currently, Public Works' opinion is
1479 that this road network can handle this development.

1480

1481 Now there are existing concerns that were, as Mr. Cejka said, under design to add an
1482 additional turn lane and move the median over to assist in traffic flow out to Board
1483 Street. Warrants don't exist for a light at Innslake and Dominion. I've heard varying
1484 different reports of the cost of a roundabout, and of course there are varying different
1485 opinions on the need.

1486

1487 That's not the easiest question to answer, Mr. Witte, because we have delayed some
1488 projects. Sadler Road in particular comes to mind where we've held back residential
1489 development waiting on road improvements to occur. In this case, I don't think that
1490 holding this back for road improvements would necessarily be warranted. It's certainly
1491 not supported by staff review at this time.

1492

1493 Mr. Witte - Okay. That was my main concern. We do have density in
1494 this area. We do right down the street at Short Pump also and several other areas
1495 around the County. But I didn't particularly see why holding this development back while
1496 a County issue was being taken care of would be reasonable. Okay, thank you.

1497

1498 Mr. Leabough - I'd like to make just one comment. I don't see how the
1499 density that's proposed here would not create an additional increase in traffic, so I was
1500 shocked to hear that comment.

1501

1502 Mr. Theobald - Of course it would.

1503

1504 Mr. Leabough - If the problem is there now as you're describing, how could
1505 this make it better if we're quadrupling the density here on this—what is it, a four-acre
1506 parcel?

1507
1508 Mr. Theobald - It's clearly going to add traffic, and I don't think anybody said
1509 it would make it better other than the fact that the improvements are anticipated to be
1510 done at Broad and at the other end onto Nuckols. And I do believe that the County is
1511 seriously looking at doing a one-lane roundabout. I don't think that that intersection is
1512 going to be left alone.
1513
1514 Mr. Leabough - There's a lot of congestion now.
1515
1516 Mr. Theobald - And it is reverse commute. I understood the comment, but
1517 people will be leaving as others are coming in. But clearly there's a lot of traffic coming
1518 in and out of Innsbrook at peak hours in the morning.
1519
1520 Mr. Leabough - The concern that I have is that—we talked about aging parks
1521 and the mistakes of other counties or localities and even the challenges that we face in
1522 some of our older office parks. I just hope that we don't make the same mistakes from
1523 an infrastructure perspective or traffic perspective that other localities have made and
1524 that are suffering from now.
1525
1526 Mr. Theobald - You are so right. You are so right.
1527
1528 Mr. Leabough - There's a nearby locality that I can refer you to.
1529
1530 Mr. Theobald - It's all about infrastructure. I mean it is all about
1531 infrastructure. You all on the Board spend so much time worrying about infrastructure.
1532 But you also need development to pay for infrastructure, and you need the tax
1533 revenues, but you have to keep your eye on the infrastructure to keep up with the pace
1534 of development. It's a challenge.
1535
1536 Mr. Leabough - It's a balancing act. It's almost like the slippery slope if you
1537 open the gates.
1538
1539 Mr. Theobald - I will tell you that the County officials—which I think have
1540 included Mr. Silber, Mr. Emerson, if I'm not mistaken, and Mr. Foster—have been
1541 meeting on a regular basis—I don't know what the schedule is; I don't attend those—
1542 with the Innsbrook Owners' Association Board. And they're talking about all of these
1543 issues. They're talking about the sewer issues for the future, which is a huge project
1544 that will be upon us in a few years. They do talk about road improvements, etc. So that
1545 dialogue is occurring. They're looking at financing in very creative ways, like the
1546 synthetic TIF that I mentioned. And there are lot of ways to try to do this, but you have
1547 to keep up, you are so right.
1548
1549 Mr. Emerson - In addition to what Mr. Theobald mentioned, we do meet
1550 monthly with the Innsbrook Association and discuss infrastructure needs and how to
1551 address them. One thing that keeps getting lost in this conversation is the
1552 improvements that we're committed to do to Nuckols Road. Traffic does flow north and

1553 south through Innsbrook. There are two ways in and out. And those improvements on
1554 Nuckols Road will also aide in this.

1555

1556 Flowing into Broad Street certainly is a challenge. Broad Street is not expandable,
1557 truthfully, at this point. Adding the additional lane, moving the median, will solve some
1558 issues or assist in moving traffic quicker. Something eventually will happen at this
1559 intersection, be it a roundabout or a light. I don't—I agree I don't see a light there. I can't
1560 tell you what the timing of that would be. It's my understanding—and Mr. Cejka could
1561 probably answer this—that we don't have that under design at this time, do we? And
1562 I've heard varying different prices on that from a half a million to a million and a half
1563 dollars. So that's an expensive fix that would take a longer-term construction. The
1564 remediation efforts we're making at Broad Street and Dominion can be made quicker
1565 and are less costly. And should help.

1566

1567 And the speeding issue was brought forth. Public Works did do a study on that. I believe
1568 we found that—I want to say it was in excess of 75 percent, I know it was over 50
1569 percent, of the people exiting were exceeding the speed limit in that area to a dramatic
1570 amount. Police have stepped up their enforcement efforts. My understanding is the
1571 motorcycle patrols have been effective.

1572

1573 Mr. Leabough - Thank you.

1574

1575 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I don't know if anybody has
1576 undertaken to determine this, but being that the current zoning is O-3C, could anybody
1577 hazard a guess as to what the traffic situation might be if developed at O-3C let's say at
1578 its maximum development? I think it's a logical question because—

1579

1580 Mr. Theobald - Sure, that's a good point. If you increase the density of an
1581 office building, under the current zoning you would clearly increase traffic. And it would
1582 be the same direction, same hours for traffic. That would I guess mitigate towards
1583 introducing some residential, if I understand your point.

1584

1585 Mr. Leabough - But obviously there's no market for O-3C otherwise you
1586 wouldn't be rezoning it to what you're rezoning it to.

1587

1588 Mr. Theobald - Well there's an interest in introducing residential. Right now
1589 residential, as you know, and multi-family is hot, financeable, etc. And while we're trying
1590 to, as a group at Innsbrook, encourage more office development, at the moment that
1591 market's a little bit dormant.

1592

1593 Mrs. Marshall - This UMU case for Innsbrook has really been a complicated
1594 case. Numerous meetings have been held to discuss this case in the last several
1595 months. During the meetings, we discuss improvement to roads, intersections, and what
1596 we can do to help the flow of traffic on Dominion Boulevard.

1597

1598 As discussed in the proceedings today, one of the major improvements that will be
1599 coming is along Dominion Boulevard, heading south on Dominion Boulevard towards
1600 West Broad Street. Dominion will be reconfigured. There will be two right-hand-turn-only
1601 lanes onto West Broad Street and a straight-or-left-turn-only lane going east on Broad
1602 Street at or prior to the intersection. There also will be a median between the south and
1603 northbound traffic on Dominion Boulevard.

1604
1605 We believe that this reconfiguration will help to alleviate the traffic issue on Dominion
1606 Boulevard. Other improvements to help ease rush-hour congestion, as talked about
1607 during this meeting, are the extension of the ramp onto 295.

1608
1609 While I understand that this case is very complicated and there is no way that you can
1610 make everybody happy, I do believe that this is a good case. At this time, the recent
1611 traffic study does not call for a roundabout or a stoplight at the intersection of Innslake
1612 and Dominion Boulevard. I do believe it's in the future, hopefully in the soon future. I
1613 think the improvements of the project that the County is providing hopefully in a timely
1614 manner are going to ease the congestion on Dominion Boulevard.

1615
1616 So with all that said, Mr. Chairman, I move that REZ2017-00006, James W. Theobald
1617 for WAM Associates, LLC, be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a
1618 recommendation of approval with proffers dated February 15, 2017.

1619
1620 Mr. Witte - Second.

1621
1622 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mrs. Marshall, a second by Mr. Witte.
1623 All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

1624
1625 Mrs. Marshall - And Mr. Chairman, I move that PUP2017-00004, James W.
1626 Theobald for WAM Associates, LLC, be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a
1627 recommendation of approval with proffers dated February 15, 2017.

1628
1629 Mr. Witte - Second.

1630
1631 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mrs. Marshall, a second by Mr. Witte.
1632 All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

1633
1634 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, I would note I have to check the advertising
1635 schedules and see if we can make the legal deadlines to place it on the April 13th Board
1636 meeting. If not, this will move to the May 11th, I believe, Board meeting, if I'm correct on
1637 my dates. I might be a day or two off. It's April the 11th. It's the 11th or possibly the 9th
1638 of May.

1639
1640 Mr. Leabough - Okay.

1641
1642 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, we now have another item on your agenda.
1643 It's a discussion item. It's an introduction of the Route 5 Corridor Study that was initiated

1644 by the Board of Supervisors at their last meeting. That presentation will be made by Ms.
1645 Jean Moore.

1646

1647 **DISCUSSION ITEM:** Study of the Route 5 Corridor

1648

1649 Ms. Moore - Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the
1650 Commission. I'm a little under the weather, so I hope that my voice holds out through
1651 the presentation.

1652

1653 Last Tuesday, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution directing the Planning
1654 Commission to conduct a study of the Route 5 corridor, which includes the area of
1655 Marion Hill. The purpose of this presentation is to provide you with a brief update and
1656 the proposed framework of these two special focus area studies.

1657

1658 Just to give you some background, Route 5, or the New Market Road corridor, and
1659 Marion Hill, are 2 of 30 special focus areas identified in the 2026 Comprehensive Plan.
1660 Focus areas are areas that warrant further study because of special characteristics,
1661 opportunities, or even challenges. And they're further broken down in four
1662 subcategories, which are shown on your screen in front of you. The New Market Road
1663 corridor and Marion Hill are identified as Existing Character Protection areas. Because
1664 of their close proximity, that they do overlap at one section, the Route 5 study will
1665 incorporate both of these areas.

1666

1667 The study will draw upon the vision statements drafted with the Comprehensive Plan.
1668 The vision emphasizes the need for recommendations for future development that
1669 integrate and respect the agricultural, residential, and commercial developments
1670 already in existence. The study focuses on the treatment of the corridor, which is linear
1671 in nature and differs a little bit from a small area study that you're accustomed to.

1672

1673 In preparation for the study, staff has completed much of the background work for these
1674 areas. This included reviewing all the known documents of past studies on Route 5, the
1675 evaluations of existing conditions and character of the area, as well as other factors
1676 such as future land use recommendations. Staff compiled a complete inventory of all
1677 the parcels and structures along the corridor and with the Marion Hill neighborhood. We
1678 looked at existing land use and zoning patterns and identified a recommended study
1679 area.

1680

1681 Just as more background, this slide shows some of the known documents—and there
1682 are eight of them—regarding Route 5. Keep in mind that these past studies and
1683 documents pertain to Route 5 as a whole, from Richmond to Williamsburg Road. About
1684 two or three of them—or actually two really focus on just Henrico County.

1685

1686 Route 5 is one of the oldest transportation routes in Virginia. It was the second road in
1687 the state to be designated as a Virginia byway in 1975.

1688

1689 Keep in mind that this is a corridor study and linear. The proposed Route 5 study
1690 boundary begins from Rocketts Landing at the border of the County and the City of
1691 Richmond to Charles City County and extends just for study purposes about 500 feet
1692 from the center line of Route 5. This was sufficient to capture the individual parcels
1693 adjacent to Route 5 without overlapping into other special focus areas such as Osborne
1694 Turnpike, which is also identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

1695
1696 This will be the longest corridor plan done in the County. Its length is almost 14 miles
1697 long and includes approximately 878 parcels and roughly 1400 acres within the study
1698 area. Marion Hill, which you see in the upper left corner highlighted in purple shows the
1699 boundaries of the subdivisions recorded in 1948 with some minor additions in the
1700 1950s.

1701
1702 Just delving a little bit into the existing conditions, what we found so far, the majority of
1703 the parcels within the study area, about 70 percent, are zoned A-1, which is the
1704 Agricultural District. This is especially true for the areas east of Interstate 295. Almost
1705 40 percent of the land zoned A-1 is either vacant or in agricultural use. And 13.6 percent
1706 of the properties are zoned for single-family residential, and this is really between the
1707 R-1 and the R-3 zoning districts. The only multi-family and townhomes located within
1708 the corridor are at Rocketts Landing. But Tree Hill Farm, while undeveloped, is
1709 approved for a mixed-use community and will also have multi-family components with a
1710 mixture of some retail, office, and civic uses.

1711
1712 The amount of business and industrial zoning accounts for approximately 7 percent and
1713 5 percent respectively, but the actually existing land uses for these categories are
1714 slightly lower. Generally, these commercial areas are concentrated around the
1715 intersections of Route 5 with Osborne Turnpike, Midview, and Strath Roads. There are
1716 industrial uses, and these are clustered more at the northern end of the study area
1717 along Old Osborne Turnpike closer to Rocketts Landing.

1718
1719 The Marion Hill study area is generally bounded by Almond Creek, Old Osborne
1720 Turnpike to the west, and Oakland Road to the south. And it includes approximately 236
1721 acres. It is predominantly zoned R-3 with just a few sections to the north zoned M-2 or
1722 heavy industrial, and a parcel that has split B-1 and B-3 zoning. The majority of the
1723 homes were constructed from the 1940s through the 1960s. It does have several older
1724 residences including the Clarke-Palmore House, which is now owned by the County and
1725 used as an interpretive museum.

1726
1727 As mentioned, staff conducted a windshield survey, photo-documented the entire
1728 corridor, and this included well over 1,000 photos to assess any patterns of streetscape,
1729 building styles, and site layout of the larger community. So really if you follow it, this is
1730 kind of starting from the northern or near Rocketts Landing all the way down to Curls
1731 Neck and beyond.

1732
1733 When we looked at the corridors and a lot of field studies, we began to see three areas
1734 of distinction. The first area, which we've identified as Sub Area 1, is from the County

1735 line to the McCoul Street. This has a more urban characteristic that includes Rocketts
1736 Landing as well as some CSX rail lines and the bulk petroleum fuel facilities.
1737

1738 The second area that you kind of see in yellow is longer. This is from McCoul to
1739 Interstate 295. This area is approximately 6-1/2 miles long. And here you begin to see
1740 the more suburban pattern and characteristics take place, interspersed with some open
1741 space and some farm land.
1742

1743 The third area is also approximately 6-1/2 miles, and it extends from Interstate 295 to
1744 the Charles City County line. This is the most rural part of the study area.
1745

1746 Again, these areas we've identified provide just a framework. These could change as
1747 we begin the official study and seek input during the public hearing process and during
1748 the public process.
1749

1750 Which leads us to our next steps. Following today's presentation, the Planning
1751 Commission will host a kickoff meeting at their May 11th meeting prior to the public
1752 hearing. All known stakeholders, homeowner associations, and other past interested
1753 citizens will be invited, and we hope directly by mail. In addition, we will advertise in the
1754 *Richmond Times-Dispatch* and on our website, which we hope will go live around April
1755 1st. This will give us a good platform of those interested and to receive initial comments
1756 for the upcoming study. And again, this is just the first step. We anticipate extensive
1757 engagement with the public throughout the process.
1758

1759 As part of our community engagement, we will be reaching out to various members of
1760 the community. Our goal right now is to form a stakeholder committee, also based on
1761 what the output is going to be on the May 11th meeting. In addition, we will have a
1762 website, as mentioned, dedicated to the study, which will house a survey, an interactive
1763 comment map, and just a general comment section that will be available to all of the
1764 public.
1765

1766 With the Planning Commission and the public engagement, we anticipate this will take 8
1767 to 12 months. Of course this is just our estimate. It could take longer based on public
1768 comments. Once public comment has been gathered, staff will return to the Planning
1769 Commission for a work session and public hearing. That will be followed by a work
1770 session and public hearing with the Board.
1771

1772 This concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.
1773

1774 Mr. Leabough - Are there any questions for Ms. Moore?
1775

1776 Mr. Baka - I have one question. As you look to the east, what are the
1777 current limits of the extension of public utilities along that Sub Area 2 as you approach
1778 295? How far do utilities currently run?
1779

1780 Ms. Moore - The utilities run—bear with me so I don't get this by memory.
1781 The lines extend down Osborne Turnpike, New Market Road, and Midview Road. There
1782 is no water past Long Bridge Road. Water service picks up along New Market Road just
1783 north of First Colonial Parkway to serve Old Colony Estates and the Village of Old
1784 Colony. So basically, you do have water down Route 5 and a little bit adjacent to—
1785 almost up to 295. And of course that serves I think it's Four Mile Run.
1786
1787 Mr. Baka - So mostly throughout Sub Area 2. And then that Sub Area 3
1788 east of 295 probably none.
1789
1790 Ms. Moore - None, correct.
1791
1792 Mr. Baka - Thanks.
1793
1794 Mr. Leabough - Are there other questions? If not, thank you, Ms. Moore.
1795 Great presentation. I look forward to the study—
1796
1797 Ms. Moore - We're excited.
1798
1799 Mr. Leabough - —and key stakeholder participation. This is good move for
1800 Varina.
1801
1802 Mr. Emerson - Mr. Chairman, I do have a couple of things I want to pull out
1803 and ask for some input from the Commission. We will get a draft study to you. We're in
1804 the final stages of cleaning up a few things. I hope to get out to you by Friday. It won't
1805 look necessarily like our normal study. Obviously, with all the base information we've
1806 gathered, we do have some conclusions that we've reached, as staff, of thoughts of
1807 things that are accomplishable along the corridor. But we do want public input prior to
1808 finalizing those. So we won't put that into our study that you will see currently.
1809
1810 It is a corridor study, as Jean said. It's not a land use study. It's not a transportation
1811 study. We are looking at the corridor with the anticipation that the ultimate right of way
1812 of VDOT is what we're dealing with in regards to this. So this study isn't meant to
1813 influence or bring up that discussion necessarily. We're looking at what people like
1814 about the corridor, what can be possibly enhanced and/or preserved regarding the
1815 corridor. We're not looking at land uses necessarily along the corridor or things of that
1816 nature.
1817
1818 The kickoff meeting on May the 11th is anticipated just to notify all the stakeholders. We
1819 were planning on having that an hour before your regular meeting. And then from that
1820 trying to come up with this stakeholder group, which is meant to be representative. Not
1821 necessarily every individual or landowner along the corridor, but representative of the
1822 interests along the corridor, being representatives, again, of HOAs, the organizations
1823 and groups, but not necessarily every member of that group. That would be a large,
1824 unmanageable crown. We're trying to get our arms around that as you know from the
1825 discussions that we've had with you and Mr. Nelson.

1826

1827 I do have a question for you on the kickoff meeting with a more detailed presentation of
1828 what Ms. Moore gave today, and the opening the floor for comments to the Commission
1829 about what people like about the corridor or would like for us to think about in terms of
1830 the document and the data that we have found through our analysis. Is that appropriate
1831 prior to your meeting? That does limit the amount of time that folks have to come
1832 forward. But then again, it isn't meant to be a long three- or four-hour meeting because
1833 we're not at that point in the study. So I want to make sure before we move forward with
1834 that, that the Commission is comfortable with that approach.

1835

1836 Mr. Leabough - Okay. Does anyone have any questions?

1837

1838 Mr. Archer - Seeing it's more in line with being a presentation to the
1839 public, I think it would be enough time.

1840

1841 Mr. Emerson - Okay.

1842

1843 Mr. Archer - Assuming we'll be doing it again anyway at some point.

1844

1845 Mr. Emerson - Yes sir. After we have that meeting and then we establish
1846 the stakeholder group, and of course the website will be out gathering comments,
1847 hopefully we'll be able to reach consensus with the stakeholder group. We'd probably
1848 come back to the Commission at that point—this is still somewhat fluid—to discuss with
1849 you what our findings are, then go out to the public with some type of meeting possibly
1850 similar to what we did with the Comprehensive Plan where we could again take broader
1851 public input. Hopefully the stakeholders could be supporters of where we are at that
1852 point. Hopefully we would have addressed most of the thoughts of the stakeholders and
1853 of the Commission at that point.

1854

1855 Certainly, there are varying different characters of the corridor and varying different
1856 tools that may or may not be available. I know over the time frame—and many of you
1857 have been here through the studies that Ms. Moore mentioned—there have been
1858 desires of architectural control and things. I think it's fair to point out—and it's in the
1859 document—that architectural control really isn't possible in this corridor. It's not allowed
1860 to the County by the Code of Virginia. It doesn't really qualify, based on our attorney's
1861 review, for a historic district along here that would grant us that ability because you don't
1862 have any real existing structures of a historic nature that you could pull those elements
1863 from.

1864

1865 So that's one of the things that I think people need to understand up front. We are
1866 looking more at landscaping, possibly from incentive tools to have people be more
1867 willing to provide buffering and setbacks from the road. In a lot of those areas, you have
1868 developed area along this corridor with the exception of the areas east of 295 where
1869 you get into the large property holders. I do think in order to accomplish anything in that
1870 area you're probably looking at some incentive-based cluster zoning or something that
1871 would allow folks to still maintain their allowed densities that they currently have while

1872 possibly preserving some area along the road to keep that corridor the way that people
1873 currently appreciate and enjoy.

1874
1875 But those are just some of the thoughts that are floating around right now.

1876
1877 With that, if we're good with the eleventh, I don't need anything for that at this point. If
1878 you'd like, I'll try to get you in early and we'll have dinner prior to beginning the meeting
1879 at six.

1880
1881 We do have the approval of the minutes left on your agenda this morning from your
1882 February 22nd meeting. I don't believe we have an errata sheet

1883
1884 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 22, 2017

1885
1886 Mr. Witte - I move approval of the minutes.

1887
1888 Mrs. Marshall - I second it.

1889
1890 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mrs. Marshall.
1891 All in favor say aye. Those opposed? There is no opposition; that motion passes.

1892
1893 The Planning Commission approved the February 22, 2017 minutes as submitted.

1894
1895 Mr. Leabough - Is there any other business for the Commission,
1896 Mr. Emerson?

1897
1898 Mr. Emerson - No sir, I have nothing further for the Commission this
1899 morning.

1900
1901 Mr. Leabough - I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

1902
1903 Mr. Witte - So moved.

1904
1905 Mr. Baka - Second.

1906
1907 Mr. Leabough - We have a motion by Mr. Witte, a second by Mr. Baka.
1908 We're adjourned.

1909
1910 Mr. Witte - Thank you, staff.

1911
1912
1913
1914 
Mr. Eric S. Leabough, C.P.C., Chairperson

1915
1916
1917 
1918 Mr. Joseph Emerson, Jr., Secretary

A. Standard Conditions for all POD's:

1. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for connections to public water and sewer. **(when the property is served by public utilities)**
- 1A. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for connections to public sewer. The well location shall be approved by the County Health Department before a building permit is issued. Connection shall be made to the public water system when available within 300 feet of the site/building. **(when not served by public water)**
- 1B. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for connections to public water. The septic tank location shall be approved by the County Health Department before a building permit is issued. Connection shall be made to the public sewer when available within 300 feet of the site/building. **(when not served by public sewer)**
2. The Director of the Department of Public Utilities shall approve the plan of development for construction of public water and sewer, prior to beginning any construction of these utilities. The Department of Public Utilities shall be notified at least 48 hours prior to the start of any County water or sewer construction.
3. The parking lot shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 24, Section 24-98 of the Henrico County Code.
4. The parking spaces shall be marked on the pavement surface with four-inch-wide traffic painted lines. All lane lines and parking lines shall be white in color with the exception that those dividing traffic shall yellow.
5. Sufficient, effectively usable parking shall be provided. If experience indicates the need, additional parking shall be provided.
6. Curb and gutter and necessary storm sewer shall be constructed as shown on approved plans.
7. The plan of development plan shall be revised as annotated on the staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if details were fully described herein. Nine (9) sets of revised plans, including the detailed drainage, erosion control and utility plans, shall be submitted by the design engineer who prepared the plans to the Department of Planning for final review. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of fourteen (14) sets of final plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. Two (2) sets of the approved plan shall be attached to the building permit application. **(Revised October 2015)**
8. Two copies of an Erosion and Sediment Control Agreement with required escrow shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works. Approval is required prior to construction plan approval and beginning construction. The Department of Public Works shall be notified at least 24 hours prior to the start of any construction.
9. A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for review and approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
9. **AMENDED** - A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
10. All groundcover and landscaping shall be properly maintained in a healthy condition at all times. Dead plant materials shall be removed within a reasonable time and replaced no later than the next planting season.

11. Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications and mounting height details shall be submitted for Department of Planning review and approval.
11. **AMENDED** - Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including depictions of light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications and mounting height details shall be submitted for Department of Planning review and Planning Commission approval.
- 11B. Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications and mounting heights details shall be revised as annotated on the staff plan and included with the construction plans for final signature. **(For POD which includes lighting plan approval)**
12. All exterior lighting shall be designed and arranged to direct the light and glare away from nearby residential property and streets.
13. The site, including the parking areas, shall be kept clean of litter and debris on a daily basis. Trash container units/litter receptacles and recycling containers shall be maintained with regular pickups scheduled and shall be screened properly on all four sides. The gate(s) shall remain closed except when the receptacle(s) are being filled or serviced and shall be repaired or replaced as necessary. Details shall be included with the final site plan or required landscape plan for review and approval.
14. Required fire lanes shall be marked and maintained in accordance with the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.
15. Traffic control signs shall be provided as indicated on the Department of Planning Staff plan. All signs shall be fabricated as shown in The National Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways and The Virginia Supplement to The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways.
16. The assigned property number(s) shall be displayed so it is easily readable from the street. If assistance is needed with the address, please contact the Department of Planning at 501-4284. The Planning Department must assign all property addresses. **(Revised January 2008)**
17. The owner shall have a set of plans approved by the Director of Public Works, Public Utilities and Secretary of the Planning Commission available at the site at all times when work is being performed. A designated responsible employee shall be available for contact by County Inspectors.
18. The property shall be developed as shown on the plan filed with the case and no changes or additions to the layout shall be made without the approval of this Commission.
19. Upon completion of the improvements and prior to the certification of the permanent occupancy permit, the owner shall furnish a statement by the engineer or land surveyor who prepared the POD plan, to the effect that all construction including water and sewer is in conformance to the regulations and requirements of the POD.
20. The approved Plan of Development is granted by the Planning Commission only to the owners(s)/applicant(s) listed on the Plan of Development application on file for this project. Upon written notification to the Director of Planning, the Plan of Development approval may be transferred to subsequent owner(s) subject to approval by this Commission, or approval by the Director of Planning provided the property is transferred to new ownership no later than 24 months following initial construction plan approval. **(Revised August 2016)**

21. Vehicles shall be parked only in approved and constructed parking spaces.
22. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change can be implemented.
23. The site, including paving, pavement markings, signage, curb and gutter, dumpster screens, walls, fences, lighting and other site improvements shall be properly maintained in good condition at all times. Any necessary repairs shall be made in a timely manner.
24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and Division of Fire.
25. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations shall be included on the final construction plans for approval by the Department of Public Utilities prior to issuance of a building permit.
26. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
27. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
29. **(Start of miscellaneous conditions)**

STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR LANDSCAPE/LIGHTING/FENCE PLANS

1. The plan shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein. Four (4) sets of prints of the revised plan shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval stamps and distribution.
2. The property shall be developed as shown on the plan filed with the case and no changes or additions to the layout shall be made without the approval of this Commission.
3. The owner shall have a set of approved plans available at the site at all times when work is being performed. A designated responsible employee shall be available for contact by County Inspectors.
4. All groundcover and landscaping shall be properly maintained in a healthy condition at all times. Dead plant materials shall be removed within a reasonable time and replaced during the normal planting season. **(DELETE IF NO LANDSCAPING)**
5. All exterior lighting shall be shielded to direct lights away from adjacent residential property and streets. **(DELETE IF NO LIGHTING)**
6. All fences, walls, and screens, including gates and doors, shall be maintained in good repair by the owner. Trash and debris should not be allowed to accumulate along the fence or wall. **(DELETE IF NO FENCE, WALL, OR DUMPSTER SCREEN)**

B. In Addition to Item A, the Following Standard Conditions for Approval of All Zero Lot Line Developments shall apply:

29. Roof edge ornamental features that extend over the zero lot line, and which are permitted by Section 24-95(i)(1), must be authorized in the covenants.
30. Eight-foot easements for construction, drainage, and maintenance access for abutting lots shall be provided and shown on the POD plans.
31. Building permit request for individual dwellings shall each include two (2) copies of a layout plan sheet as approved with the plan of development. The developer may utilize alternate building types providing that each may be located within the building footprint shown on the approved plan. Any deviation in building footprint or infrastructure shall require submission and approval of an administrative site plan.
32. Windows on the zero lot line side of the dwelling can only be approved with an exception granted by the Building Official and the Director of Planning during the building permit application process.
33. The mechanical equipment for each building shall be located on its respective lot. Except for wall-mounted electric meters, in no case shall the eight-foot easement for construction, drainage, and maintenance access on the abutting lot be used to locate other mechanical equipment (such as HVAC equipment, generators, and the like) for the subject lot.

C. Standard Conditions for Approval of All Dry Cleaners and Laundries in Addition to Item A:

29. The dry cleaning establishment shall use only non-inflammable cleaning solvents and have fully enclosed cleaning and solvent reclamation processes and fully enclosed pressing equipment with no outside steam exhaust.

D. In addition to Item A, the Following Conditions for Approval of All Shopping Centers Shall Apply:

29. Only retail business establishments permitted in a **ZONE** may be located in this center.
30. The ground area covered by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate 25 percent of the total site area.
31. No merchandise shall be displayed or stored outside of the building(s) or on sidewalk(s).

E. In Addition to Item A, the Following Standard Conditions for Approval of All Multi-Family Shall Apply:

29. The unit house numbers shall be visible from the parking areas and drives.
30. The names of streets, drives, courts and parking areas shall be approved by the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission and such names shall be included on the construction plans prior to their approval. The standard street name signs shall be installed prior to any occupancy permit approval.

F. In addition to Item A, the Following Standard Conditions for Approval of All Service Station Developments Shall Apply:

29. This business shall not remain in operation after midnight and no exterior signs shall remain lighted after **(12:00 midnight - B-1) (1:00 o'clock a.m. - B-2) (no limit - B-3)**.
30. No merchandise shall be displayed outside of the building except that oil racks will be allowed on the pump islands.
31. This service station shall be used only for the sale of petroleum products and automobile accessories and parts. It shall not be used to sell or rent camping trailers, nor as a base of operation for truck fleets or fuel oil delivery or other such use that is not strictly a service station operation.
32. Only light repair work shall be allowed at this station, including motor tune-up, brake, generator, ignition, and exhaust repairs, and wheel balancing. The only work that can be performed outside the building is those services that are normally furnished at the pump island and the changing of tires.
33. No wrecked automobiles, nor automobiles incapable of being operated, shall be kept on the premises.
34. The prospective operator of this station shall come to the Department of Planning and sign the file copy of the special plan of development letter before he signs a lease with the oil company to operate this station.

G. STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR CONVENIENCE STORES WITH FUEL PUMPS IN A B-2 ZONE

29. Bulk storage of fuel shall be underground.
30. There shall be no exterior display of merchandise except on pump islands and on paved walkway areas within three (3) feet of building.
31. Lighting fixtures shall not exceed a height greater than twenty (20) feet.
32. No temporary storage of wrecked or inoperative vehicles or rental of vehicles, trailer campers, vans or similar equipment shall be permitted.
33. Not more than two (2) electronic amusement games shall be permitted.
34. Not more than two (2) vending machines for food and beverage and similar merchandise shall be permitted on the premises outside of an enclosed building.
35. The prospective operator of this facility shall come to the Department of Planning and sign the file copy of the special plan of development letter before he signs a lease with the oil company to operate this station.
36. The landscaping plan shall include details for screening of refuse containers and refuse storage facilities in accordance with Section 24-61(i).
37. Refuse containers or refuse storage facilities shall be serviced during business hours only.
38. The owner or manager on duty shall be responsible for temporarily closing the car wash facility when the on-site stacking space is inadequate to serve customer demand to prevent a backup of vehicles onto the public right-of-way.
39. The owner shall arrange with the Traffic Engineer to provide standard traffic control signs to notify customers that stopping or standing on the public right-of-way shall not be permitted near the entrances to the car wash facility. **(If Car Wash Is Proposed)**

**H. STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR CONVENIENCE STORES WITH FUEL PUMPS
IN A B-3 ZONE**

29. Bulk storage of fuel shall be underground.
30. The owner or manager on duty shall be responsible for temporarily closing the car wash facility when the on-site stacking space is inadequate to serve customer demand to prevent a backup of vehicles onto the public right-of-way. **(If Car Wash Is Proposed)**
31. The owner shall arrange with the Traffic Engineer to provide standard traffic control signs to notify customers that stopping or standing on the public right-of-way shall not be permitted near the entrances to the car wash facility. **(If Car Wash Is Proposed)**

CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION STANDARD CONDITIONS

Conventional Single-Family Subdivisions Served By Public Utilities

1. All requirements of Chapter 18, 19 and 24 of the Henrico County Code shall be met.
2. Construction plans, including proposed erosion and sediment controls, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning at least 30 days prior to final approval.
3. Construction shall not commence until the Director of Planning has granted final approval of the plat; and until the construction plans including the detailed drainage, erosion control, and utility plans have been approved by the Department of Planning, the Department of Public Utilities, and the Department of Public Works and a preconstruction meeting has been held with the Department of Public Works. Plans for Final Subdivision review shall be submitted to the Department of Planning in accordance with the requirements of the Final Subdivision application. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of sixteen (16) sets of final construction plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All erosion and sediment control plans, agreements, and bonds must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the construction plans.
4. Clearing and grubbing shall not commence until a clearing and grubbing plan has been approved by the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, eight (8) sets of clearing and grubbing plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All appropriate bonds and agreements, authorizations from state and/or regulatory agencies for impacts to the Waters of the United States, and offsite easement plats must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the clearing and grubbing plans. Approvals must be updated prior to recordation of the plat.
5. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for water. **(Substitute condition 5A if well)**
- 5A. A detailed soil analysis shall be performed and other requirements of the Health Department met before final plats are recorded. The developer shall have the center lines of all streets and lot corners staked to facilitate the examination of lots by the Health Department Sanitarians prior to filing for final approval and shall notify the Department of Planning and Health Department in writing when the staking has been done.
6. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for sewer. **(Substitute condition 6A if on-site sewage disposal/septic)**
- 6A. A detailed soil analysis shall be performed and other requirements of the Health Department met before final plats are recorded. The developer shall have the center lines of all streets and lot corners staked to facilitate the examination of lots by the Health Department Sanitarians prior to filing for final approval and shall notify the Department of Planning and Health Department in writing when the staking has been done.
7. A copy of the letter from the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission giving approval to the street names in this subdivision shall be submitted to the Director of Planning for final approval of street names before the recordation plat is submitted for review.
8. The plat shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein.
9. This approval shall expire on **March 21, 2018**, unless an extension is requested in writing stating the reason such extension is necessary. The request shall include the fee and must be

- filed a minimum of two weeks prior to the expiration date.
10. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change can be implemented.
 11. The conditional approval of this plat by the Planning Commission does not imply that all lots shown thereon will be granted final approval. Such approval is contingent on each lot meeting a number of requirements including but not limited to minimum zoning requirements, Health Department requirements as applicable, and design considerations.
 12. Prior to a request for final approval, the developer shall provide a buildable area plan showing information for all lots within the subdivision. Such plan shall be a part of the construction plans submitted for review and for signature. The buildable area plan shall be a minimum of 1" to 50' scale or larger and shall show the buildable area for the principal structure, all setback dimensions, the minimum lot width (perpendicular to the center line of the lot at the front building line), and if applicable, any Special Flood Hazard Areas (floodplains) and the area of each lot exclusive of floodplain, wetlands, easements, buffers, Chesapeake Bay Act Areas, wells and primary/reserved drainfields.

CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION STANDARD CONDITIONS

Conventional Single-Family Subdivisions Not Served By Public Utilities

1. All requirements of Chapter 18, 19 and 24 of the Henrico County Code shall be met.
2. Construction plans, including proposed erosion and sediment controls, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning at least 30 days prior to final approval.
3. Construction shall not commence until the Director of Planning has granted final approval of the plat; and until the construction plans including the detailed drainage and erosion control plans have been approved by the Department of Planning, and the Department of Public Works and a preconstruction meeting has been held with the Department of Public Works. Plans for Final Subdivision review shall be submitted to the Department of Planning in accordance with the requirements of the Final Subdivision application. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of eleven (11) sets of final construction plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All erosion and sediment control plans, agreements, and bonds must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the construction plans.
4. Clearing and grubbing shall not commence until a clearing and grubbing plan has been approved by the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works, and a preconstruction meeting has been conducted with the Department of Public Works. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, eight (8) sets of clearing and grubbing plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All appropriate bonds and agreements, authorizations from state and/or regulatory agencies for impacts to the Waters of the United States, and offsite easement plats must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the clearing and grubbing plans. Approvals must be updated prior to recordation of the plat.
5. A detailed soil analysis shall be performed and other requirements of the Health Department met before final plats are recorded. The developer shall have the center lines of all streets and lot corners staked to facilitate the examination of lots by the Health Department Sanitarians prior to filing for final approval and shall notify the Department of Planning and Health Department in writing when the staking has been done.
6. A copy of the letter from the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission giving approval to the street names in this subdivision shall be submitted to the Director of Planning for final approval of street names before the recordation plat is submitted for review.
7. The plat shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein.
8. This approval shall expire on **March 21, 2018**, unless an extension is requested in writing stating the reason such extension is necessary. The request shall include the fee and must be filed a minimum of two weeks prior to the expiration date.
9. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change can be implemented.

10. The conditional approval of this plat by the Planning Commission does not imply that all lots shown thereon will be granted final approval. Such approval is contingent on each lot meeting a number of requirements including but not limited to minimum zoning requirements, Health Department requirements and design considerations.
11. Prior to a request for final approval, the developer shall provide a buildable area plan showing information for all lots within the subdivision. Such plan shall be a part of the construction plans submitted for review and for signature. The buildable area plan shall be a minimum of 1" to 50' scale or larger and shall show the buildable area for the principal structure, all setback dimensions, the minimum lot width (perpendicular to the center line of the lot at the front building line), and if applicable, any Special Flood Hazard Areas (floodplains) and the area of each lot exclusive of floodplain, wetlands, easements, buffers, Chesapeake Bay Act Areas, wells and primary/reserved drainfields.

CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION STANDARD CONDITIONS

Residential Townhouse for Sale (RTH) Subdivisions

1. All requirements of Chapter 18, 19 and 24 of the Henrico County Code shall be met.
2. Construction plans, including proposed erosion and sediment controls, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning at least 30 days prior to final approval.
3. Construction shall not commence until the Director of Planning has granted final approval of the plat; and until the construction plans including the detailed drainage, erosion control, and utility plans have been approved by the Department of Planning, the Department of Public Utilities, and the Department of Public Works and a preconstruction meeting has been held with the Department of Public Works. Plans for Plan of Development and Final Subdivision review shall be submitted to the Department of Planning in accordance with the requirements of the Plan of Development and Final Subdivision applications. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of fourteen (14) sets of final construction plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All erosion and sediment control plans, agreements, and bonds must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the construction plans.
4. Clearing and grubbing shall not commence until a clearing and grubbing plan has been approved by the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works, and a preconstruction meeting has been conducted with the Department of Public Works. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, eight (8) sets of clearing and grubbing plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All appropriate bonds and agreements, authorizations from state and/or regulatory agencies for impacts to the Waters of the United States, and offsite easement plats must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the clearing and grubbing plans. Approvals must be updated prior to recordation of the plat.
5. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for water.
6. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for sewer.
7. A copy of the letter from the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission giving approval to the street names in this subdivision shall be submitted to the Director of Planning for final approval of street names before the recordation plat is submitted for review.
8. The plat shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein.
9. This approval shall expire on **March 21, 2018**, unless an extension is requested in writing stating the reason such extension is necessary. The request shall include the required fee and must be filed a minimum of two weeks prior to the expiration date.
10. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change can be implemented.

11. The conditional approval of this plat by the Planning Commission does not imply that all lots shown thereon will be granted final approval. Such approval is contingent on each lot meeting all requirements, including but not limited to, minimum zoning requirements, and design considerations.
12. A draft of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for review, prior to final approval. The proposed Homeowners Association for the project shall be responsible for the exterior maintenance of all buildings and grounds.
13. All block corners shall be monumented and referenced, where possible, to the exterior boundaries of the site
14. The record plat shall contain a statement that the common area is dedicated to the common use and enjoyment of the homeowners of **(name of subdivision)** and is not dedicated for use by the general public. This statement shall refer to the applicable article in the covenants recorded with the plat.

CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION STANDARD CONDITIONS

Zero Lot Line Subdivisions

1. All requirements of Chapter 18, 19 and 24 of the Henrico County Code shall be met.
2. Construction plans, including proposed erosion and sediment controls, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning at least 30 days prior to final approval.
3. Construction shall not commence until the Director of Planning has granted final approval of the plat; and until the construction plans including the detailed drainage, erosion control, and utility plans have been approved by the Department of Planning, the Department of Public Utilities, and the Department of Public Works and a preconstruction meeting has been held with the Department of Public Works. Plans for Plan of Development and Final Subdivision review shall be submitted to the Department of Planning in accordance with the requirements of the Plan of Development and Final Subdivision applications. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of fourteen (14) sets of final construction plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All erosion and sediment control plans, agreements, and bonds must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the construction plans.
4. Clearing and grubbing shall not commence until a clearing and grubbing plan has been approved by the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works, and a preconstruction meeting has been conducted with the Department of Public Works. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, eight (8) sets of clearing and grubbing plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All appropriate bonds and agreements, authorizations from state and/or regulatory agencies for impacts to the Waters of the United States, and offsite easement plats must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the clearing and grubbing plans. Approvals must be updated prior to recordation of the plat.
5. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for water.
6. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for sewer.
7. A copy of the letter from the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission giving approval to the street names in this subdivision shall be submitted to the Director of Planning for final approval of street names before the recordation plat is submitted for review.
8. The plat shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein.
9. This approval shall expire on **March 21, 2018**, unless an extension is requested in writing stating the reason such extension is necessary. The request shall include the required fee and must be filed a minimum of two weeks prior to the expiration date.
10. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change may be implemented.

11. The conditional approval of this plat by the Planning Commission does not imply that all lots shown thereon will be granted final approval. Such approval is contingent on each lot meeting all requirements, including but not limited to, minimum zoning requirements, and design considerations.
12. Prior to a request for final approval, the developer shall provide a buildable area plan showing information for all lots within the subdivision. Such plan shall be a part of the construction plans submitted for review and for signature. The buildable area plan shall be a minimum of 1" to 50' scale or larger and shall show the buildable area for the principal structure, all setback dimensions, the minimum lot width (perpendicular to the center line of the lot at the front building line), and if applicable, any Special Flood Hazard Areas (floodplains) and the area of each lot exclusive of floodplain, wetlands, easements, buffers and Chesapeake Bay Act Areas.

CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION STANDARD CONDITIONS

Road Dedication with No Lots

1. All requirements of Chapter 18, 19 and 24 of the Henrico County Code shall be met.
2. Construction plans, including proposed erosion and sediment controls, shall be submitted to the Department of Planning at least 30 days prior to final approval.
3. Construction shall not commence until the Director of Planning has granted final approval of the plat; and until the construction plans including the detailed drainage, erosion control, and utility plans have been approved by the Department of Planning, the Department of Public Utilities, and the Department of Public Works and a preconstruction meeting has been held with the Department of Public Works. Plans for Final Subdivision review shall be submitted to the Department of Planning in accordance with the requirements of the Final Subdivision application. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, a minimum of sixteen (16) sets of final construction plans for signature shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All erosion and sediment control plans, agreements, and bonds must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the construction plans.
4. Clearing and grubbing shall not commence until a clearing and grubbing plan has been approved by the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works. Upon notice from the Department of Planning to the Engineer that all comments have been addressed, eight (8) sets of clearing and grubbing plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for approval signatures. All appropriate bonds and agreements, authorizations from state and/or regulatory agencies for impacts to the Waters of the United States, and offsite easement plats must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and approved prior to approval of the clearing and grubbing plans. Approvals must be updated prior to recordation of the plat.
5. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for water.
6. The owner shall enter into the necessary contracts with the Department of Public Utilities for sewer.
7. A copy of the letter from the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission giving approval to the street names in this subdivision shall be submitted to the Director of Planning for final approval of street names before the recordation plat is submitted for review.
8. The plat shall be revised as shown in red on Staff plan dated **March 22, 2017**, which shall be as much a part of this approval as if all details were fully described herein.
9. This approval shall expire on **March 21, 2018**, unless an extension is requested in writing stating the reason such extension is necessary. The request shall include the fee and must be filed a minimum of two weeks prior to the expiration date.
10. The name of this development, as designated in this approval, shall be the name used for marketing and public recognition purposes. A written request for a name change must be received and granted by the Department of Planning before such a change can be implemented.