Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of Henrico, Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the Government Center at Parham and Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, November 15, 2006.

Members Present: Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Chairperson (Fairfield)
Mr. Tommy Bralin, Vice Chairperson (Three Chopt)
Mrs. Bonnie-Leigh Jones (Tuckahoe)
Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C. (Varina)
Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C. (Brookland)
Mrs. Bonnie Leigh Jones (Tuckahoe)
Mr. Randall R. Silber, Director of Planning, Secretary

Member Absent: Mrs. Patricia S. O’Bannon (Tuckahoe), Board of Supervisors

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

Welcome to the November 15, 2006 edition of subdivisions and plans of development. I don’t think our agenda is too long today. We will try to get through it as speedily as we can. I see no one from the press. With that, I will turn it over to Mr. Randall Silber, Director of Planning, and Secretary of the Commission. Mr. Silber.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have a quorum this morning. Mrs. O’Bannon will not be attending the meeting today. She is not feeling well, but we do have the other five members present and we can conduct business. First on the agenda would be consideration of deferrals and withdrawals. We have a number of deferrals and we can go through those first. Ms. News.

Good morning, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. We have five requests for deferrals and withdrawals this morning. The first is on page 5 of your agenda and is located in the Fairfield District, POD-55-06.
PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the September 27, 2006 Meeting)

POD-55-06
Magellan Center – Brook Road and Telegraph Road (POD-38-97 Revised)

Foster & Miller, P.C. for Robert B. Ball, Sr. and Empire Development: 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, 10,000 square foot office/warehouse building. The 5.3-acre site is located on the east line of Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) and the west line of Telegraph Road, approximately 1,300 feet north of the intersection of Brook Road and Mountain Road on parcel 784-760-1564. The zoning is B-3, Business District. County water and sewer. (Fairfield)

Ms. News - The applicant is requesting a deferral to January 24, 2007.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. News. Is anyone present who opposes this deferral, POD-55-06, Magellan Center. I see no one. I move that the Magellan Center, POD-55-06, be deferred to the January 24, 2007 meeting at the request of the applicant.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Archer and second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye. Those opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred POD-55-06, Magellan Center – Brook Road and Telegraph Road (POD-38-97 Revised), to its meeting on January 24, 2007.

The next is on page 7 of your agenda and is located in the Varina District.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

POD-58-06 (Revised)
The Shops @ White Oak Village – 4500 S. Laburnum Avenue

Vanasse Hagen Brustlin, Inc. for Forest City Commercial Group, Inc: Request for approval of a revised plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-56 of the Henrico County Code, for approval of the outside display of merchandise for a proposed Lowe’s home improvement store (major anchor B). The 13.21-acre site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of S. Laburnum Avenue and I-64, west of Audubon Drive on part of parcel 815-718-5710. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Varina)
Ms. News - The applicant is requesting a deferral to the December 13, 2006 meeting.

Mr. Archer - OK. Is there anyone present who is opposed to this deferment, POD-58-06 (Revised), The Shops @ White Oak Village. I see no opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I move for deferral of POD-58-06, The Shops @ White Oak Village outdoor display to December 13, 2006, by request of the applicant.

Mrs. Jones - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mrs. Jones. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion carries.

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred POD-58-06 (Revised), The Shops @ White Oak Village, to its meeting on December 13, 2006.

Ms. News - The next case is on page 10 of your agenda and located in the Three Chopt District.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

POD-65-06 Lowe’s @ Short Pump Plaza – Garden Center Expansion (POD-85-97 Revised) McKinney & Company for Lowes Home Centers, Inc.: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-56 of the Henrico County Code, for approval for the outside display of merchandise and an expansion of an existing garden center for an existing Lowe’s home improvement store. The 16.21-acre site is located in the Short Pump Plaza Shopping Center on parcel 740-763-6239. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional) and WBSO (West Broad Street Overlay) District. County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)

Ms. News - This is POD-65-06, formerly POD-85-97 Revised, Lowe’s at Short Pump Plaza – Garden Center Expansion. The applicant is requesting deferral to the December 13, 2006 meeting.

Mr. Archer - Thank you. Is there anyone present who is opposed to this deferment, POD-65-06, Lowe’s @ Short Pump Plaza – Garden Center Expansion? No opposition. Mr. Branin.

Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I’d like to move for deferral of POD-65-06, Lowe’s @ Short Pump Plaza, to the December 13, 2006 meeting, per the applicant’s request.

Mrs. Jones - Second.
Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Branin and second by Mrs. Jones. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion carries.

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred POD-65-06, Lowe’s @ Short Pump Plaza – Garden Center Expansion (POD-85-97 Revised) to its meeting on December 13, 2006.

Ms. News - The next item is on page 11 of your agenda and located in the Varina District.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the October 25, 2006 Meeting)

POD-34-06 Gillies Creek Recycling – Office Area – Masonic Lane and I-64 (POD-83-97 Revised) Engineering Design Associates for Gillies Creek Industrial Recycling: 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, 6,000 square foot office/repair shop and two equipment sheds for an existing recycling center on the landfill property. The 3.57-acre site is located at 4200 Masonic Lane on parcel 806-719-8851. The zoning is M-2, General Industrial District. Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. (Varina)

Ms. News - The applicant is requesting a deferral to May 23, 2007.

Mr. Archer - All right. Is anyone present who is in opposition to this deferment, POD-34-05, Gillies Creek Recycling? Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I move for deferral of POD-34-06, Gillies Creek Recycling – Office Area – Masonic Lane and I-64, to May 23, 2007, by request of the applicant.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred POD-34-06, Gillies Creek Recycling – Office Area – Masonic Lane and I-64, (POD-83-97 Revised), to its meeting on May 23, 2007.

Ms. News - The next and last item is on page 14 of your agenda and located in the Three Chopt District. This is Subdivision Dalton Park @ Greenbrooke (November 2006 Plan), for 30 lots. The applicant is requesting a deferral to December 13, 2006.
SUBDIVISION

SUB-59-06
Dalton Park @ Greenbrooke (November 2006 Plan)
4320 – 4350 Belfast Road

Youngblood, Tyler & Associates for Fidelity Properties, Ltd.; Dalton Park LLC; Estate of Daisey A. Childress; Maynard L. Puryear, Helen D. Puryear, and Brenda H. Puryear; Larry C. Riley and Patricia R. Coleman and Myrtle B. Graves: The 2.254-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 30, single-family homes is located between the east line of I-295 entrance ramp and the west line of Belfast Road on parcels 743-763-3572, 743-762-7481, 743-763-8604 (part), 743-763-8655, 743-762-3527 (part) 9020 and 9533. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Three Chopt) 30 Lots

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone present who is opposed to this deferral, Dalton Park @ Greenbrooke, SUB-59-06? No opposition. Mr. Branin.

Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I would like to move for deferral of Subdivision Dalton Park @ Greenbrooke to the December 13, 2006 meeting, per the applicant’s request.

Mrs. Jones - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Branin and second by Mrs. Jones. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred SUB-59-06, Dalton Park @ Greenbrooke (November 2006 Plan) to its meeting on December 13, 2006.

Mr. Silber - Next on the agenda would be consideration of those items on our expedited agenda. Items from the expedited agenda are plans on a somewhat smaller scale, smaller in size. These are plans that staff has reviewed, and the applicant is in agreement with all of the conditions and annotations on the plans. The Planning Commissioner from the district is comfortable with the plan and there is no known opposition. The plan is placed on the expedited agenda to be heard. If there is opposition, the case would be pulled off of the expedited agenda and heard in the order in which it is found on the full agenda. We have several plans, I believe, on expedited agenda. Ms. News.

Ms. News - The first item is on page 2 of your agenda.
Ms. News - This is located in the Three Chopt District, and this is Transfer of Approval, POD-91-95, Albright Wilson Americas. There is an addendum item on page 1 of your addendum which contains an added condition, No. 1, stipulating the date for addressing deficiencies, and the staff recommendation for approval.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. News. Is anyone present who is opposed to this transfer, POD-91-95, Albright Wilson Americas? No opposition. Mr. Branin.

Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I would like to move for approval of POD-91-95, Transfer of Approval, Albright Wilson Americas, on the expedited agenda, including the addendum additional condition.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Branin and second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.

The Planning Commission approved Transfer of Approval for POD-91-95, Albright Wilson Americas – 4851 Lake Brook Drive, subject to the owner accepting and agreeing to be responsible for continued compliance of the original approval and the following additional condition:

1. The site deficiencies, as identified in the inspector’s report dated October 3, 2006, shall be corrected as follows:
   a. pavement markings and curb and gutter repair by December 31, 2006; and
Ms. News - The next item is on page 12 of your agenda, Granger Estates, November 2006 Plan, for two lots. It is in the Varina District.

**SUBDIVISION**

**SUB-56-06**
Granger Estates (November 2006 Plan)
6907 Miller Road

**Engineering Design Associates for Kenny Wilbourne Realty & Construction Company:** The 2.37-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 2 single-family homes is located on the southern side of Miller Road adjacent to I-895, approximately 0.21 miles west of the intersection of Miller Road and Darbytown Road on parcel 814-698-5579. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. *(Varina) 2 Lots*

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone present who is opposed to this subdivision, Granger Estates in the Varina District? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of subdivision SUB-56-06, Granger Estates (November 2006 Plan) with the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities and the following additional conditions Nos. 11, 12, 13 and 14 and on the expedited agenda.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye. Those opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision SUB-56-06, Granger Estates (November 2006 Plan) subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities and the following additional conditions:

11. Each lot shall contain at least 43,560 square feet.

12. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within the 20-foot-wide planting strip easement along I-895 shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.

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

14. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located within the buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be developed with engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in accordance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical guidelines established by a professional engineer. A detailed engineering report shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Building Official prior to the issuance of a building permit on the affected lot. A copy of the report and recommendations shall be furnished to the Directors of Planning and Public Works.
226 Ms. News - The final item is on page 13 of your agenda and located in the
227 Varina District.
228
229 SUBDIVISION
230
SUB-58-06
Bluffs @ Battery Hill
(November 2006 Plan)
1400 Battery Hill Drive

Timmons Group for Christopher Rand and Karen Budlong:
The 8.42-acre site proposed for a subdivision of 3 single-family
homes is located at the western terminus of Battery Hill Drive
approximately 1,200 feet east of the intersection of Battery Hill
Drive and Osborne Turnpike on part of parcels 804-676-2063,
804-676-4672, 5364, 1236 and 4233. The zoning is R-2A, One-
Family Residence District. Individual well and septic
tank/drainfield. (Varina) 3 Lots

231 Ms. News - There is an addendum to revise the square footage, condition No.
232 11 on page 2 of your addendum which corrects the acreage of the lots 43,560, as required for lots
233 on well and septic.

234 Mr. Vanarsdall - All right. Is there opposition to this subdivision, SUB-58-06,
235 Bluffs @ Battery Hill? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

236 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of subdivision SUB-58-06,
237 Bluffs @ Battery Hill, November 2006 Plan, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard
238 conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities, and the following additional conditions:
239 No. 11, which was revised for the acreage, and 12 through 15.

240 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

241 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in
242 favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. That motion passed.

243 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision SUB-58-06, Bluffs @
244 Battery Hill (November 2006 Plan) 1400 Battery Hill Drive, subject to the annotations on the
245 plans, the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities and the following
246 additional conditions:

247 11. Each lot shall contain at least 43,560 square feet exclusive of the flood plain areas.

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

251 13. A plan shall be submitted prior to recordation of the plat showing the buildable area for
252 each lot to properly recognize the limitations for dwelling unit dimensions and setbacks.
253 Buildable area is that area within which a dwelling unit may legally be located
254 considering the front yard, side yard, and rear yard setback requirements of Chapter 24, of
255 the Henrico County Code.
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14. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the construction plan by the Department of Public Works.

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

Mr. Silber - Next on the agenda would be consideration of Subdivision Extensions of Conditional Approval. All of the items listed on your agenda today are for informational purposes only. All of these extensions can be handled administratively and will be handled administratively. We are providing these for your information.

FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Magisterial District</th>
<th>Original No. of Lots</th>
<th>Remaining Lots</th>
<th>Previous Extensions</th>
<th>Year(s) Extended Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kain Estates (September 2004 Plan)</td>
<td>Three Chopt</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsridge (October 2003 Plan)</td>
<td>Varina</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton Grove, Section A (November 2005 Plan)</td>
<td>Brookland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Mill Estates (October 2004 Plan)</td>
<td>Brookland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocketts Landing Townhouses (November 2005 Plan)</td>
<td>Varina</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetbay Hills (October 2005 Plan)</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Collector Roads, Phase 1 (October 2005 Plan)</td>
<td>Varina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodman Hills (November 2001 Plan)</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Year 11/14/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr. Silber - These are the Conditional Approval Extensions today and if you have any questions, staff is prepared to answer your questions. Otherwise, they can just be accepted. It requires no action by the Commission. Does the Commission have any questions on any of these conditional approvals?

Ms. Goggin - I would like to point out that Kain Estates is being withdrawn. The applicant is letting it expire.

Mr. Silber - OK, so that is not one that would be extended.

Ms. Goggin - It is as shown on page 1 of your addendum.

Mr. Silber - Thank you. Hearing no other comments on that, we can move on to page 3 of your agenda.

Plan of Development Reconsideration & Phase One Landscape Plan

POD-74-05
Reynolds Crossing One – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP and Higgins & Gerstenmaier
Glenside Drive and for Reynolds Holdings, LLC: Request for approval of a
Forest Avenue reconsideration of a plan of development for revisions to the site
layout and architectural plans, and for approval of a phase one landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The revised site layout includes a 72,000 square foot, three-story office building and a one-story, 7,785 square foot coffee shop/restaurant. The 9.18-acre site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Glenside Drive and Forest Avenue on part of parcel 765-744-6557. The zoning is O-3C, Office District (Conditional) and B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer.

(Three Chopt)

Mr. Silber - This is a plan of development for reconsideration and Phase One landscape plan, POD-74-05, Reynolds Crossing One, in the Three Chopt District.

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone present who is opposed to this plan of development, POD-74-05, Reynolds Crossing One at Glenside Drive and Forest Avenue? There is no opposition. Good morning, Mr. Strauss.

Mr. Strauss - Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. This is a request for approval of both a reconsideration of the site plan layout of the original plan of development, and Phase 1 of the landscape plan. The Commission may recall that the Reynolds Crossing One portion of the Reynolds tract, which was rezoned in December of 2004, allowed for redevelopment under the B-2, B-3 and O-3 Districts for construction of a hotel, office and retail uses. The Reynolds Crossing One project consists of the western portion only at Forest Avenue and Glenside Drive. This nine-acre tract was granted plan of development
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of development approval last December for construction of a three-story office building, a one-
story restaurant coffee shop, and a future drug store. Since that time, the applicant has submitted
construction plans for the building, but in a slightly different configuration. It is now closer to
the property line of the Charles Glen Subdivision. It is more like the original conceptual plan for
the zoning of the tract. That building location was closer to the property line, as well. Staff has
handed out additional plans this morning in the packet which includes the original approved site
plan in December of 2005 and the most recent revision, which shows the three-story office
building closer to the southern property line, but the minimum 75 feet away as mandated by the
proffers in the rezoning case. Staff and the neighborhoods most interested in the site plan, the
Charles Glen Subdivision and the Crestview Subdivision, have met with the applicant on several
occasions and we have recently met on Sunday, and we are now in a position to recommend
approval for the revised site plan. But we do not at this time have revised architectural plans,
however, for the revised building, so we will be seeing those architectural plans at a future date.
You will also see the revised landscape plan for the Reynolds property in your new packet. This
annotated staff plan is the result of the recent meeting on Sunday with the neighborhood and a
meeting on November 1. The applicant seeks approval for the Phase 1 portion of the landscape
plan and installation of Phase 1 buffer plantings before the planting season is over. Staff is aware
of some additional concerns regarding the need for supplemental screen planting along the
property line near the three houses on Cornell Avenue in the Crestview Subdivision. There was a
meeting to discuss this planting last Sunday night and the applicant walked the site with the
neighbors last week. Although it has not been determined at this time what additional plantings
might be necessary, both the applicant and the neighbors are in agreement they do not want a
delay of approval of this Phase 1 buffer plan, in order to get the installation completed.
Therefore, we have agreed to review the issue of supplemental plantings after installation of the
Phase 1 buffer, when Phase 2 landscaping comes to the Commission in the future. And this is
annotated on the plan that was handed out. So, with that, staff is recommending approval of the
revised site plan in accordance with the original conditions of approval, which are included in
this packet for your convenience, Phase 1 conditions Nos. 1 through 32. And staff is
recommending the approval of the Phase 1 landscape plan, subject to standard conditions for
landscape plan approval. I will be happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Strauss. Are there questions from the
Commission?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Jim, the shop and restaurant, do you know the name of that? The
rumor a long time ago was Starbucks, of course.

Mr. Strauss - The original plan of development had Caribou Coffee and I don’t
know what the name of the restaurant was.

Mr. Vanarsdall - It may have been. Right now I am hearing a Max and Erma’s, and
Ruth Chris?

Mr. Strauss - And my other question was, what is the largest building that has
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been approved for this? What is the square footage of the largest building?

Mr. Strauss - Up to this portion?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes.

Mr. Strauss - I believe it was 70,000.

Mr. Vanarsdall - That is what I thought. That is not big enough for a Wal-Mart, is it?

Mr. Strauss - There is farther east a Westin Hotel, which is already approved. On the site, I don’t know, off hand.

Mr. Vanarsdall - I remember in the rezoning they restricted the square footage of any building for some reason.

Mr. Strauss - Well, the retail portion north of Forest Avenue had a 125,000 sq. ft. commercial component. That is the largest building.

Mr. Silber - Mr. Vanarsdall, are you talking about the business zoning on the north side of Forest Avenue?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes.

Mr. Silber - I think there was a restriction on the maximum size of that retail building.

Mr. Vanarsdall - It was restricted and I was just wondering what the square footage was.

Mr. Strauss - The largest was 125,000.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

Mrs. Jones - May I ask, Mr. Strauss, the plan that I am considering now is the 11/15/06 plan. Is that correct?

Mr. Strauss - Is that the small plan in your packet? Yes.

Mrs. Jones - What you are showing us, if you go back to the original was the three buildings.

Mr. Strauss - Yes.

Mrs. Jones - So what we are considering now has been changed to two.
Mr. Strauss - It is two, one of them has a small addition attached to it. That would be the coffee shop attached to the north side.

Mrs. Jones - One, two, three.

Mr. Silber - I think her point, Mr. Strauss, is that the previous plan did show three separate free-standing buildings. The current plan shows two, one being a three-story medical office building, and the second being a one-story restaurant and attached coffee shop. It looks as though the two buildings were formerly three.

Mrs. Jones - I just wanted to understand what I was considering here, and the neighbors are fine with the initial planting now to be supplemented later as necessary, as part of the second phase?

Mr. Strauss - Yes. The concern here is that the additional supplemental planting would have to be done among the existing trees, and whenever we do that, we have got to be careful what we are digging up or damaging with the original trees that are there. So, we have to selectively look at that. We need a little bit more time to do that. They don’t want to delay the approval of this phase one buffer. They would just like to get the planting in to start growing now.

Mrs. Jones - OK. Thank you.

Mr. Silber - And the applicant is agreeable to supplementing landscaping with phase two as necessary?

Mr. Strauss - My understanding is that Mr. Reynolds walked that site last week and was agreeable to some of that planting. They, obviously, don’t want to give a blank check, but want to be selective as to what they will be planting.

Mr. Silber - I understand.

Mr. Archer - All right. Anything further from Mr. Strauss?

Mr. Branin - I am going to ask the applicant to come up, but I also have two people in the audience that represent the neighborhood directly behind, and I want to make sure that they are comfortable and have seen the latest proposal.

Mr. Archer - All right. Will the applicant come forward?

Mr. Reynolds - Good morning. My name is Sarge Reynolds and I am the applicant.

Mr. Branin - Good morning, Mr. Reynolds. How are you today?
Mr. Reynolds - I am well, thank you. And how are you all?

Mr. Branin - Very good, thank you. Just with the supplemental plantings, I want to make sure that you are in agreement that we are going to get some in and then there will be additional. Are you in agreement?

Mr. Reynolds - Yes, I am in agreement. We have worked well with the neighbors in good faith and will continue to do so.

Mr. Branin - That is all I needed from you, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. Archer - Does anybody else have a question for Mr. Reynolds? All right.

Mr. Branin - With that, Mr. Chairman, I’d like to move for approval of POD-74-05 including the revised staff plan with the annotations and the standard conditions for landscape plans of this type, including the original additional conditions Nos. 1 through 32.

Mrs. Jones - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Branin and second by Mrs. Jones. All in favor say aye. Those opposed say no. The ayes have it. The case is approved.

The Planning Commission approved POD-74-05, Plan of Development Reconsideration and Phase One Landscape Plan for Reynolds Crossing One, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type, the standard conditions for landscape plans, including the original additional conditions Nos. 1 through 32.
POD-42-06
West Broad Village –
W. Broad St./Three Chopt Road

Timmons Group for West Broad Village, LLC, West Broad Village II, LLC and Unicorp National Developments, Inc.:
Request for approval of architectural plans, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one two-story, 63,875 60,000 square foot grocery store, a three-story, 58,000 61,450 square foot retail/office building, and a one-story, 4,050 square foot bank building with drive-thru facilities in an urban mixed use development. The 115.04-acre site is located along the south line of W. Broad Street (U. S. Route 250), the north line of Three Chopt Road, and the east line of the future John Rolfe Parkway on parcel 742-760-7866. The zoning is UMUC, Urban Mixed Use District (Conditional) and WBSO, West Broad Street Overlay District. County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)

Mr. Archer -
Is anyone present who is opposed to POD-42-06, West Broad Village? No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Wilhite.

Mr. Wilhite -
Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. This is the first set of architectural plans submitted for approval for the West Broad Village project. They have three buildings before you today. The first building, the Wachovia Bank, is located here along West Broad Street, right across from where S&K Clothing is located. This building is 4,500 square feet and is constructed primarily of brick and cast stone construction. Staff believes that it is in keeping with the guidelines of the West Broad Village Master Plan and we can recommend approval. The retail office building, the square footage, we have been told at this point, is 61,450 square feet. It is a three-story building with the first story retail, the upper two stories is office. It is constructed primarily of brick, stucco and cast stone accents. Staff also feels this is in keeping with the West Broad Village guidelines. We had made a comment about treatment of the southern façade of this building, and recommended additional enhancements, which the applicant has agreed to do, by adding more brick and changing the coloration in the back. This building is located here, which is just going to be just to the south of the Whole Foods Grocery Building, which is the third building in this package. This is the one that staff does have concerns about. The requirements of the UMU limits are for 30,000 square feet, with provisional use permit approval for this project. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors approved this building at 60,000 square feet. There is the ability to increase the square footage and we have been informed by the applicant that final square footage of the building is 63,875. Because of the way the conditions of the provisional use permit are worded, specific approval of this square footage is required. Staff does have concerns about designs of this building and how it fits within the guidelines of the West Broad Village master plan. This is an industrial looking building. Staff has not been convinced that examples of this were provided with the master plan and the pattern book. They are proposing the use of corrugated metal panel wall systems. These are the lighter colored material that appear on all of the four elevations. This was not a material that was specified in the proffers of the zoning case and would require specific Planning Commission...
specific Planning Commission approval. In addition, the café area, they have an outdoor café here on the south side of the building, which has columns and a painted structured steel trellis on top. Staff was concerned about how that treatment is going to appear. Guidelines for the West Broad Village architecturals indicate that all commercial buildings are supposed to have a base, a middle, and a top. The bottom elevation that you see here is the façade that faces what W. Broad Street and it is arguably the most visible side on this building. We are not sure how that façade really follows that guideline. Also, the guidelines specify that upper floor windows are supposed to be square or of a vertical design, and as you can see here, this is a horizontal window treatment on the second story. That does not follow the guidelines of West Broad Village. The applicant is here today, including their two principal architects for the project. Staff is in a position to recommend approval of the Wachovia Bank and the retail/office buildings; however, we are not in a position at this time to recommend approval of the Whole Foods Grocery Store building. If you have any questions, I will be happy to try and answer them.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Any questions from the Commission?

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Wilhite, you say that the green portions of that building are corrugated steel?

Mr. Wilhite - A corrugated metal wall system. We don’t have details or a material sample, but these are the lighter colors that take up significant portions of the façade.

Mrs. Jones - I would like to know about Whole Foods design alternatives on that on a nationwide basis. Is that something the applicant could address or do you know?

Mr. Wilhite - I believe so. Actually, I was on their web site yesterday and they did have one web page that showed a wide variety of different designs. They are not wedded to a single design philosophy. There is quite a wide variation in the buildings on the web site.

Mrs. Jones - I would think that opens the door then to some discussion of design without having a problem with the…

Mr. Wilhite - I think so.

Mr. Archer - All right. Anything further for Mr. Wilhite? All right. I think we need to hear from the applicant. Would the applicant come forward, please?

Mr. Joe Antunovich - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Joe Antunovich here representing West Broad Village, LLC. I am also joined here by Mr. Jim Voelzke, the architect for Whole Foods, and we will kind of do this together. We won’t drag it out. You have been very patient with us over the last several months, and so we just handed out a book that is just a little summary of what Mr. Wilhite talked about and the images on the screen simply go back to show a little bit of what we have presented in our master plan and our master plan approval. The overall development that we are so excited about along West Broad. These buildings are the first buildings that we are up for approval on. The office building, I will just go through these
quickly, that is illustrated here (referring to rendering), the site plan, and then the elevations. It just helps to see these in color a little closer up because we are very excited about the eclectic architecture that we have here, and as we went through the master planning we gave you some ideas of how we would be putting these buildings together. The important thing is that the buildings are a collection of different buildings, even this office building here that is 260 odd feet long is expressed as a collection of six different facades, just like a city goes together, just like a village goes together, and a village goes together with a combination of different architectural styles, and while the architectural styles have an overall unifying element, every now and then there is an exclamation point. So, as we go forth here, you can see that. These buildings are eclectic. They have different personalities and staff did not like this elevation on the rear side of the office building, and so we very quickly resubmitted another that had more brick on it. This is a lousy coloration of it, but we have added a lot more brick and been able to keep staff very, very happy on this one particular building. The Wachovia Building, as we discussed a little bit earlier, is a brick and stone building that we worked closely with our tenants on. This has undergone several redesigns before we submitted. We are very happy with the way that bank building has come forth, and with Whole Foods, this is really our major tenant in our entire development. The facades of this building really didn’t show a lot of different designs on, when we brought it through the master planning process. As you well know, Whole Foods has a wonderful reputation for eclectic design throughout the country, and what we are trying to do is do something exciting. I was somewhat shocked at the response from everyone when they said we had some concerns here. When I first saw these elevations, I was thrilled. This really takes our development, I believe, a huge step forward. This is a signature building. It integrates a lot of brick and it integrates a lot of, I believe, almost like the farm architecture that you found here in Richmond, and we have integrated somewhat of the old, the old industrial with that barn-like architecture, and yet integrated it with brick. You can see the brown colors here, those very tall elements that extend up, and the trellises that help make a very eclectic façade for the building. I am going to get the renderings, because really you shouldn’t be looking at this building without all of the elevations. These are two of the elevations, two of the primary elevations, and I think the one elevation, the lower elevation we are thrilled with. I mean, look at the brick that is here as you see this building on two sides. On the right-hand side of the lower elevation, the taller element that actually is an exclamation point, and it creates what we believe is really a wonderful composition. I think that one of the concerns, the largest concern that staff had was the elevation that you see at the top, and I think we are anxious to get going and get going quickly here, and if there is some concern about the particular elevation on the top, we would appreciate hearing about that, and if we can talk about it and figure out a way that we could move forth here, we’d be very appreciative. The other elevations here, you can see the elevations from the parking lot at the bottom. We believe it shows a wonderful eclectic energy and at the key locations where our project is, we’d be very proud to have this building in as the first building. And so, while it is not identical to all of the kind of pseudo-classical elements that were shown on the master plan, it says something about the tenant, Whole Foods, and we are very, very conscious of that. It is a different kind of building, but we believe through its materials integrates very well with the overall sense of Whole Foods, and Jim, perhaps you’d like to say a few words as we go forward. And, if you like, the other four elements, the four images are here.
Mr. Jim Voelzke - Good morning. I am the architect for Whole Foods Market. I have been designing Whole Foods for the last 15 years and have been primarily responsible for all their work in the mid-Atlantic and in the Midwest, and I want to address the first question as to “Do they have a national standard?” and they don’t. They purposely don’t and that is one of the reasons my firm and I, particularly, get along well with Whole Foods is that their first task in a new market is to send me down to kind of investigate local vernacular, local styles, local buildings, and really come out with a design that reflects the community, not Whole Foods. They want the building to be a part of the community as soon as they open up and that is an architect’s dream. They are great clients and they want me down here today to sort of make it clear that they are trying to do a piece of architecture here that reflects the community. With that said, they also give us a lot of leeway as far as architectural style and design, and they really are trying to move forward. They are a very progressive company. They have a progressive style management, a progressive style of running their stores, and they really want the architecture to reflect that, as well.

So, whatever the task, we are sort of putting a mirror up to what is there, but a task that we are drawing out what’s there, what is part of the history of the community, but then also putting it back together in a way that reflects the forward thinking. And that is, pretty much as Joe said, what we try to do here. We spent a couple of days in Richmond, in the spring, going to all different parts of town and different neighborhoods and tried to find forms and styles and even materials that we thought we could use to do the Whole Foods at West Broad Village. It is a particular challenge in that this is a 65,000 square foot box. It is very hard to break that down into kind of smaller buildings. We are sort of stuck with the proportion that is challenging, to say the least, and the Whole Food Stores have gotten bigger. I am going to go through a couple of examples of some other Whole Foods so you can see how we sort of met that task, to reflect the community. I want you to be a little sympathetic in that some of these stores are smaller. They are 35,000 to 38,000 square feet, and now the Whole Foods prototype has gotten bigger.

This is a Whole Foods in Downtown Washington, D.C. on P Street. It is, again, a very modern interpretation of some kind of classical styles in the neighborhood. This is a neighborhood that was filled with pseudo-industrial and a lot of auto-related industries, car repair shops, car show rooms in the 1930s and 1940s. We borrowed from a lot of that in form and came up with a very modern piece dropped in to kind of a traditional form, not unlike what we are doing at West Broad, and we added the entrance to the left side.

This is a Whole Foods in Clarendon, Virginia in Arlington. This is the first Whole Foods that we did. This is the first Whole Foods in Washington, D.C. This project was written up in the Washington Post by their architectural critic as being a classic example of what to do with a big box and how to break it down. It, again, won numerous awards. Again, it is taking kind of a
classical form, simple proportions, classical materials, like brick, but really reinterpreting them into a modern vernacular.

Here is another picture of the Clarendon Store from a different angle. Again, one of the things we typically do, especially on a four-sided project, is try and break down each different elevation and let each elevation respond to the needs of what is around it, what is across the street, and let me go back to the design and just briefly kind of point out, you see some stuff repeated in here. We pride ourselves on being sort of a brick or masonry aficionado. What you are starting to see here is the development of the masonry details. These are not flat sort of brick walls. These are heavily articulated, heavily designed, and I will show you P Street and what we did with brick there. I think you can start to see some of the detailing on the left side. You’ll see that and look over the windows around the loading dock there, details on top of that brick stair tower. It is hard to convey that in kind of computer renderings, but be assured there will be a tremendous amount of texture. We are also looking at, at least two, and possibly three, brick colors, that are going into the project. You start to see that top form from that clear story form. That is really a much larger interpretation of what we have done in the Vienna store, and modern, but still feels comfortable within the proportion. It will glow at night time. It really is kind of a beacon for the store. Unlike Vienna, it is envisioned here as being transparent glass, so you will be able to see inside. These are the two sides. You can see this coming together very nicely. Again, you are starting to see lots of brick detailing that will just continue to develop as we continue. The trellis form, I was surprised to hear that there were some issues with that, that was an attempt at a breakdown of a relatively blank façade. There are parts of the store, because of the program, with food stores, where we need to have solid wall to back up against, and so we were trying to use the trellis here to break down that and really create sort of a pattern along the elevations. Then the northwest perspective is the entrance to the building. Now, this is the entrance in the West Broad Village. We purposely located the store offices in this location, because you could have windows of activity behind them. Again, you are at the back of the house with regard to the store, so there is nothing really happening at ground level that we can show, so we tried to put the offices, the conference room, the break room up on the second floor, so that they will have a view and it will be activity. That is all I have for now, but again I want to assure everybody that Whole Foods’ goal is to create a building that we are all proud of, and that the community embraces quickly (unintelligible).

Mr. Branin - Jim, I’ve got a couple of comments. I’ve got your website up here and 90% of those I love. Most of the ones on your website are of other stores. Now the ones that you just presented to us of Whole Foods are all too modern, and I don’t see any of the other ones that are on the Whole Foods website up there. They are more classical.

Mr. Voelzke - I think you are going to see a variety of stuff on the website and the Mid-Atlantic region they have more of a tradition of building their buildings from the ground up. A lot of the facades that you are looking at are in shopping centers, strip malls, that part of the architecture was done by the architect of the strip mall, not of…

Mr. Branin - Now, Joe will tell you from the get-go that I am excited about the architecture. It is a step-up in the project. They are beautiful. In the original meeting with the
community when Joe first came in to Richmond, one of the big selling points to the community as well as the County was that he was going out and he had spent hours and hours of time going through Richmond, picking up the traditional Richmond feel and bringing it out, and that this would be a new development, a different type of development being urban mixed use, but he was bringing that characteristic of our area to this area. Now, I don’t know where you guys got off the train on it, but I hear you saying “break away from that” and where did we change you? Because, the proffers reflect those original meetings.

Mr. Antunovich - We have had an interesting discussion, and please, this is a discussion that is really a very open discussion because we will be coming back here with many buildings, and I can assure you that this is the one building that is a little bit different. It is a huge building. It is 64,000 square feet and we have tried to break this building down. Usually a grocery store has three solid walls and one wall that is open, as you enter. This is a free-standing building, and we collaborated here with what we think is really a marvelous, marvelous tenant, and we tried to come up with something that is part of the village. The rest of the village, Mr. Branin, looks exactly like the sketch books that we gave you, and we are committed to doing that. We are in with connected buildings, a huge building that is 450 feet long, and you will see in a month that is exactly consistent with the overall sketch pack. Here, though, our tenant is asking us to consider a slightly different, more eclectic, design at this important location. And, if we believe what we are saying about this being a village, we should be able to accept tenants, forward-thinking tenants that come forth with a slightly different view, and I believe that it is the material that will integrate this. The building, instead of just being a large box, has an enormous amount of interest. I think if there is some concerns about that one particular elevation where there is a lot of use of metal facing West Broad, in discussion earlier with our tenant, there would be some willingness to warm that elevation up and look at other materials.

Mr. Branin - Let me stop you right there. If you had said in your initial presentation, “Hey, look. We know we had a vision. We sold that vision to you all. We came in with that vision, and our tenant is now asking that we change it and we would like it to be considered.” But, instead, you took it a different direction in my opinion, and you said, there is no need to keep with this same pattern. We need to go with something different. I think it is the right building if it was an airport, or a school, or not in this development. I truly do. It is a beautiful building, but the architecture that you well-defined in the beginning, this is a far stretch, and I believe it doesn’t fall in line with proffers already provided. So, that is my comment. I am sure some of the other commissioners would like to ask a few questions.

Mr. Archer - I have got a couple of questions. Mr. Wilhite, in his presentation, indicated that staff felt like there was sort of an industrial flavor to the architectural, and Jim, I believe your name is, said you all had made a study of the vernacular at the time to see what might blend well in this area. Were you specific in where you looked, because…to try to gain that place?

Mr. Voelzke - Yes, we spent time in a bunch of different neighborhoods, more urban neighborhoods in Richmond, and one of the things we originally borrowed from is, when you are looking at kind of historical retail architecture, the sizes are much smaller than 60,000
square feet, and so we tried. We did deliberately try to look as well at how were 50,000 square foot buildings built back then, and we are certainly borrowing from both some more industrial vernacular, but also an agrarian vernacular in trying to blend those two together. Some of those that were a particular influence on this building were, I apologize and I don’t know the names of the neighborhood, but we spent a lot of time in a neighborhood going into the City, on Broad Street, maybe a mile or two west of Downtown. There is a TV station there and an art deco building and then a lot of kind of quasi warehouses, light industrial buildings.

Mr. Branin - Scott’s Addition and Seaboard? That area? Midtown?

Mr. Antunovich - Yes. There is fantastic architecture there and it looks like there is going to be some development happening and there is plenty of stuff going on. So, we spent a little bit of time there looking at a lot of kind of “30s” and early “40s” light industrial buildings, and then really tried to introduce to a standard retail in the smaller storefront openings and smaller canopies. It was intended to be reflective of numerous different kinds of vernacular in your community. I stress that it is hard. One of the things that we struggle with and are open to suggestions on is that it is hard to find a historical prototype for 60,000 square foot stores, and we struggled, not really struggled, but it is a goal of ours – it behooves us that the architectural details that we do create, have a certain architectural integrity to them. They are not sort of pasted on pieces onto a box that doesn’t look appropriate. One of the things that we had them do here is create a building that has some architectural integrity to it and that it is not trying to be anything other than what it is, which is, I am hesitant to say a grocery store, because Whole Foods is much more than that, but reflective of Whole Foods and the community.

I think, also, this building is very unique on our site. It is a single-story building, apart from the small mezzanine. That is a very, very large user. All of the other buildings except for the smaller out parcels that we will bring to you have either office above the retail, a hotel above the retail, or residential above the retail, and in that kind of design vernacular where we are dealing with four-story or three-story buildings where we can make them different and make them very consistent with what we had our original idea. I don’t want you to think that this is a vast separation, because I was looking at the book and I regret that we perhaps did not include some of the photographs and some of the sketches on Whole Foods, because I think at the time we were just not; I regret doing that now. But the other buildings that will come, because of their use, because of their mixed-use, will be very consistent with what we have committed to deliver to you.
Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, this is sort of like looking at art. One person sees something and another person sees another, and flying in and out of several airports, the top photo looks like an airport, looks like a hangar and I don’t think it is certainly intended for it to, but…

Mr. Antunovich - Are you referring to this photo?

Mr. Vanarsdall - It does look it.

Mrs. Jones - Are you finished, Mr. Vanarsdall? Just in addition to that, I wanted to ask, because we are all as enthused as you are. I cannot wait for this to be here and open, but our charge is to make sure that the case is moved ahead with the vision it was originally presented. The area of Richmond that was emphasized over and over again, during the presentation of West Broad Village, was the Fan District, and that, when you were using words to describe the Whole Foods, such as industrial eclectic, that is not part of the same architecture and vision, but just taking this first page of the handout today, looking at the middle section which is part of the classic vision that was presented to us, even the bank and the retail buildings have less delineation and rooflines than necessarily were presented at the first vision, and then Whole Foods, while I happen to be a contemporary nut, I live in Richmond, Virginia and have to operate under those taste guidelines a little more than most, but this is the first impression of West Broad Village for many. They will be coming in. This is a key location. Maybe these renderings don’t do the detail justice, as you were saying. The bricks are detail, but if you can’t place a façade into individual building sections because of the size of this building, that makes it even more important to emphasize what is distinctly Richmond, Fan, Village about this building. And I think you can achieve a modern look, not being an architect, with glass and light without sacrificing this vision with the roofline and the windows are redone. That is what is putting me off about this building. The roof line and the windows. Even the retail building in my view, has too much of a flat roof line as the solid line. And it is because, if you look at the middle pattern here, which are representative of what was presented to us for original approval, and you look top and bottom, it doesn’t seem to blend in my view. So, not being an architect, I am going to ask you a question. Are there roofline and window details and other things that can be done within the confines of a 64,000 square foot building to make it work?

Mr. Antunovich - Absolutely. And we are getting into one of the primary reasons why we wanted to come before you today, was really to sort of take from this what we need to do to soften the building and make the building more appealing to you all. The windows, most certainly, and we have tried, and we are looking at different options. The roofline was a sort of foot forward. We probably have the sloping roof on the whole east elevation right now, and sort of bring that whole roofline down and just create a different parapet, and then throughout the building, we do have kind of multiple stepping parapet lines. This is not a flat roof building at one elevation, so I think we will continue to look at ways to bring the roofline down. Penetration and certainly the northwest elevation can be looked at in numerous kinds of ways. The goal is to kind of create sort of a smaller punched opening rather than ribbon windows. I think that is a great idea and we can certainly look at that, especially as it pertains to this elevation.

Mr. Branin - So you came hoping to get some feedback?
Mr. Antunovich - We are anxious to get this store open and so we are anxious to move forward and we need to, we are well into construction documents at this point.

Mr. Branin - How long are you going to be in town?

Mr. Antunovich - I came from Washington, so it is an hour and a half drive.

Mr. Branin - So you don’t mind spending some time with staff and getting a feel for what we are looking for?

Mr. Antunovich - No. Anything, Mr. Branin. At this point, I think the response that we got from the Planning Commission is exactly what we wished to, and I think what we would like to do is have you consider Wachovia and the office and retail building, and we would like to pull back on Whole Foods and would like to be able to continue this discussion. I think we are, hopefully, on the agenda with another building a month from today, and perhaps we could defer this and work with staff and come back again with a revised design that would be a little more in keeping with…

Mr. Branin - You knew we were going to hate this?

Mr. Antunovich - Given the true spirit of collaboration with which we have worked here, it would be terrible to ask for a vote on this today, don’t you agree?

Mr. Branin - I don’t think you would like the vote you got.

Mr. Archer - I think I was experiencing the same thought pattern that Mr. Vanarsdall had when he talked about dealing in art. I don’t know if the Mona Lisa is smiling or frowning or smirking, and we have sort of got the same thing. UMU is sort of new to all of us right now and architecture, particular modern architecture can take so many different things. We haven’t had a chance to get used to it yet. So, I can understand why staff has some concerns about this because I think we all see something different when we look at these pictures, and I don’t know if we will ever reach a point where we all will see the same thing. We may not.

Mr. Branin - Unfortunately, we can’t build a full-scale mockup.

Mr. Archer - But anyway, I do think that this does need some more discussion.

Mr. Jernigan - I want to say something. If this building came through in a separate zoning case, and this was the architectural on a piece of property sitting somewhere, I think it is a nice looking building. I would vote for it in a condition like that. But you have to remember, this is 115 acre tract and we have proffers. This is a business of precedent, and if this building went through as far off of the proffers as it is, the next person that comes to us, with another building says, “Well, you let Whole Foods do it.” So, we have to stick close to the proffers. It is tough for your commissioners to get this far off of what is committed and get an approval on it. The building, like I say, I like it, but it is just not right for the area.
Mr. Antunovich - We, perhaps, should have brought all the other buildings through first, and then actually came with Whole Foods three months from now, and so it is just the schedule that we have, although, given the general tenor of the group today, I am not sure that even in three months we would have gotten a positive vote, so we will go back and…

Mr. Branin - I think one day of working it out, like I said when you came up and started speaking, I pulled up the same website that I have looked at it five times preparing for this meeting, and looked at a lot of the architectural characteristics fall in line with the vision of this project, and, there are only 68,000 people that have been keeping a close eye on this that I have to answer to, and when this airport shows up in their backyard and when they are expecting to see traditional Richmond, I’ve got a problem on my hands. So, does anybody else have anything?

Mr. Silber - Allow me to say from staff’s perspective, we look forward to working with you in the coming weeks to get this into a shape that we think may be more appropriate and we will be happy to work with Mr. Branin and other Commission members to bring back something more in keeping, and we look forward to working with you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - We don’t want to run you off. We want to help you.

Mr. Branin - Like I said when we started, we are excited that Whole Foods is coming. The people in the community are talking about it and they are excited about it, but they haven’t seen it.

Mr. Archer - OK. I guess we need to keep the meeting moving. Are we going to defer this, Mr. Branin?

Mr. Vanarsdall - I have one question and not relating to this, but we have gone to feet now and not floors, but on the, way down the road, but you are going to be handling that? The building is a 13-story building. It was in the paper and it is still 13 floors.

Mr. Antunovich - Yes, that is what we had agreed to was 13 floors.

Mr. Vanarsdall - One article said it was marketed at that and then I think Andy told me that it was, how many feet is that, 260?

Mr. Antunovich - It is 160 and I think we had also identified a height, had we not,
Mr. Vanarsdall - I just happened to think about it. I know it has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Antunovich - Just for your information, it is 13 floors at approximately 13 feet in height, so that is 159, or approximately that height.

Mr. Archer - Mr. Branin, I think you…

Mr. Jernigan - The airport is in my district, so if you want to bring this down my way, it would fit in.

Mr. Vanarsdall - I didn’t want to say anything when he said it was OK for him, but I wanted to say he lives near the airport and he grew up looking at big buildings.

Mr. Branin - Mr. Chairman, I am sure they are ready to get out of here. I would like to move for approval of POD-42-06, the retail building and the bank.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Branin and second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of that motion say aye. All opposed say no. The motion carries.

Mr. Silber - And I guess we are deferring the architectural for Whole Foods until one month from now?

Mr. Branin - Yes.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Silber - For us to come back on December 13.

Mr. Branin - Andy, are you deferring this or am I? I will defer it for you. I was so rough on you. I feel guilty.

Mr. Wilhite - We have a second architectural package that has been submitted and we can say it will be on the December agenda, so the Whole Foods Building can just be incorporated with that.

Mr. Branin - December 13. That is a rough date. OK.

Mr. Silber - So the architectural for Whole Foods will be deferred until December 13.
The Planning Commission approved POD-42-06, West Broad Village – West Broad Street/Three Chopt Road, the retail/office building and the bank, and deferred the architecturals for Whole Foods until December 13, 2006.

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

POD-64-06
Advance Auto @ East Towne Center – Charles City Road and Williamsburg Road

Balzer & Associates, Inc. for Jill-East Towne, LLC and Peck-East Towne, LLC: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one-story, 6,889 6,800 square foot retail building on an outparcel in an existing shopping center. The 0.88 0.45-acre site is located on the south side of Williamsburg Road (U.S. Route 60) at the intersection of Williamsburg Road and Charles City Road in the East Town Center Shopping Center on parcel 808-714-4906 and part of parcel 808-713-9182. The zoning is B-3, Business District. County water and sewer. (Varina)

Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-64-06, Advance Auto @ East Towne Center, in the Varina District? No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Greulich.

Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members, the applicant is requesting to construct a one-story retail building that is just less than 7,000 square feet in size on approximately 0.88 acres as shown on the addendum. This out parcel is considered part of the previously approved East Towne Shopping Center. The majority of issues were resolved to the satisfaction of the County; however, there was one outstanding issue that revolved around the appearance of the building. Staff has received revised architecturals as requested that depict vertical pilasters on all sides that help to break up the expanses of split-face CMU block. These can be more clearly seen on the overhead display of the revised architecturals. While these architecturals do not necessarily incorporate the predominant design features from the existing shopping center, they do represent an improvement over what was originally proposed. The applicant has also agreed to provide additional landscaping in the rear of the building to help screen it from Charles City Road.

With this staff recommends approval subject to the annotations on the plans, the annotations on the handout in the addendum, standard conditions for developments of this type and the additional conditions 24 through 42 as stated in the packet.

Staff and representatives of the applicant are present this morning to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Greulich. Are there questions from the Commission for Mr. Greulich?

You said they have agreed to put more landscaping in the back?

Yes, sir.

Who is representing Advance?

The representatives are the engineer and developer, not actually anyone from Advance.

Okay. Well, just note that this is in an existing shopping center that was a zoning case years ago but, in the future we are probably going to be looking for a little more roof detail than what’s on these buildings now. I know you had one built in your district.

Yes.

Down at the shopping center that’s down near the Show Place….

Yes.

… and I think you went by there and looked at that. Did that have a roof line on it or was that a flat front like this?

It did have more of a roof line on it. The roof line features, probably around the top part, it looks more like they were constructed of metal. The building didn’t have split-face CMU that they are proposing all the way to the top.

Well, there is not much we can do about it at this time….

It’s in the Oakhill Shopping Center.

Right. Like I said, there is not much that we can do because of the proffers of the case, but for the future, just for the record, we will be looking for some more enhanced roof features. All right. I don’t have any more questions, Mr. Chairman.

All right, then, sir, we are ready for a motion if you are.

Mr. Chairman, with that I will for approval of POD-64-06, Advance Auto @ East Towne Center – Charles City Road and Williamsburg Road, with the standard conditions for developments of this type, the following additional conditions Nos. 24 through 42 and on the addendum the square footage correction to the building at 6,889 and for the lot size at 0.88.

Second.
Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye….all opposed say nay. The motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved POD-64-06, Advance Auto @ East Towne Center, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

24. The right-of-way for widening of Williamsburg Road and Charles City 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.

25. 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.

26. 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.

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

28. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the south side of Williamsburg Road.

29. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the east side of Charles City Road.

30. All repair work shall be conducted entirely within the enclosed building.

31. Outside storage shall not be permitted.

32. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer must furnish a letter from Dominion Virginia Power stating that this proposed development does not conflict with their facilities.

33. 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.

34. 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.

35. The loading areas shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 24, Section 24-97(b) of the Henrico County Code.

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

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

38. 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.

Except for junction boxes, meters, and existing overhead utility lines, and for technical or
environmental reasons, all utility lines shall be underground.

Only retail business establishments permitted in a B-3 zone may be located in this center.
The ground area covered by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate 25 percent of
the total site area.

No merchandise shall be displayed or stored outside of the building(s) or on sidewalk(s).

Mr. Silber - That completes the plans for consideration. The remaining item on
your agenda would be the approval of minutes. These are the minutes from the October 25, 2006
meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 25, 2006

Mr. Archer - I think Mrs. Jones has corrected the minutes and posted her
corrections on the web site.

Mrs. Jones - I move we approve the minutes of October 25, 2006 as corrected.

Mr. Branin - Second.

Mr. Archer - All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes. The
minutes are approved.

Mr. Archer - All right this ends our meeting. May I have a motion for
adjournment?

Mrs. Jones - So moved.

Mr. Branin - Second.

Mr. Archer - With that, this meeting is adjourned at 10:11 a.m.
On a motion by Mrs. Jones and seconded by Mr. Branin, the Planning Commission adjourned its November 15, 2006 meeting at 10:11 a.m.

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

______________________________
Randall R. Silber, Secretary