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, October 24, 2001.

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

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

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

Mr. Archer - The Planning Commission will come to order. Good morning everyone. Is there anyone here from the press, we would like to recognize you? No one raised their hand, well we welcome you. I need to mention to everyone that previously we indicated that the November meeting was scheduled for 28th and the actual date is the correct date of November 28. Did I say that right, Ted?

Mr. Marlles - November 14 was the incorrect date and the correct date is November 28.

Mr. Archer - Okay. So, it is November 28, 2001. With that, I will turn this over to Mr. Marlles, our Secretary.

Mr. Marlles - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. We do have a full quorum today so, obviously, we can conduct business. The first item on the
agenda is the requests for deferrals and withdrawals. We do have quite a few items on
the list for deferrals and withdrawals. We also have quite a few items on the expedited
agenda. The list of requests for deferrals and withdrawals will be presented by Mr.
Ted McGarry.

Mr. Archer - Good morning, Mr. McGarry.

Mr. McGarry - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.
We have a total seven requests for deferrals and withdrawals. Seven items on the
Expedited agenda and six cases to be heard. So, it broke down very nicely. Your first
item is on page 3 of your agenda.

TRANSFER OF APPROVAL

POD-85-96
The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase I
(Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase 1)

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

Mr. McGarry - The applicant is requesting deferral to your November 28, 2001,
meeting.

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here in opposition to the deferment of this
transfer of approval for POD-85-96, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase I
(Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase 1), by the applicant? No
opposition. I move deferment of POD-85-96, The Cameron at Virginia Center to the
November 28, 2001, meeting at the applicant’s request.

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

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred transfer of approval
POD-85-96, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase I (Formerly The Chesapeake at
Virginia Center, Phase I) to the November 28, 2001, meeting.
TRANSFER OF APPROVAL

POD-20-98
The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase II
(Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase II)

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

Mr. McGarry - On page four, a companion transfer of approval for POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase II. The applicant is also requesting deferral to your November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here in opposition to the deferral of this transfer of approval for POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase II (Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase II)? No opposition. I move deferral of POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia Center to the November 28, 2001, meeting at the applicant’s request.

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

At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred transfer of approval POD-20-98, The Cameron at Virginia Center, Phase II (Formerly The Chesapeake at Virginia Center, Phase II) to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

TRANSFER OF APPROVAL

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

Blackwood Development Company for Richfield Associates, LLC: Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from Richmond Glen Eagle Association and Paragon Group to Richfield Associates, LLC. The 12.42 acre site is located at the northeast intersection of Ridgefield Parkway and Glen Eagles Drive on parcel 66-A-11F. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Tuckahoe)
Mr. McGarry - On page six of your agenda POD-61-90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center. The applicant is also requesting deferral to your November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here in opposition to the deferment of POD-61-90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center - Ridgefield Parkway? No opposition. Ms. Dwyer.

Ms. Dwyer - I move the transfer of approval for POD-61-90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center, be deferred to our November 28 meeting, at the applicant's request.

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

At the applicant's request, the Planning Commission deferred transfer of approval for POD-61-90, Glen Eagles Shopping Center - Ridgefield Parkway, to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

POD-76-01  Blue Dot - Fuel Facility - Audubon Drive

Engineering Design Associates for Carolyn M. Meares & John H. Ingram and Blue Dot, LLC: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct an unattended fueling facility. The 3.071-acre site is located on the north line of Audubon Drive approximately 1,200 feet east of Oakleys Lane on part of parcel 163-9-B-1D. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial District (Conditional) and ASO District (Airport Safety Overlay). County water and sewer. (Varina)

Mr. McGarry - The applicant is requesting to withdraw this item.

Mr. Archer - Do we have a motion?

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I’ll make a motion that we withdraw POD-76-01, Blue Dot Fuel Facility, from the agenda.

Mr. Vanarsdall - 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 carries.

At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission withdrew POD-76-01, Blue Dot - Fuel Facility - Audubon Drive from any further consideration.
John A. Wilson for Columbia Properties Virginia, Ltd.: Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from W. B. Johnson Properties to Columbia Properties Virginia Ltd. The 6.67 acre site is located along the west line of W. Broad Street (U. S. Route 250), approximately 1,600 feet north of Horsepen Road on parcel 92-A-28. The zoning is B-3, Business District, B-2, Business District and R-6, General Residence District. County water and sewer.

(Three Chopt)

Mr. McGarry - For the next item, there are three PODs involved; POD-113-78, POD-68-77 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn, the applicant is requesting deferral to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Archer - Is there opposition to the transfer for this deferral? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I'll move transfer of approval for POD-113-78, POD-68-77 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn – W. Broad Street, be deferred at the request of the applicant to November 28, 2001.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-113-78, POD-69-77 and POD-79-73, Holiday Inn – W. Broad Street, to the November 28, 2001, meeting.
LANDSCAPE, LIGHTING & ALTERNATIVE FENCE HEIGHT PLAN

LP/POD-40-96 Madison @ Spring Oaks Phase I - Three Chopt Road

Youngblood, Tyler & Associates, P.C. for SHLP Madison Development, L.L.C.: Request for approval of a landscape, lighting and alternative fence height plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106, 24-106.2 AND 24-95(l)(6)b. and c. of the Henrico County Code. The 16.73 acre site is located on the north line of Three Chopt Road, approximately 500 feet west of Pump Road on parcel 46-A-1W. The zoning is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional) and WBSO (West Broad Street Overlay) District. (Three Chopt)

Mr. McGarry - We will move forward to page 22 of your agenda. The Planning Commission is requesting deferral to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Archer - Is there opposition to this deferral, LP/POD-40-96, Madison @ Spring Oaks, Phase I - Three Chopt Road? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, just in explanation of why that choice was made to considering deferring at my request is because as of yesterday, when I talked with Ms. News, there were a number of outstanding items that needed to be resolved. The landscape architect was in Texas. He was proving hard to get in touch with. He was going to board a flight and fly and get here rather late and it was simply no way, in the time that we had, that Ms. News could do a creditable job so, I just want to move it back off the calendar. So, I move that the landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-40-96, Madison @ Spring Oak, Phase I, Three Chopt Road, be deferred at the request of the Planning Commissioner to November 28, 2001.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

The Planning Commission deferred the landscape, lighting and alternative fence height plan for LP/POD-40-96, Madison @ Spring Oaks, Phase I, Three Chopt Road, to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. McGarry - This is the last item on your list of request for deferrals and withdrawals. The Planning Commission also requests deferral for this case to the November 28, 2001, meeting.
LANDSCAPE, LIGHTING & ALTERNATIVE FENCE HEIGHT PLAN

LP/POD-82-96 Madison @ Spring Oaks Phase II – Three Chopt Road

Youngblood, Tyler & Associates, P.C. for SHLP

Madison Development L.L.C.: Request for approval of a landscape, lighting and alternative fence height plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106, 24-106.2 and 24-95(1)(6) b. and c. of the Henrico County Code. The 20.63 acre site is located on the north line of Three Chopt Road, approximately 1,000 feet west of Pump Road on parcel 36-A-50A. The zoning is R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional) and WBSO (West Broad Street Overlay) District. (Three Chopt)

Mr. Archer - Is there opposition to this deferral, LP/POD-82-96, Madison @ Spring Oaks, Phase II – Three Chopt Road? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move that the landscape, lighting and alternative fence height plan for LP/POD-82-96, Madison @ Spring Oak, Phase II, Three Chopt Road, be deferred at the request of the Planning Commissioner to November 28, 2001.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

The Planning Commission deferred the landscape, lighting and alternative fence height plan for LP/POD-82-96, Madison @ Spring Oaks, Phase II, Three Chopt Road, to the November 28, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda is the Expedited Agenda. And, again, this will be presented by Mr. McGarry.

Mr. Archer - All right. Mr. McGarry, carry on, sir.

Mr. McGarry - The first expedited case is on page 2 of your agenda.
TRANSFER OF APPROVAL

POD-100-93
New York Properties, L.C.
9220 Brook Road

James W. Theobald: Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from New York Properties, LLC to Huss Holdings, LLC. The 1.431 acre site is located at 9220 Brook Road on the southwest corner of the intersection of New Your Avenue and Brook Road (U.S. Route 1) on parcels 43-2-14-18 and 21. The zoning is O-1C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Fairfield)

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the transfer of approval request for POD-100-93, New York Properties, L.C.? No opposition. I move approval of POD-100-93, New York Properties, L.C., subject to the standard conditions and additional condition No. 1 listed on the agenda.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-100-93, New York Properties, L.C. - 9220 Brook Road, to transfer from New York Properties, LLC to Huss Holdings, LLC, subject to the conditions previously approved by the previous owner and the following additional conditional.

1. Deficiencies as identified in the inspector’s report dated October 10, 2001, shall be corrected or bonded by December 1, 2001.

TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the May 23, 2001 Meeting)

POD-14-97
Westwood Retail Center - 6221 W. Broad Street

McCandlish Kaine for Sky, Inc.: Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, from Richmond Horsepen, LLC to David W. Clarke, Esquire for Sky, Inc. The 1.837 acre site is located on the southeast corner of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) on Horsepen Road on parcels 103-4-28-10 and 103-A-1. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. (Three Chopt)

Mr. McGarry - There is an addendum on this case, and the purpose of the addendum is to correct the caption.
Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to the transfer of approval request for POD-14-97, Westwood Retail Center? No opposition. Mr. Taylor

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of transfer of approval POD-14-97, Westwood Retail Center at Three Chopt and the comments on the addendum.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved the transfer of approval request for POD-14-97, Westwood Retail Center - 6221 W. Broad Street, to transfer from Richmond Horsepen, LLC to Sky, Inc., subject to the conditions previously approved by the previous owner and the following additional conditional.

1. The deficiencies as identified in the inspectors report dated April 11, 2001, shall be corrected or bonded by December 1, 2001.

SUBDIVISION

Groome Estates (October 2001 Plan) Engineering Design Associates for C. T. & Joanne S. Groome: The 0.930 acre site is located along the north line of Yates Lane approximately 150 feet west of Lowell Street on part of parcel 147-A-108. The zoning is R-2A, One-Family Residence District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. County water and sewer. (Varina) 3 Lots

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to Groome Estates (October 2001 Plan)? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve Groome Estates subdivision subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for subdivisions served by public utilities.

Ms. Dwyer - Second.

Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in favor say aye... all opposed say nay. The motion carries.
The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Groome Estates (October 2001 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for subdivisions served by public utilities and the annotations on the plan.

**LANDSCAPE PLAN (Deferred from the September 26, 2001, Meeting)**

**LP/POD-4-01**
Citizens & Farmers Bank - Williamsburg Road

*Ken Magalis and Jeff Collins for Citizens and Farmers Bank:* Request for approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24.106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 1.81 acre site is located on the northeast corner of Williamsburg Road and Garland Avenue at 104 Williamsburg Road on parcel 164-2-10-H. The zoning is B-1, Business District and ASO District (Airport Safety Overlay). *(Varina)*

**Mr. McGarry** - There is an addendum for this case, and the addendum is for a revised plan. The addendum purpose a six-foot-high vinyl fence adjacent to a single-family residence that has been revised to a board on board fence, to provide a finished face on both sides of the fence.

**Ms. Dwyer** - So, the only change to it is to white vinyl board fence.

**Ms. News** - Yes, ma’am. It’s white vinyl and the plan also incorporated all of the annotations that were on the original plan.

**Mr. Archer** - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition the landscape plan for LP/POD-4-01, Citizens & Farmers Bank? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

**Mr. Jernigan** - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve landscape plan, LP/POD-4-01, Citizens & Farmers Bank on Williamsburg Road, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for landscape plan, plus the addendum.

**Mr. Taylor** - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-4-1, Citizens & Farmers Bank - Williamsburg Road, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for landscape plans.
REVISION OF PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT
(Deferred from the September 26, 2001, Meeting)

POD-70-01
Elko Union Church - Elko Road

Engineering Design Associates for Elko Union Church: 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, 12,000 square foot multi-purpose building and master plan that would authorize a future one-story, 12,000 square foot sanctuary as well as additional parking. The 7.45 acre site is located at 6861 Elko Road (State Route 156) on parcels 156-2-C, 6, 9, 13 and 16 and 156-2-D-1, 19 and 20 210-A-16 and 19A and 210-6-B-6, 7, 8, and 9. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. (Varina)

Mr. McGarry - There is an addendum for this case and that addendum adds conditions No. 34, which states that the access from Elko Road (State Route 156) shall be redesigned to satisfy the requirements of the County Traffic Engineer and the Resident Engineer of VDOT’s Sandston Residency Office.

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-70-01, Elko Union Church? No opposition. Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve POD-70-01, Elko Union Church on Elko Road, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type and the following additional conditions Nos. 23 through 33, plus No. 34 on the addendum.

Mr. Vanarsdall - 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 carries.

The Planning Commission approved POD-70-01, Elko Union Church - Elko Road, subject to the standard conditions attached to the minutes for developments of this type, not served by public utilities, the annotations on the plan and the following additional conditions.

23. The right-of-way for widening of Elko Road (State Route 156) 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.
24. 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.

25. The entrances and drainage facilities on State Route 156 shall be approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.

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 Planning Office prior to any occupancy permits being issued.

27. 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.

28. The temporary parking areas shall be properly compacted and maintained at all times.

29. The applicant shall furnish proof to the Planning Office that conditions satisfactory to the Health Department have been met that insure the proposed septic tank drainfield system is suitable for this project prior to the issuance of a building permit.

30. 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.

31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

32. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and information purposes only. All subsequent detailed plans of development and construction plans needed to implement this conceptual plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and shall be subject to all regulations in effect at the time such subsequent plans are submitted for review/approval.

33. The section of Elko Station subdivision occupied by the site shall be vacated, including a portion of landscape easements, utility easements and Caboose Lane prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy.

34. Access from Elko Road (State Route 156) shall be redesigned to satisfy the requirements of the County Traffic Engineer and the Resident Engineer of VDOT’s Sandston Residency Office.
SUBDIVISION

Millspring Townes (October 2001 Plan)

Bay Design Group, P.C. for River Tower Building #3 and Wilton Development Corporation: The 23.43 acre site is located along the west line of Hungary Spring Road, approximately 200 feet north of Olde West Drive on parcel 50-A-39. The zoning is RTHC, Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) and C-1, Conservation District. County water and sewer. (Brookland) 150 Lots

Mr. McGarry - There is an addendum to this case also. The purpose of the addendum is to revised the recommendation for an approval, plus you still have the conditions Nos. 13 through 15 in your original staff report and the annotations have been added to the revised plan and the annotations are for the design of traffic and they all deal with improvements to Hungary Spring Road.

Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to subdivision to Millspring Townes?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Wilhite can shed some light on this new plan. There are no changes on it, I believe.

Mr. Archer - All right.

Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. Staff received a revised plan prior to the staff/developer meeting so we got one a lot earlier than we normally do. But, we did not have time to get every agency’s comments into that plan. We were lacking Design from the Division of Public Works and the Traffic Engineer and those have been added to this plan. They deal with the widening of Hungary Spring Road and the future dedication of approximately 9 ½ feet of right-of-way right along Hungary Spring and the escrow of the improvements required of the developer. There is no change to the plan itself, other then the annotations. Staff can recommend approval.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

Ms. Dwyer - I just have one question. This cul-de-sac that adds an access to the school and then from that cul-de-sac there’s a rather long access to this particular development. Do you have any examples of those elsewhere in the County or is this kind of a novel approach? I can’t recall seeing anything like this. I was trying to visualize what that would look like and I couldn’t.

Mr. Wilhite - Off the top of my head, no I can not. We do have Todd Eure, the traffic engineer, here. Perhaps he can give you some examples.
Ms. Dwyer - I think we looked at this at zoning time, didn't we Mr. Vanarsdall, this access the way that would be configured? That's all right. I'll just talk to Mr. Eure later. I was just trying to get an idea of how that would look.

Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't know why it would look any different then a regular cul-de-sac, do you?

Mr. Wilhite - I would think it is more or less a standard cul-de-sac.

Mr. Vanarsdall - It was put in there to keep people from.... To give people a chance to turnaround or something like that.

Ms. Dwyer - All right. I guess the difference is that you have a cul-de-sac.... Well, it looks like a long driveway with a cul-de-sac kind of in the middle of it and then access to lots on the backside. It's just that I've never seen that before.

Mr. Wilhite - Yes. This would be a dedicated public road that goes to, at least the rear of the parking lot on the school property. From that point on, it would be private to the development itself.

Ms. Dwyer - I think I remember that coming up at zoning time.

Mr. Taylor - I think one of the reasons for that was to accommodate the school buses, which needed a little wider space.

Ms. Dwyer - I think it gave the school an access point that they didn't already have.

Mr. Wilhite - Yes. That's correct. The strip of land there now is all wooded, to the road. There is no driveway there now. I've been informed by the traffic engineer that this is a 45-foot radius, which is a standard size cul-de-sac that you would find in normal subdivisions.

Mr. Archer - All right, is there any further discussion? There is no opposition.

Mr. Vanarsdall.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, I move Millspring Townes (October 2001 Plan) subdivision be approved with the revised plans we have this morning dated October 7, 2001. Is that right, Kevin?

Mr. Wilhite - It's October 8.
Mr. Vanarsdall - October 8. The standard conditions for subdivisions of this type, the annotations on the plans and then we have Nos. 13, 14, and 15 additional conditions and then on the addendum on page 3 it just simply says that staff recommends conditional approval.

Ms. Dwyer - Second.

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

The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision Millspring Townes (October 2001 Plan) subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for residential townhouse subdivisions served by public utilities, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions.

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

14. The proffers approved as part of zoning case C-30C-01 shall be incorporated in this approval.

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

Mr. McGarry - On page 15 of your agenda, this is the Professional Office at CrossRidge, POD-74-01. Mr. Vanarsdall, I understand that you requested that this be removed from the Expedited Agenda.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes. I would like to remove this from the Expedited Agenda.

Mr. Kennedy - The applicant is requesting the same thing.

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

**POD-74-01**  
Professional Office at CrossRidge - Staples Mill Road

Jordan Consulting Engineers, P. C. for Staples Mill, L.C.: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 35,676 square foot office. The 8.92 acre site is located 1,000 feet south of Staples Mill Road (State Route 33) on part of parcel 40-A-14. The zoning is O-2C, Office District
At the request of the Planning Commissioner and the applicant this case was moved from the Expedited Agenda and placed on the regular agenda.

Mr. McGarry - The last item of which staff is aware of is on page 25.

LANDSCAPE PLAN

LP/POD-12-00 Hunton Baptist Church Facility Expansions

TIMMONS for Hunton Baptist Church: 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 8.98 acre site is located at the intersection of Old Washington Highway and Greenwood Road on parcels 14-8-11-55A and 14-8-12-54B. The zoning is District B-3, Business District and A-1, Agricultural District. (Brookland)

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to this landscape plan, LP/POD-12-00, Hunton Baptist Church? No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval of landscape plan LP/POD-12-00, Hunton Baptist Church Facility Expansion, with the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for landscape plans.

Mr. Taylor - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-12-00, Hunton Baptist Church - Facility Expansion, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for landscape plans.

Mr. Archer - All right. We are done with the Expedited Agenda. Okay, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Marlies - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda is a review of the subdivision extensions of conditional approval. Those will be presented by Mr. Kevin Wilhite. And, again, these are being presented for informational purposes only.

(FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSE 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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Mr. Wilhite - We had four subdivisions listed for administrative extension on the agenda. Dakota Estates, which was listed, has been pulled off and has been placed on the agenda for Planning Commission approval of this extension. If you have any questions of the other three subdivisions, I’ll be happy to answer.

Mr. Archer - All right, are there any questions? No questions. Do we need to take any further action, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. Jernigan - We have to vote on Dakota Estates for a 60-day extension.

Mr. Marlles - Right. That will be taken up under the next category of requests, which do require Planning Commission approval. Mr. Wilhite, would you review those?

---

**FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

<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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Ridge Cluster Lot</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oct. 1994 Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/23/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formerly Stuarts Ridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millrace</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(October 1990 Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/23/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Estates</td>
<td>Varina</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May 2000 Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Wilhite - The first one is Magnolia Ridge Cluster Lot development October 1994 plan. There were 387 lots originally approved and there are only 21 lots remaining lacking final approval. Staff recommends an extension of one year.
Mr. Archer - Do we need to move on that?

Mr. Marilles - Yes, sir.

Mr. Archer - Okay. I move to grant the extension.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

Mr. Wilhite - The next case is Millrace (October 1990 Plan). This was extended by the Planning Commission last year. There were 35 lots approved and there are 10 lots remaining that lack final approval. We are recommending extension of one year with the same condition that was attached to the extension last year. And that read: This development shall meet all ordinance requirements currently in effect as of the date of this extension. With that condition, staff recommends approval.

Mr. Archer - All right, we need a motion.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I’ll move extension for Millrace subdivision for one year to October 23, 2002, with the condition.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Wilhite - The subdivision that was removed from the administration portion, Dakota Estates (May 2000 Plan) approved for 80 lots. This was eligible for administrative extension by the Director of Planning. He has requested that this be pulled and place on the agenda for Planning Commission approval due to the recent change in the Multi-Family development standards. We have received a revised plan, which we have started to review. Staff is recommending an extension of two months, to the December 19, 2001, hearing.

Mr. Archer - All right, any discussion? We are ready for a motion.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to extend for 60 days, Dakota Estates subdivision.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye...all opposed say nay. The ayes have it.
The Planning Commission approved the extension of conditional approval for one year, October 23, 2002, for Magnolia Ridge Cluster Lot and Millrace (October 1990 Plan). The approval for Dakota Estates was approved for two months, to the December 19, 2001, meeting.

Mr. Archer - All right, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Marlies - Mr. Chairman, I believe the first case is way back on page 14 of your agenda. This is a request by Hallwood Farms, Section B. It’s a request for approval of a stem lot exception as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-95(w) and in Chapter 19, Section 19-4(c) of the Henrico Code to resubdivide an existing lot and create two standard cul-de-sac lots and two stem lots. The 3.8 acre site is located on the western terminus of Hallwood Farm Road. The staff report will be given by Mr. Kennedy.

SUBDIVISION & STEM LOT EXCEPTION

Hallwood Farms, Section B
(A Resubdivision of Lots 36 and 37 and Common Areas)
(October 2001 Plan)

Engineering Design Associates for H. W. Owens, Inc.: Request for approval of a stem lot exception as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-95(w) and Chapter 19, Section 19-4(c) of the Henrico County Code to resubdivide an existing lot and create two standard cul-de-sac lots and two stem lots. The 3.8 acre site is located on the western terminus of Hallwood Farm Road (under construction) on parcels 140-7-A-100, 146-11-A-36 and 37. The zoning is R-3AC, One-Family Residence District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. County water and sewer. (Varina) 4 Lots

Mr. Archer - Is there opposition to Subdivision and Stem Lot Exception? No opposition. Mr. Kennedy. Good morning, sir.

Mr. Kennedy - Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. I am sorry, but I am kind of running in from trying to meet with people out in the hall. Hallwood Farms was previously approved by the Commission and they were authorized to have a maximum of 47 lots. They have 45. This would make, permit them to meet under the proffers what is the maximum. However, the resubdivision to create these two new lots, by the resubdivision of two existing lots and the BMP would require Stem Lot Exception by the Planning Commission. The conditions of an exception by the Planning Commission are contained in the addendum to the agenda and we provided that to you, so that you know the four standards that have to be met. We’d like to just draw your attention to the standards, so that you are aware of what is the criteria that is necessary for someone to request an exception by the Planning Commission and I’d like to read those to you for the purpose of putting it into the record.
(a) Generally. When the planning commission, as agent for conditional plat approval, or the director of planning, as agent for final plat approval, finds that extraordinary hardship may result from development of a particular parcel in strict compliance with this chapter, either may grant an exception, provided:

1. The exception substantially complies with the provisions of this chapter, does not defeat the chapter’s purposes, and protects the public interest;
2. The exception will not be detrimental to public safety, health or welfare or injurious to surrounding property or improvements;
3. The conditions on which the exception request is based are unique to the property, are not generally applicable to other property and do not create mere inconvenience; and
4. The exception is not based exclusively on financial considerations.

So, that is the criteria you have to consider to an exception request. As we look at the request, we requested the applicant provide you a house siting plan and that is attached to the agenda. If you take a look at the orientation of the houses on it, they are not a typical orientation. It is a very awkward orientation with the lots facing at very awkward angles, and it is not a typical. It is one of the reasons we adopted stem lot rules was to prevent this type of awkward orientation. The other thing I’d like to draw your attention to is on Lot 36, the fact that it has got a very limited rear yard. The RPA comes up basically to the house. Now the house that is shown on these plans is a proffered house size. In this development there are proffered minimum house sizes. Now, it could be a ranch, it would be a minimum of 1,100 square feet. It could be a Cape Code, it would be a minimum of 1,350 square feet. Neither one of those would fit on this lot. Or it could be a two-story house, with a minimum of 1,500 square feet, with a 750 square foot footprint. That is what is placed on that lot. What you see is what that person would get. They would be able to walk out their rear door and 10 feet from their rear door they would hit the RPA and would not be able to have any improvements, cut down a tree, put a playground in or do any development behind their house. They could not put a shed or do any development. So, we don’t feel that this is appropriate development. We did talk to the applicant and the applicant did provide a couple of alternative layouts with one three lots as stem lots. Again, we found those same sorts of problems. The reality of it is that Lot 36 is not a very good lot under the current layout, but it has open space next to it which is a BMP. It doesn’t have that. It does have an open field despite the fact that it doesn’t have any development potential. Now that the BMP is no longer there, staff’s recommendation is actually to incorporate that BMP site into Lot 36 and make it a true marketable lot where someone can actually have a buildable area, and actually have a yard that they can use. And that is what our feeling is. We don’t feel that the conditions of the special exception are met, and that is what our recommendation is at this time.

Ms. Dwyer - Where is the BMP located?
Mr. Kennedy - The BMP is located basically where those two stem lots are created. That is where the BMP was located.

Ms. Dwyer - Is the 36A and 36B?

Mr. Kennedy - Right.

Mr. Marlles - Mr. Kennedy, is my memory right that this is the first time since the Ordinance as amended that we actually had a request for the Planning Commission for an exception?

Mr. Kennedy - To the best of my recollection, that is true, and that is the reason why we listed the conditions. It is such a unique animal that we wanted the Commission to understand the conditions, which would have to be offered.

Mr. Marlles - And also, this particular amendment was part of a series of recommendations to improve the quality of lot design within the County?

Mr. Kennedy - That is true, sir. And we, actually that is the reason we asked for a house siting plan because we wanted to see if it conformed to what we considered the policy that we are trying to establish in the development of these stem lots. I am sure there are cases where stem lots are effective on large lot subdivisions, when you have large lots and small street frontages in a rural area, but in this case we don’t think, because of the orientation of the house being so close and the way they are crowded, and the orientation, that it is appropriate, and meets the criteria that we set forth.

Ms. Dwyer - So what you are saying is that while we recognize the existence of the wetlands and the floodplain create a problem for developing this site, it is not our job to create unlivable or inappropriate lot design to compensate for that?

Mr. Kennedy - That is right. Those conditions existed prior to the development of the site, and there is no guarantee that you get 47 lots just because you proffered for it.

Ms. Dwyer - That would be the maximum.

Mr. Kennedy - That would be the maximum.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Kennedy, are there any hardships in this case that you know of?

Mr. Kennedy - No, because they already have the lots as they are, so they have the existing lots. They could move forward with it. They were moving forward with it.
previously, so as far as, I mean it would be a financial incentive to them, but there is no hardship if you don't have the development potential for the site.

Ms. Dwyer- Is it your opinion that two lots could be created instead of the four and they would be acceptable? Is that what you were saying?

Mr. Kennedy- What we were saying is that the BMP lot that is there, which is not really a lot. It is just a BMP common area could be incorporated into the current lot 36 and make it a much more reasonable buildable area, and because it was open space prior to this, the open space of that lot, it didn't have as much impact as putting that house on that lot, and it already is a very tight site. So, we felt that the best thing would be to accommodate the redevelopment of this site would be to incorporate the BMP into existing Lot 36, which could be done administratively.

Ms. Dwyer- Are you saying Lot 36A and 36B would be one lot?

Mr. Kennedy- Exactly.

Ms. Dwyer- And then 37 would be the second lot?

Mr. Kennedy- Exactly, that is already there, but they were just changing the boundary lines a little to adjust, but they would not require conditional approval to do that. That is administrative action that could be done for the final by adjusting lot lines.

Ms. Dwyer- Have you discussed the potential for using this as common area? The neighborhood could develop it or is it not appropriate for that?

Mr. Kennedy- We haven't, basically it becomes a maintenance item for a common area, and we have continuing concerns about that, about income levels and maintenance of common areas. As I discussed previously, house sizes are not extremely large. You are talking about maintenance costs for a Homeowners Association which becomes a hardship to be able to collect those things and maintain it, so our recommendation is that it be incorporate into the adjoining lots.

Ms. Dwyer- OK, thank you.

Mr. Kaechele- On Lot 36B, that drainage easement that goes through the home, is there room to relocate that?

Mr. Kennedy- It could be relocated along the property line, but as a matter of course we just feel that, again, impacts the development of that site, limits the development potential. What they have shown these house siting plans, the minimum house size to be able to build doesn't give them a lot of buildable area outside those...
areas to put thing in, particularly in Lot 36. There is no development potential outside of that house.

Mr. Kaechele - So, there is no proffer in that subdivision as to the house size, it's just minimum.

Mr. Kennedy - The house size is proffered. If it is a one-story house, it needs to be 1,100 square feet, which is pretty minimal. If it is a two-story house, it's 1,350 feet, I mean one and a half story cape cod. If it is a two-story house, it has to be 1,500 square feet. What they have shown on these lots are 1,500 square foot two story houses because that's the only thing that would fit on Lot 36. It is so tight that you couldn't even fit a rancher on this property, under the proffers.

Mr. Kaechele - Thank you.

Mr. Kennedy - The applicant has a representative here to make a presentation. They are entitled to make a presentation on the merits of the case. You have heard the staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Archer - Okay, Mr. Jernigan, are you ready to hear from the applicant?

Mr. Jernigan - Yes.

Ms. Isaac - Good morning. As Mr. Kennedy told you there was a BMP and under the Stream Restoration Program and Public Work, the BMP was eliminate. The developer wanted to incorporate that area back into the subdivision as buildable lot. Initially, the request was for four lots and after the staff/developer meeting with the County a redesign was done, base on 3 lots. The lot layout was done. One of the concerns in eliminating steam lots was that you had houses facing into the rear of other houses. We tried to eliminate that with the layout that was presented. I have talked to Mr. Kennedy and I've talked to Mr. Jernigan. I know their concerns and based on that, I really have nothing else to say.

Mr. Jernigan - Ms. Isaac, is there any hardship case in this?

Ms. Isaac - I think not.

Mr. Jernigan - I see problems, first of all, on the condition No. 1. I don’t feel that, for public interest, we ought to have a house that has SPA coming up 10 feet behind the door. And the second thing, I think is for financial consideration. The BMP is gone, which means they had to make a donation to the SPA fund and that was probably half or less than what the BMP was going to cost. I can’t approve this.
Ms. Isaac - I understand.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I want to make a motion that we deny subdivision case Hallwood Farms, extension. Excuse me, lot split.

Mr. Archer - Hallwood Farms Resubdivision.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Jernigan - Hallwood Farms Resubdivision, excuse me. I'm sorry, Ms. Isaac.

Ms. Isaac - I understand.

Mr. Jernigan - You do your job and I do mine.

Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. Those in favor of the motion say aye...those opposed say no. The ayes have and the motion is granted.

The Planning Commission vote a 5 to 0 with Mr. Kaechele abstaining, denied the subdivision request for Hallwood Farms, Section B (A Resubdivision of Lots 36 and 37 and Common Areas) (October 2001 Plan)

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

**POD-74-01 Professional Office at CrossRidge - Staples Mill Road**

*Jordan Consulting Engineers, P. C. for Staples Mill, L.C.:* Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 35,676 square foot office. The 8.92 acre site is located 1,000 feet south of Staples Mill Road (State Route 33) on part of parcel 40-A-14. The zoning is O-2C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer. *(Brookland)*

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-74-01, Professional Office at CrossRidge? No opposition. Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy - Hello ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, I'm back again. There has been some public interest on this case and we do have a couple of the neighbors who live in the Courtney Subdivision. They have had some discussion with the applicant and with myself, but they still feel that they need to see a public presentation. That's why I am making the presentation at this time. I think for the time...
being the applicant has resolved their concerns but I think they need to hear the public
presentation of this.

Mr. Archer - Okay.

Mr. Kennedy - As we have gone through this, the CrossRidge development, we've
gotten an overall plan. Let me see if I can get it up on the screen. It’s not very clear,
but in any case, as we have indicated we have the overall master plan for CrossRidge on
the screen in front of you. The Planning Commission has previously approved basically
everything that’s shown on here.

Mr. Vanarsdall - What’s wrong with the screen? It’s jumpy and it’s bothering my
eyes.

Mr. Kennedy - Yes, it is. I don’t know what is going on with the screen. It’s
pulsating. But, in any case, the Oaks, single-family residential development to the north
has been approved as a conditional and it’s under Phase I construction. Phase II is
subject to conditional approval but has not had final approval. On the Carriage Homes,
coming down Staples Mill Road, the Carriage Homes are two-family condos. That’s
under construction. It was previously approved by the Planning Commission as POD.
The Pavilion site that was previously approved is under construction, it’s almost complete
and it’s almost ready to be occupied. Of course, CrossRidge Way has been under
construction and was approved by the Planning Commission and they have landscape
plan approval. In front of the Pavilion, where it says proposed office, that’s the United
Methodist Family Office Building. That also has POD approval. They are in for
construction plan signatures. They are getting sign plans now. They should start
construction shortly. Moving down along the site, the commercial property has no plan
right now. There are discussions but there is no current plan that has been before the
Commission or the staff. The next thing is, and it’s very hard to read, is the The
Cottages, Section 1. That has subdivision and POD approval by the Planning
Commission and is under construction. Further down along, The Townes, Section 1,
also has POD and subdivision approvals under construction. The apartments have not
been seen by the Commission. The Townes, Section 2, and The Cottages, Section 2
have been tentatively approved by the Planning Commission, they have not come in for
final approval.

Basically, what we are now looking at is the office building along Staples Mill Road, the
southernmost one, which is adjacent to Courtney. On the other side of Courtney is The
Greens, which is a single-family subdivision. That is tentative approval. They are
working out permits with The Army Corps of Engineers and that should be under
construction some time in the spring. Courtney, of course, is a subdivision that’s
surrounded by CrossRidge. There are a lot of other subdivisions that abut it, but
Courtney is the sole subdivision that’s surrounded by CrossRidge and clearly is the
affected property by this development. Courtney was developed about 40 years ago. So,
they are used to having woods around them and this development is a severe change from
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what they were used to do. The proposed office building is a two-story office building. It’s approximately 36,000 square feet. It has a standing seam metal roof and a brick façade. The property, if you look at the site plan, is occupied by several large water features. In the front you have property owned by somebody else, along Staples Mill Road. It’s zoned A-1 that person has had some discussion with staff and they are, more then likely, going to come in for rezoning sometime in the future. Going along Staples Mill Road, next to that other parcel there is a big wetland site. That’s the reason why there is no development there. And, then, along Staples Mill Road, there’s the entrance which lines up with the Warren Road signalized entrance of the signalized intersection on Staples Mill Road, there a BMP. That BMP is approximately one acre in size. Then to the back of the site you have the parking, in a row, and then you have the building and behind the building there is another BMP, which is approximately three quarters of an acre in size. Those two BMPs are actually BMPs that serve all of CrossRidge. The drainage from CrossRidge from all the multi-family development cuts through this site and actually crosses over. It eventually ends up in Laurel Lakes, the lakes on the other side of Staples Mill and Hungary. So, basically, they crossover. The crossover point is at this office building. That’s the reason there is actually a wetlands in front of this building, that’s the natural drainage way was there. The proffers for CrossRidge require that a masonry wall be constructed along the property line, the common line, for Courtney subdivision. It says: The masonry wall may be up to eight feet in height. And that “may be up to eight feet in height” actually is an exception. It would be an exception under our rules. Normally, you can’t have anything over six feet in height without having an exception but that would be a fence height exception. But, that would authorize them to have that as an exception. The intention of that wall was also to screen and provide protection from the residents of Courtney from the intensity of this development. The office building is set approximately 120 feet away from the nearest property line. Primarily, what abuts the common property line of Courtney, are these two BMPs. There are going to be ponds with water features. So, they will be wet ponds, not dry ponds. There has been some concern by the neighbors about mosquitoes breeding. The actual purpose of these ponds is, of course, for stormwater management both quantity and quality. And we don’t wish them to be mosquitoes breeding grounds. That’s the reason why we want them to be fountains. The office building sees them as an amenity. They are substantial in size but they also will look and feel like this office building of something you would find in Innsbrook, of that quality.

There is a conceptual landscape plan that has been submitted as well in your package. That conceptual landscape plan was just for the buffer that surrounds the property. It’s between them and the adjoining residential property and along, because of the BMPs, separation from Staples Mill Road. The buffer, in addition, they normally need to meet a 10-foot transitional buffer. If this was straight zoned property, without any proffers, between the office and residential, they would be required to have a 10-foot transitional buffer planting. They have the 10-foot transitional buffer planting and on top of that they have the wall. So, they are more than exceeding what would be normal development standards in this area. Along the front, along Staples Mill Road, they have a 30-foot
proffered buffer between them and any development along Staples Mill Road. That shows planting equivalent to the 25-foot transitional buffer, which is pretty substantial. It's meant to be screen so that that's not visible.

Basically, that's my presentation. I know I have overwhelmed you with a lot of material and I know it's very difficult to see this plan because of the wobbling on the screen, but if you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them. I guess the only other thing I can tell you, as far as my understanding, is it is a professional office building, it's not necessarily meant to be a medical office building, it's meant to be just a general professional office building.

Mr. Archer - All right. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Are there any questions of Mr. Kennedy by the Commission?

Ms. Dwyer - So, the wall is on the residence side of the property line?

Mr. Kennedy - Yes. That's the way it was proffered, on the residence side.

Ms. Dwyer - And the landscaping is on the opposite side.

Mr. Kennedy - Right. On the other side with trees that would go above the wall, hopefully.

Ms. Dwyer - It looks like the slope for the BMP begins almost at the property line.

Mr. Kennedy - Basically, it's a 10-foot shoulder.

Ms. Dwyer - On the first page it looks like the pond is somewhat removed from the property line, but when you look at the topos it shows it sloping on this 10-feet off and then it goes slightly in.

Mr. Kennedy - Right. The water quality limit can't be any closer than 10 feet from the wall. So, the water level is there. Basically, the 100-year storm would be no closer than 10 feet to the wall.

Ms. Dwyer - What would the water level be in the BMP, typically, do you know?

Mr. Kennedy - Let me just take a look at the plan. I don't know offhand.

Ms. Dwyer - It's intended to be a wet pond.
Mr. Kennedy - It’s intended to be a wet pond. I think it’s shown on one of the
plan. The proposed surface elevation will be at 240 level. The wall itself is about 253
feet and the pond level is at 240 feet. So, it would be about 13 feet below grade, at the
wall.

Ms. Dwyer - Did you say that there will be fountains.

Mr. Kennedy - There will be fountains in both ponds. As far as protection, you
know, that there is always a concern that neighborhood children could fall in and that’s
part of the basis of having a wall there as well. It provides, you know, fence or, you
know some point where it doesn’t become an attraction nuisance.

Ms. Dwyer - What kind of masonry wall?

Mr. Kennedy - We haven’t gotten to that point yet. It will be a part of the
landscape plan approval. I understand that it will be brick, at this point. We’ve raised
the issue with some of the neighbors that they may not want this wall to be the full eight
feet and we’ve encouraged Atack to have that discussion just because eight feet is actually
walling them out as opposing to walling in, what is almost a natural area. So, we’ve
asked them to reconsider that because we think that eight feet may be excessive. And
they may actually end up being happier with having the trees behind them, the tree
canopy at six feet, possibly even five feet. I think that they really need to think about
that. The neighbors have expressed concerned that their houses are on a higher grade
and slopes down, but I really don’t think that there view is going to be terrible. The
majority of the parking lot is away from there and I think when it comes in for screening
I think we can do something, where the parking is abutting that section of the property
with providing some continuous evergreen screen at that location. So, basically,
everyone else is looking at ponds. I think it can be accommodated at landscape plan
approval.

Ms. Dwyer - So, maybe more evergreens around where the parking lot is.

Mr. Kennedy - Yes. I think we can concentrate that.

Ms. Dwyer - It looks like you have American Hollies, and you don’t get any
better than that.

Mr. Kennedy - We wanted to have this schematic landscape plan so that we would
actually be able to give you some idea of what the developer was attempting to do on this
site. As with all development we have had so far, on the main entranceway on
CrossRidge, they well exceeded all of our landscape requirements. And, again, even
here, even at this point, the typical landscape proffer, the typical transitional buffer
requirement, they have already exceeded just because they have provided wall in addition
to the landscape planting as well.
Mr. Kaechele - Is there potential for another building just to the right of the entranceway?

Mr. Kennedy - Yes. On the site plan there is a parcel indicated with the name Marketti.

Mr. Kaechele - Yes.

Mr. Kennedy - That's where potential... It's actually it's between Marketti's property and the pond is actually a large wetlands area, which is approximately three quarters of acre. So, it could be of that side but not any closer to the Courtney development. It would be closer to the office.

Mr. Kaechele - I understand, but it's going to remain natural for the time being.

Mr. Kennedy - Yes. It will remain natural. As I said, in fact, someone from Mr. Marketti's came in this week to discuss with the staff future development of that site.

Mr. Kaechele - Is that zoned office?

Mr. Kennedy - No. That's zone A-1, Agricultural, right now. So, they would have to rezone it. We would expect that they would have the same 30-foot buffer along Staples Mill Road, the range of this development has, it runs along all of Staples Mill Road, that staff would request that. We would request the building to be one like or compatible to this proposed building, so it would be compatible in architecture.

Mr. Vanarsdall - It's been zoned a long time.

Mr. Kennedy - I will note to you that there is no requirement that the landscape plan comes back to the Commission, but staff is more than willing to encourage the Planning Commission, to give some additional comfort to the homeowners that they can have additional opportunity to have some input into that, as the site is developed to come back and actually maybe at that time the composition height of that wall could be determined in a public forum. This way the neighbors will have a little bit more input at that time. And we can work with them in the meantime to make sure that satisfactory plan comes forward.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Kennedy, has any thought being given along that fence line, given that we don’t know the character of the material. There's going to be some plantings on one side, I guess that will be towards the office building. Has there been any discussion within the homeowners or the developer to agree to put some plantings on the owners side to kind of screen that fence from their backyard given up to eight or six feet or whatever? Is that a possibility perhaps?

Mr. Kennedy - There hasn't been any discussion.
Mr. Vanarsdall - It's a possibility, yes.

Mr. Taylor - They will have either a fence of six feet or eight feet, as you describe it.

Mr. Kennedy - If they can come back with an agreement, which could be approved by the Planning Commission, it could be lower.

Mr. Taylor - As Ms. Dwyer said, American Hollies go a long way. Maybe on both sides we get a nice screen of hollies and that would screen the fence from some view.

Mr. Kennedy - Truly, the only thing that really needs to be screen is actually that section of the parking lot. Screening a lake feature is kind of overkill. A lot of people pay for water views. If you are up in Wyndham, you would pay a premium for those lots.

Mr. Taylor - But they really don't have a water view. I mean they have got that fence between them and the water.

Mr. Kennedy - Right. At this point. And that's the issue that they need to resolve. I think we need to have some sort of protection along there. The question is what height would satisfy them and provide them adequate screening, what kind of landscaping can they work out between now and the landscape plan approval that would satisfy the proffers and at the same time become a reasonable compromise between them and the developer.

Mr. Taylor - Because I see that there are four variables, the height of the fence, four, the height of the fence, the material in the fence, the trees behind the fence, the trees in front of the fence.

Mr. Kennedy - Right. That they can work with that.

Mr. Taylor - Yes.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Kennedy, do you have their names and so forth?

Mr. Kennedy - Yes.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Would you be sure that they are notified when it comes back for landscape?

Mr. Kennedy - Yes, sir.
Mr. Vanarsdall - And I appreciate you coming today. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy - I just want to remind you, that they may not know that they have the opportunity to ask specific questions of the Commission. So, if they have any questions, I'm more than happy to address them in a public forum.

Mr. Archer - Mr. Vanarsdall, would you like to hear from the applicant?

Mr. Vanarsdall - I don't need to, unless someone else wants to.

Mr. Archer - Do you want to hear the questions the citizens may have?

Mr. Vanarsdall - I think we should ask them, yes, sir.

Mr. Archer - Okay. Does anyone care to make a remark or comment?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Would you all like to come down and say anything about this or did Mr. Kennedy cover it pretty well?

Ms. Tate - (Ms. Tate was speaking from her seat in the audience and her comment is unintelligible).

Mr. Archer - Madam, would you mind coming down to the mike and identify yourself. We can't hear you from there and we would like to get this on the record.

Mr. Marlles - Madam, when you get down to the podium would you give your name and address too.

Ms. Tate - My name is Doris Tate and I live at 3306 Lanceor Drive. I've been there since the house was built. We are glad to hear your concern on the landscape and what we have to look at. I appreciate it. I know it's nothing else we can do but that will help.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you understand what we are going to do? When it comes back for landscaping you all will be notified and then you will have some input on what you want there and so forth. We will work it out.

Ms. Dwyer - I wonder, Mr. Kennedy, if, in the discussions about the height of the fence and what the neighbors want, what stage of development will this BMP be in when those discussions are held. You are suggesting that this is going to be a great, attractive area that the neighbors wouldn't mind looking at and if they could see that then it might help them decide exactly what they want. But, if it's just a lot of dirt moved around in an unattractive state of construction then they might have to make a decision that they won't be happy with in the long run. Do we know that?
Mr. Vanarsdall - Phil, do you want to get in on this?

Mr. Kennedy - Mr. Parker could probably answer that.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, ma'am for coming up.

Mr. Parker - My name is Philip Parker, vice president with Atack Properties. Ms. Dwyer, your question is what stage of construction would the BMP be under when we begin the wall. In all fairness, it would probably simply be exposed or seeded and sod earth. We would need to be in there with heavy equipment for the foundation of getting the brick and blocking there from our side of the property to build this wall prior to coming in with final grading tops or landscaping, etc. So, in fairness, what they would seed would be a hole in the ground. The question, as it seems right now, Mrs. Tate and Mrs. Willis and I were discussing, and Mr. Martin, is the questions of whether or not the wall is eight feet tall. And the three neighborhood residents that are here have agreed to go back and discuss with the other residents how high they would like that wall. From their initial discussion, we will meet with them and discuss do we do five feet, do we do six feet, do we eight feet. The requirement is not to exceed eight feet, and we are going to meet the intents and desires of their needs.

Ms. Dwyer - Will there be brick on their side?

Mr. Parker - Yes, ma'am. It’s finished on both sides.

Mr. Taylor - And, Mr. Parker, you would agree to some kind of compromise of landscaping on both sides to make it attractive.

Mr. Parker - As far as the law would allow.

Ms. Dwyer - I don’t think that they can landscape on other people’s property, though.

Mr. Parker - As far as the law would allow, we can do that. There are ways to accommodate things. The law will allow us to do certain things with their approval and authorization.

Mr. Taylor - So, that can be considered.

Mr. Parker - That can be considered, yes.

Mr. Taylor - Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.
Mr. Archer - All right. Thank you, Mr. Parker. Is there anymore discussion and if not, Mr. Vanarsdall?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thanks for all of the discussion and suggestions. I move that POD-74-01, Professional Office at CrossRidge - Staples Mill Road, be approved with the annotations on the plans and the standard conditions for developments of this type. I want Nos. 9 and 11 amended and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 32.

Mr. Taylor - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved POD-74-01, Professional Office at CrossRidge - Staples Mill Road, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions:

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

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 Planning Office review and Planning Commission approval.

23. The right-of-way for widening of Staples Mill Road (State Route 33) 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.

24. 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.

25. The entrances and drainage facilities on Staples Mill Road (State Route 33) shall be approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.

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 Planning Office 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. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-17C-00 shall be incorporated in this approval.

29. 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.

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

31. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

32. The owners shall not begin clearing of the site until the following conditions have been met:

(a) The site engineer shall conspicuously illustrate on the plan of development or subdivision construction plan and the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the limits of the areas to be cleared and the methods of protecting the required buffer areas. The location of utility lines, drainage structures and easements shall be shown.

(b) After the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been approved but prior to any clearing or grading operations of the site, the owner shall have the limits of clearing delineated with approved methods such as flagging, silt fencing or temporary fencing.

(c) The site engineer shall certify in writing to the owner that the limits of clearing have been staked in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the Planning Office and the Department of Public Works.

(d) The owner shall be responsible for the protection of the buffer areas and for replanting and/or supplemental planting and other necessary improvements to the buffer as may be appropriate or required to correct problems. The details shall be included on the landscape plans for approval.

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the September 26, 2001, Meeting)**

POD-57-01
The Virginia Diocesan Center at Roslyn - Phase 1 and Master Plan - River Road

Draper Aden Associates for Memorial Trustees of the Virginia Diocese: Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 14,313 square foot dining hall, a two-story, 5,489 square foot community center, three, two-story guest residences totaling 4,950 square feet and a master plan for future development in an existing church.
education and conference center. The 97.35 acre site is located along the south line of River Road approximately 1,300 feet east of Parham Road on parcel 125-A-25. The zoning is R-1, One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer.

(Tuckahoe)

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-57-01, The Virginia Diocesan Center at Roslyn? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite.

Mr. Wilhite - Thank you. This case was deferred last month, at the applicant’s request to look more closely at the amount of parking to be provided on the site. An application of the parking requirements of the zoning ordinance was determined at 197 spaces that were required by the ordinance. The applicant had originally requested that we consider them for approval under our joint parking section of the ordinance, which would allow them to reduce the parking to 70% of that total. They had proposed providing 141 spaces total plus an additional 45 spaces for overflow of parking. Staff determined that they did not fall within the provision of that ordinance requirement. We have annotated the plan to recommend approval in such a manner that 197 spaces would be provided here. In discussions with the applicant last week, they are asking us to reconsider the amount of parking that’s going to be required under the ordinance. They will provide us some additional documentation on their parking needs, and it will be reviewed by the Director of Planning. Another option they have would be going to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance in order to reduce parking. As I said, the staff has annotated this plan to provide 197 spaces as required by Code. The applicant is in agreement with theannotation and is willing to go forward and concur with our annotations with provision that this issue will still be looked at by the Director of Planning at a future time. I’ll be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Are there any questions of Mr. Wilhite by Commission members?

Mr. Kaechele - This is an incidental question. Is this tax-exempt property?

Mr. Wilhite - I believe so, yes. Actually, I think Henrico does tax them as a hotel/motel.

Mr. Archer - That’s an interesting question, Mr. Kaechele. Are there any further questions or discussion? Ms. Dwyer, do you need to hear from the applicant?

Ms. Dwyer - No, I don’t, unless they would like to come forward and speak.

Mr. Archer - All right.
Ms. Dwyer - This is a wonderful space to have and we are lucky to have this oasis in the middle of suburbia and certainly this addition will create minimal if any impact on the surrounding neighborhood and traffic situations as used as a retreat. There's a commitment to maintain a lot of the open space, almost all the of the open space that currently exist. Mr. Mariles and I will get together with the applicant and discuss this parking issue further, but it appears to be annotated so that it's in a position to be approved today but allow continuing discussion among the applicant and the staff and myself. So with that, I will move the approval of POD-57-01, The Virginia Diocesan Center at Roslyn – Phase I and Master Plan and added conditions Nos. 23 through 29.

Mr. Taylor - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved POD-57-01, The Virginia Diocesan Center at Roslyn – Phase I and Master Plan – River Road, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions.

23. 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.

24. The limits and elevations of the 100-year frequency flood shall be conspicuously noted on the plan “Limits of 100 Year Floodplain.” In addition, the delineated 100-year floodplain must be labeled “Variable Width Drainage and Utility Easement.” The easement shall be granted to the County prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.

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

26. 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.

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

28. The conceptual master plan, as submitted with this application, is for planning and information purposes only. All subsequent detailed plans of development and construction plans needed to implement this conceptual plan may be
administratively reviewed and approved and shall be subject to all regulations in
effect at the time such subsequent plans are submitted for review/approval.

29. The applicant shall widen both entrances drives off of River Road to the
minimum County width standards with the next phase of this development.

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

POD-75-01
Richmond Subaru -
9177 W. Broad Street

Balzer & Associates, Inc. for Jacques J. Moore, Jr.: 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, 6,364 square foot
building addition and associated parking. The 6.57 acre
site is located along the southern line of West Broad
Street (U.S. Route 250) approximately 490 feet west of
Tuckernuck Drive on parcel 59-A-37B. The zoning is
B-3C, Business District (Conditional). County water
and sewer. (Three Chopt)

Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-75-01,

Ms. Goggin - Good morning. The revised plan in your addendum has
incorporated most of the previous staff annotations on the plan in your packet.
Specifically, it addresses the shared entrance between the future Haynes Jeep, which is
POD-20-01 and Moore Cadillac. This entrance was proposed and approved by the
Planning Commission on February 28, 2001, with the Haynes Jeep plan and needs to be
shown on this plan submission to ensure that the proposed addition and improvements are
coordinated between the two sites. At staff’s request, the applicant has provided a color
rendering of the proposed addition to provide a reference for the colors and building
materials specified in the Commission’s packet to help determine compatibility with the
existing sales center. The addition would extend the window pattern that runs the length
of the existing building and will continue the colors of the existing Moore Cadillac sale
center. Staff recommends approval subject to the annotations on the revised staff plan,
the standard conditions for developments of this type, and additional conditions Nos. 23
through 36 specified in the agenda. I’ll be happy to answer any questions from the
Planning Commission. The project engineer is also present, but unfortunately the
architect is not here, if you have any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. Goggin. Are there any questions from the
Commission members?

Ms. Goggin - Just for the record, I also have the site map from the Haynes Jeep
POD approval if you would like to see that in relation to this site.
Mr. Kaechele - This is a totally separate building, there’s no through pass way from the exiting showroom?

Ms. Goggin - It’s a totally separate building.

Mr. Vanarsdall - This is the old Hawthorne Volkswagen, isn’t it?

Ms. Goggin - I think it’s always been a Cadillac dealership. It was Jone’s Motor Car Company, and it’s now Moore Cadillac.

Mr. Archer - All right. Are there any further questions? Do we need to hear from the applicant, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. Taylor - No, Mr. Chairman. There is no opposition and I think that the staff has reviewed this case and the applicant was grandly responsive to providing us a color rendering yesterday. We have gone over this, this, of course, is going to be next to the planned jeep facility and on that one there is a shared entrance and that’s incorporated in the design. So, as far as I am concerned, it is a complete package and it fits with the neighborhood.

Mr. Archer - All right.

Mr. Taylor - And with that, Mr. Chairman, I’ll move approval of POD-75-01, Richmond Subaru – 9177 W. Broad Street, subject to the annotations on the plans, the comments in the addendum, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and additional conditions Nos. 23 through 36.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

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

The Planning Commission approved POD-75-01, Richmond Subaru – 9177 W. Broad Street, subject to the standard conditions attached to these minutes the annotations on the plans and the following additional conditions.

23. 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.

24. The entrances and drainage facilities on W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) shall be approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the County.
25. 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 Planning Office prior to any occupancy permits being issued.

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

27. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the south side of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250).

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

29. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-50C-81 and C-54C-83 shall be incorporated in this approval.

30. 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.

31. 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.

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

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

34. 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.

35. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Virginia Department of Transportation maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by the contractor and approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

36. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this development.

**PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & TRANSITIONAL BUFFER DEVIATION**
(Deferred from the September 26, 2001, Meeting)

**POD-60-01**
Virginia Eye Institute - ASC Building - Huguenot Road

**TIMMONS FOR SBB Associates:** Request for approval of a plan of development and transitional buffer deviation, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code to construct a two-story, 14,315 square foot medical office building. The 2.68 acre site is located along the south line of Huguenot Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of River Road on parcel 126-A-8A. The zoning is B-1, Business District and O-1, Office District. County
Mr. Archer - Is there anyone in the audience in opposition to POD-60-01, Virginia Eye Institute? We have opposition. Thank you, sir, we will get to you in a moment. Okay. Mr. Wilhite.

Mr. Wilhite - Thank you, sir. This case was deferred from last month’s meeting. At that time, they needed to act on a transitional buffer deviation request. There is an O-1/B-1 zoning line that runs right through the middle of this property. Staff supports the waiver of this requirement since this site function as an addition to the existing medical office building. Also, since that time, there has been a meeting with the applicant concerning the design of the building. We do have a revised rendering here today, which shows some changes to the canopy roof design over top of the entrance and some changes to the materials used on the building. The architect is here if you do have any questions about what’s being proposed, as far as the changes. Staff is in a position to recommend approval of this plan.

Mr. Archer - All right. Are there any questions by Commission members for Mr. Wilhite?

Ms. Dwyer - This revised rendering then would just be submitted today, as of today.

Mr. Wilhite - Yes. They are going to provide us with a paper copy and it would be part of the record.

Mr. Jernigan - What’s the exterior of this building?

Mr. Wilhite - A combination of metal and masonry construction.

Mr. Taylor - Looking at this, there are gray panels or gray sections and tan sections. Can you tell us the type of masonry? Is it stone or brick?

Mr. Price - My name is Ron Price and I’m with Odell Associates. I’m the architect for this project. The metal panel of gray is actually the metal panel that matches the existing Eye Hospital. It’s kind of blue/silver. The block you are seeing there is a ground face masonry unit, 8 inches by 16 inches. It’s going to be a neutral color, on the tan side. Fairly close to what that rendering represents. I guess, the specific color of that sample has not been selected at this time. If you have an opinion about that I’ll be happy to listen to that.

Ms. Dwyer - Maybe you could just expand a little bit on the features and virtues of this particular design and how it compares with the existing building.
Mr. Price - I’ll be happy to. One thing, it is raised 12 feet above the floor because of the floodplain issue, so it does match floor to floor high of the existing. So, all the 14,000 square feet is on level two. There is a small lobby that you will see in that rendering on the far right (referring to rendering on the screen). So, you can walk in that lobby and take the stairs or elevator upstairs. There is no ramp like there is on the existing building. Beneath the building, which is screened by landscaping, is the physician parking. The employee/visitor parking is going to be around the outside. Again, the metal panel matches the existing building. The block is a fairly new material and that’s almost…. It’s been a warmer color it kind of match the new shopping center next door. The windows you are seeing there, that’s the view facing Huguenot Road, that’s what you will see when drive out Huguenot Road. We have a metal roof to match the existing building. We have a large glass window that kind of gives you a, I guess, a size view of what’s going on inside and that’s a two-story (piece?). The window to the left, that’s the waiting room for the hospital itself. There’s a small strip of windows on the far left; that’s the recovery area. And, that’s really about the only windows we need in this facility. We are trying to put all of that on Huguenot Road, just to kind of jazz up and make that front elevation as appealing as possible. So, again, it’s more of a recall existing building. It’s a simplified version of what’s already there.

Mr. Kaechele - You describe that gray panel as a metal panel, is that siding?

Mr. Price - If you go out there now, it’s the exact same material you see on the building right now.

Mr. Kaechele - Is that aluminum siding?

Mr. Price - That’s correct, it’s corrugated metal, so it’s got a ribbed look. And, again, it’s the same material as you see on the hospital right now.

Mr. Taylor - Sir, as you say gray, it’s not reflective is it?

Mr. Price - No.

Mr. Taylor - Is it low tones?

Mr. Price - Correct.

Mr. Vanarsdall - You say it is metal?

Mr. Price - Yes, sir.

Mr. Vanarsdall - And it won’t rust, I’m sure.

Mr. Price - No, it won’t rust. It’s a painted metal, that’s correct.
Mr. Taylor - The interesting feature that you state is that this is going to be above the floodplain.

Mr. Price - That's correct.

Mr. Taylor - That indicates that there's basically no utilities up to about level eight.

Mr. Price - That's correct. The only thing we have below that is actually the stair and the elevator. But, in the time of a flood, the elevator will be raised up so the elevator is not affected, but the pit in the lower level would be suspect. But, nothing else is beneath that line.

Mr. Taylor - In the event of flooding, you would assume that the James River is going to take over and flow right through the lower level of that.

Mr. Price - That's correct.

Mr. Taylor - With that, of course, we don't want to put a dam in the way of Mother Nature, so I would guess that the siding is meant to either be hydraulic stream line or capable of being carried away.

Mr. Price - If you look at the far right. I have drawn some holes down low. There are holes on that first floor all the way around this building that will allow air and water to go through this building.

Mr. Taylor - Well, what about trees and logs and such?

Mr. Price - I can't speak for trees and logs. I guess there is always an issues with trees and logs.

Mr. Taylor - Mother Nature is not going to sort those out and the question of safety, I think... If we start accumulate trees and logs, the hydraulic load is going to be such that there may be a point that this entire structure will float. At what state do you think that might be?

Mr. Price - Well, I think the structure is actually a concrete frame, concrete columns. The skin you are seeing down there could be just knocked off. It's not going to jeopardize the structure integrity of the building to have any kind of debris to hit that in a flood situation. The metal panels themselves may be damaged and dented but I doubt the structure will not be impacted.
Mr. Taylor - So, structurally there will be piles that can substantially resist trees, floating debris and other stuff.

Mr. Parker - Yes.

Mr. Taylor - But everything else might be capable of being carried away.

Mr. Parker - Could be, that's correct.

Mr. Taylor - Now, on a happier note. Looking at the size of the floor plan. How many patients can you treat in here at one time?

Mr. Parker - Kathy, correct me if I'm wrong (referring to lady in the audience). There could be 40 visitors, I think, could be waiting there at one time. Is that correct?

Kathy - (Speaking from her seat) On an average 25 patients a day, as many as 40 a day.

Mr. Taylor - And these are all ambulatory, I understand.

Kathy - Yes.

Mr. Taylor - There's no overnight residence at this facility.

Kathy - Absolutely.

Mr. Taylor - So, in the event, of a flood, there wouldn't be any patients that would reasonably be there or couldn't be quickly removed.

Mr. Price - That's correct.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you want to repeat the number she gave because I'm not sure if we picked it up on the tape or not?

Mr. Price - I think we said 25 per day would be an average patient load, maybe up to 40.

Mr. Taylor - Thank you. Those are all of the questions that I have.

Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anybody else? We did have opposition so could you please come forward.

Mr. Bostic - Good morning. My name is Bryan Bostic and I live at 6500 Westham Station Road.
Mr. Archer - Good morning, Mr. Bostic.

Mr. Bostic - If you could put back up the drawing again I would appreciate it. I'm here on behalf of the neighbors that live in and around Westham Station Road and on Panorama Road and on Kanawha Drive. My property is the R-1 directly to the left of the Eye Center (referring to rendering on the screen). It's a five and a half-acre parcel. Our neighborhood has great, great, concern over the traffic issues that are created with the new River Road Shopping Center but not with our neighbors with the Eye Center. They are excellent neighbors. We backed the project for them, but we also want noted that they also would also like a stop light and has requested a stop light some two and a half years ago. We are very concerned about accidents that have occurred. We know that there are elderly constituents that participate at the eye institute. We do not want their safety to be jeopardized nor do we want the safety of our children. The neighborhood has changed. We now have young families present. We also know that the bridge construction, at some point, will take place and we have renderings of that bridge and a stop light would dramatically impact the cost of that structure and I have that from engineers with VDOT as well. So, on the record, we would like a traffic light considered for the intersection and Kanawha Drive and Huguenot Road in order to better control the traffic flow in and around that area while at the same time, noting that this will save taxpayers dollars for a future construction of the Huguenot bridge. Thank you.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, sir. Are there any questions?

Ms. Dwyer - I guess I'm not following how the stop light saves money in the construction of the Huguenot Bridge or the reconstruction of it.

Mr. Bostic - Well, in discussing the current plans with VDOT and with County engineers, there was a plan for Westham Station Road, which currently comes off of Huguenot as a very small 12-foot junction, really. It's not even a real road. That would not be needed. And the plan was for that to be an off ramp and to raise Panorama eight feet higher to meet Code. That would no longer be necessary. In order to do that, they would also have to put an enormous drainpipe underneath that road. So, the structure of Westham Station Road, where it meets Panorama, all would raise eight feet above its current position. At the same time, as you can see my driveway, links out up from Panorama that would be heavily impacted from and encroachment standpoint. I'm not opposing the bridge reconstruction, I'm sure it's falling down at this point, but I am saying, as a taxpayer, a large taxpayer, that we do not need Westham Station Road to be reconstructed the way it's planned. The only way that can happened is if there is a stop light present on Huguenot Road. So there are two reasons; One, safety because as you well know by supercharging that bridge to what they are calling a two-lane bridge, which is two and a half time larger than the current design, it will be four lanes, rated at 55 mph and we don't think that that is in the best interest of the Eye Institute or the neighborhood. Now, is that a matter for here today, probably not? But it is a matter,
from a traffic light standpoint when it comes to that intersection and how it impacts the
Eye Institute, our neighborhood and the rest of that development in that corridor.

Ms. Dwyer - I know you have spoken to Mr. Eure because you were here last
month and you are aware, I’m sure, that VDOT is beginning to have hearings on bridge
design.

Mr. Bostic - I am aware of that and participating in that actively. I just want it
on the record here that our friends at the Eye Institute also would like a stop light there
for their constituents and I’m sure that Mr. Lacy and the other owners of River Road
Shopping Center would encourage a stop light at some point as well. I’m sure they
didn’t want to have to pay for it, and I’m sure that was the issue at the time. But, as a
resident of the area who watches this traffic everyday, we are greatly concerned about
that intersection.

Ms. Dwyer - Thank you, Mr. Bostic.

Mr. Bostic - Thank you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Eure is here.

Ms. Dwyer - I know. I was just going to ask Mr. Eure if you would just speak
briefly, not to the Huguenot Bridge issue, necessarily, because we all understand that’s a
VDOT matter and not one that we have any control over here today. But, if you would
speak briefly to the stop light issue. I know it came up before with the shopping center
and if you would just summarize the traffic engineer’s point of view on putting a stop
light at this intersection.

Mr. Eure - Yes, ma’am. Good morning. My name is Todd Eure, Traffic
Engineering. The issue with a traffic signal at the crossover…. I’ve spoken with VDOT
traffic engineering folks several times over the course of the last month. They are doing
projections there and they are anticipating full build out of the Eye Institute as well as the
shopping center and taking existing counts and projecting added traffic on top of that to
look at what the ultimate needs are. I have not heard back from them as far as any
conclusions. So, I assume that they have not completed their full review, but I’ll be glad
to share that with Mr. Bostic and anybody else that’s interested once we get the results.

And, at the same time, consideration does need to be taken into what the ultimate design
of Huguenot Road, in relation to the bridge replacement, is to…. I’m not as familiar with
the proposed plans as Mr. Bostic is in terms of the grade changes with the roads and so
forth. But, I can relay my conversation with him after last month’s meeting with Bob
Thompson, Public Works Director, make him aware of the issues and the concerns. We
will certainly be glad to follow up with him as we get feedback from VDOT.
Ms. Dwyer - Okay. As far as placing a stop light here, at this particular location, is that something that the traffic engineer’s office would support and if so, why or if not, why?

Mr. Eure - Well, as with any location, we support the insulation of a signal if it meets warrants. Warrants consider everything from traffic volumes on your main road, your side streets, and in this case driveways. As well as your accident history and type of accidents. And, as we discussed last time, outside of the public forum, we did do a very in-depth analysis at this crossover, prior to the shopping center POD. And, we looked very closely at the type of accidents that were occurring there because there had been some concern about, I guess, a huge number of accidents, which there has been along this whole corridor of Huguenot but we’ve focus on the crossover itself and…. I don’t have the numbers with me, but there had been some accidents that would be correctable by a traffic signal at that location, ankle-type accidents. That’s something that VDOT is updating, that accident analysis, because that’s several years old now and they are looking at the full accident history and whether the insulation of a signal would actually help that situation. As we tell citizens that call us on a daily basis requesting traffic signal, that they don’t always solve the problem, sometimes they make the problem worst. And I’m not saying that’s the case here, but that’s the reason that they have to do a very careful analysis of the location to see if they think the signal is going to be the long term best solution in conjunction with the bridge project.

Ms. Dwyer - And there were issues, as I recall, about traffic backing up onto the bridge. There are issues about the proximity of existing stop light a little farther east, I guess, of this location and concerns about putting a stop light there. There are a number of very real, I guess as a real downside to putting a stop light there. If the spread was wider between this location and the location of the bridge and you had a stoplight, then certainly would be something more viable. I would like to say also, my understanding, that costs was not a factor in not putting a stop light in there when the shopping center went in. That was not an issue at all. I believe Mr. Bostic may be under the misimpression that it was, but it was not. Also, is it true that if we put a stop light here now, not that we have the authority to do that, but that wouldn’t necessarily change what VDOT is going to do in terms of bridge design.

Ms. Dwyer - I think I understood, maybe I misunderstood Mr. Bostic to say that if we have a stop light here, then VDOT will be less inclined to have to have the kind of design that would impinge on his property.

Mr. Eure - That issue I can’t speak to because that goes back to the issue with realigning Westham Station and during the grade changes and retaining walls and all of those issues, and I have not been as heavily involved in the meeting with VDOT as Mr. Bostic has, so that I can really speak to that, but as far as certainly putting in a traffic signal now would be, I think, a big concern from the standpoint of the backup
and the sight distance available, the available sight distance that we would have for
traffic coming off of the bridge without long curves, and what we don’t want to do is
take, take a potential problem with angle accidents that we have now by not having a
signal and making the problem, changing the problem and making it worse by having
backed up traffic stopped at the signal coming off of the bridge and having an increase
in rear end accidents, and certainly with the bridge redesigned, if consideration is given
to a traffic signal, which VDOT is looking at, then we’d be looking at, hopefully, a
better alignment of the bridge that would allow a better line of sight to this intersection.

Ms. Dwyer - So, VDOT, whether or not a traffic signal is placed is here now,
that is certainly an option that VDOT will consider as one of the alternatives available
in designing the bridge. So, it would not necessarily preclude the grade changes that
they are considering, but it may be considered as one alternative.

Mr. Eure - I would agree with that, yes.

Ms. Dwyer - Getting to the matter at hand, the issue before us today, we have
property that is both zoned B-1 and 0-1. Could you comment briefly on, this is actually
to be used as 0-1 for an office-type facility and will not be used as a commercial use,
which could be under its zoning, so could you expound a little bit on the traffic
advantages of using this as an office as opposed to a business.

Mr. Eure - Sure. Certainly with the use they have there and what they are
proposing with the addition, the traffic generation numbers are much lower than they
would be with many business uses, and the pattern of traffic arriving and leaving the
site is a little bit more diverse than it could be with a business use, and that is always a
big concern with, with access locations, what your distribution of traffic is. Everybody
is coming and leaving at once. For example, if you have a restaurant with a heavy
lunch-time usage, for example, of morning usage, you have more traffic concern issues
than if it is a facility like this that is, by the nature of their business, spreads the arrivals
and departures over the course of a day.

Ms. Dwyer - The volume is lower and the traffic pattern is spread out over the
course of the day as opposed to having heavy peaks. That is what I am looking for.
OK. Thank you. I don’t have any more questions.

Mr. Kaechele - Well, do you have a traffic count for Huguenot Road through this
area today? Do you happen to have that with you?

Mr. Eure - I did not bring those numbers with me. I am sorry, sir. If I can
think back what we had a couple of years ago, I believe we are - don’t quote me on this
but I’m going on record - I think we are upper 30,000 vehicles per day, but I am not
100% sure, and if that is something that you want specific numbers on, I’d be glad to
follow up with it.
Mr. Kaechele - I was just curious, and then I guess VDOT has the ultimate jurisdiction on this signal.

Mr. Eure - That is correct. Both the bridge as well as Huguenot Road up to the City line are VDOT maintained facilities, but the County is actively involved in the Huguenot Road project and that is being handled at this point in time at least by Chesterfield.

Ms. Dwyer - Are you involved with VDOT or who is representing the County in these meetings?

Mr. Eure - Most of the meetings so far, Bob Thompson, Public Works, has been involved in the meetings, and I am sure that as the project progresses more of the staff and Public Works will be involved.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Eure, on that project for the bridge, for the VDOT project, there is an area here where it is four lanes up by the B-1 area, and I would presume that a traffic study would start there and do Huguenot Bridge, Westham Station Road, Panorama Drive, and Kanawha Drive in its entirety, both for traffic flow and for safety, and I would think that, at that time, that there would be some thought given to widening certainly and merging with Panorama and Kanawha and the grade in there. Because as I remember going over there, the grades are not, grades are something that have to be carefully considered in the design of the bridge, so it seems to me that between Huguenot - between the time you get to the edge of the river and you are up to the area of four lanes, which I guess is maybe the property line between Richmond and Henrico County, or our jurisdiction and VDOT's jurisdiction, could we be assured that that higher avenue, that starts at the four lanes, all the way through the (unintelligible), Kanawha Drive, Panorama Drive, and Westham Station Road is going to be studied comprehensively and together with regard to the lane width, grades, elevations, merging and lights?

Mr. Eure - Yes, sir. That is what VDOT is looking into, the entire section of roadway, because obviously you don't want to build a bridge without consideration of what it is tying into, and what effects along that segment of road are, and, consequently, that also requires them to look at the neighborhood that is adjacent to the roadway where Mr. Bostic lives and the surrounding streets right there, and how to best tie those into the existing roadway, and deal with the grades that we have out there.

Mr. Taylor - Yes, and I think to the extent that is done and good engineering principles applied, and I am sure that they will, if Mr. Bostic keeps his eye on that, I am sure there are going to be lots of opportunities for public meetings, public input, and public review. So, it is a matter, I think, of staying abreast of what the County is doing in their overview, and then VDOT, what they are doing in terms of their design,
and I believe there are requirements for public hearings by VDOT of that entire design before funding and before proceeding with the project. Am I correct?

Mr. Eure - Yes, sir. If there is anything that VDOT does well, it is that they hold a lot of public meetings on projects, so there are many meetings to come on this because they do not have final approved plans yet, so that will be something that will be at least several meetings in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Taylor - And Henrico is pretty adept at public meetings, too.

Mr. Eure - We do our best.

Mr. Taylor - So I just wanted to make sure that Mr. Bostic was assured that there will be lots of opportunities for public scrutiny, private scrutiny, staff scrutiny, zoning people scrutiny and Planning Commission scrutiny.

Mr. Eure - Absolutely, and I got Mr. Bostic's card at the last meeting and the only reason I had not contacted him between then and now is because I have not heard anything back from VDOT as far as their analysis of the intersection, but I will be glad to follow up with him personally once I hear from them.

Mr. Taylor - With regard now to Case POD-60, the entrance that I see going into the Eye Center is right across from Kanawha Drive. This, I guess, begs the question that this, that the location of the entrance at this point, is that futuristic in your view?

Mr. Eure - That is already an existing entrance in there. They are just going to use it as it still is.

Mr. Taylor - That will be respected in the final design?

Mr. Eure - Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor - Do the grades and everything match?

Mr. Eure - Well, I assume that they do. I think if the...you are talking about the grades where the bridges are going to tie back in?

Mr. Taylor - I guess I would mean the elevation match, as you come out of the Eye Institute and the elevation of Huguenot Road at that point, which then becomes the approach to the bridge, that they all have to be matched, and I guess that it is VDOT's requirement to match that up so that traffic flows freely, and at that point in time that would be the opportunity to address traffic signals and turning radius and details of that type. Correct?
Mr. Eure - Yes, sir. I would assume that VDOT would have the bridge grade tied back into the existing grade prior to the intersection at the Eye Institute.

Mr. Taylor - My thought would be that the approach to the bridge would tie all the way back to the four-lane width. Correct?

Mr. Eure - Correct.

Mr. Taylor - I have no further questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Todd, I have a question. You mentioned they had had accidents there?

Mr. Eure - Yes, sir.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Is that at the intersection there in front of the shopping center?

Mr. Eure - The shared entrance the shopping center has with the Eye Institute, and when the POD came in for the shopping center, there was a lot of concern and interest from the adjacent neighbors about the accident hazards at that intersection, and we did a detailed analysis, listed all of the accidents for about a five-year period. As for as what the potential causes were and there were a number of angle accidents there. Again, I don't have the figures.

Mr. Vanarsdall - There were some fatalities there as I remember. I know of two that were done there.

Ms. Dwyer - In that vicinity? Yes, sir.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.

Ms. Dwyer - Were they at that intersection or were they, some of them were on the bridge or related?

Mr. Eure - On the approach to the bridge, I believe one of them, and there had been one on the bridge itself.

Mr. Vanarsdall - And one was at the driveway past the Chatham Square. That driveway there, a lady got killed.

Mr. Eure - I mean it is, certainly the whole segment of road through there has had a long accident history, and to some degree that is a result of the volume of traffic that we have out there, but there are some other issues that need to be looked at, and that is what VDOT is in the process of doing.
Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Eure. All right. No further discussion. Ms. Dwyer.

Ms. Dwyer - About the traffic, I think I will address that now. I think as far as this particular case is concerned, the traffic impact is much less with this proposed development than it could be if this were developed as a matter of right, in accordance with this B-1 zoning, so I think in terms of the traffic generated and the spacing of the traffic throughout the day, we are in a much better position to be looking at this development than we could be otherwise, so while it may add a few more cars to this particular intersection, they are fewer cars than could be added by right if this were developed for B-1. So, traffic-wise, this is a good scenario.

My colleagues on the Commission know that I am a real advocate for roads, particularly having the Commission stick to the Major Thoroughfare Plan that we have adopted, and this is one of the reasons why this and some other intersections and the road systems we have in the Tuckahoe area, which were designed for far less traffic, and which cannot be improved without major trauma to existing development, and this is just one of those situations where if a stop light could be put there and we would know that it would be appropriate and, in fact, improve the safety and not actually make the situation less safe, then certainly we would do that. The Traffic Engineer tells us it is a little more complicated than that, because of the configuration of the roads that currently exist because the development already exists, so there are no easy solutions to the traffic issue. I think the County, Mr. Eure, Mr. Thompson, are aware of the traffic issues here and we will do everything that is humanly possible to do to make this as safe a thoroughfare as it can possibly be. The other reality is this is a State road, a VDOT road, and so we have to work certainly through the State and there is a governmental entity that dictates what will happen here. So, I hope, Mr. Bostic, that we have assured you that we will do what we can as a staff, as a County, to insure that this is a safe a roadway as it can be made retroactively, considering the existing development and increasing traffic loads.

As far as the development itself, I will move to approve POD-60-01, Virginia Eye Institute - ASC Building - Huguenot Road, including the revised architecturals that were received today, including annotations to the plan and standard conditions for developments of this type, and conditions Nos. 23 through 29, but I will add No. 9 Amended, which requires the applicant to come back for Planning Commission review of their landscape plan.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - OK. Motion by Ms. Dwyer and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion carries. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
The Planning Commission approved POD-60-01, Virginia Eye Institute - ASC Building - Huguenot Road, subject to the revised architectural plans, the annotations on the plan, the standard conditions attached to these minutes for developments of this type, and added conditions No. 9 Amended and the following additional conditions Nos. 23 through 29.

23. 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.

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

25. Outside storage shall not be permitted.

26. 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.

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

28. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted to the Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for this development.

29. A VDOT standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the south side of Huguenot Road from the eastern property line to the Huguenot Bridge. The applicant may escrow sufficient funds for construction of said sidewalk in conjunction with future improvements to the Huguenot Bridge.
Steve Harvey for St. Paul’s Baptist Church: 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 46.27 acre site is located on the south line of Creighton Road, approximately 1,200 feet east of Cedar Fork Road on parcel 130-A-20. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District, and ASO District (Airport Safety Overlay District). (Varina)

Mr. Archer - Is there opposition to St. Paul’s Baptist Church? All right.

Ms. News - Good morning, Mr. Chairman. The revised plan, which is being distributed, now addresses staff’s one main comment, which was to provide additional landscaping along Creighton Road. The applicant will be providing a combination of Red Maple Trees, Yoshino Cherries and Nelly Stevens Hollies in this area. The plan has been annotated to shift the trees back from the right of way a minimum of 8 feet, and to take the cherry trees and pull them closer to the parking lot. The trees right now are proposed in a single line, and we feel we could make better use of that space. The applicant has agreed to that. Staff believes this planting, in combination with the generous landscaping of the ceremonial entrance to the church, will be an attractive addition to the Creighton Road Corridor. An adjacent neighbor, Ms. Betty Walters, who is present, has requested that the church provide an additional 10 Evergreen trees adjacent to the rear property line in an area where the buffer is thin. It is this area right here (referring to slide). The church has indicated they are willing to accommodate this request. The trees will be shown on the final plan. This plan was received after the deadline, so it will be necessary to waive the time limit. With that said, staff recommends approval of the revised plan, as annotated, subject to the standard conditions for landscape plans. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. News. Are there any questions for Ms. News from the Commission?

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I went over this a lot with her yesterday in a meeting and I think they have met all of the criteria that is required on this.

Mr. Archer - All right. Anything else? All right. Mr. Jernigan.

Mr. Jernigan - Do we need to waive the time limits?

Ms. News - Yes, sir. This plan was received after the deadline.
Mr. Jernigan - OK. I make a motion that we waive the time limits on LP/POD-32-99.

Mr. Taylor - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Ms. News - Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I believe Ms. Walters may want to speak.

Mr. Archer - We will hold the motion for a moment. Good morning, ma'am.

Ms. Walters - Good morning. I am Betty Walters and I live off of the property to the south of this. My concern was that there was very little of a buffer; a natural buffer there, and for my protection and I would think for theirs, too, that they would like better screening in that particular area. My property is on the market and I don't know what might be there. At least, for my protection right now I would like to see a buffer along that whole area, and I think this would make that possible, and that was my reason for feeling that way. I think that has been answered.

Ms. Dwyer - So your concerns have been taken care of?

Ms. Walters - Yes. Actually, the back part of this is not included, I understand today. That is for some future development, and because there should be a buffer left there, there is some natural buffer material that was left by the nursery that abandoned this property. If they don't get rid of all of that, that would still suffice, I think for that area, but this is, it was my understanding it was only the front part of this property that is being approved today for the landscaping. Thank you.

Mr. Jernigan - Ms. Walters, I rode through there yesterday and it looked like you had a fair amount of buffering across the back side. There's trees and all through there.

Ms. Walters - On the back, to me?

Mr. Jernigan - Yes, ma'am. On the back side.

Ms. Walters - It is up on the high part, there is some. There are some natural cedars in there, but the lower view of it, it is, I don't think a rabbit could get through it. It is briars, poison ivy, honeysuckle, just a little of everything, and, of course, the foliage of those trees won't be there when winter comes, and that was the reason that I had hoped that it could be something along there that would block it. Thank you.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. Walters.
Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, ma’am. Ms. News. You rode out there and I spoke to you. I mean, what is your opinion?

Ms. News - Yes. What Ms. Walters is asking for is provision of 10 Evergreen trees in this area right here (referring to slide), and the church has already agreed to do that. So we will be annotating the final plan to add those trees. I think she is just expressing her concerns, but they have been satisfied.

Mr. Taylor - Where is her residence? Just south of the...that over there?

Ms. News - This whole property (referring to slide).

Mr. Taylor - So that is quite a distance from her house, too? And that is all treed in there?

Ms. News - No. There is a heavy buffer of woods along this area. There is a large BMP in this area, but there is a thick stand of trees here (referring to slide), and this area is all a combination of wooded areas, wet areas, old landscape material that was left from the nursery. And this whole area has not been touched except for the installation of the septic system in the center of it, but there is substantial existing landscaping all around this. She was referring to around the back, at a later date, to get approval to do this area (referring to slide), and we may want to look at doing some more screening along the property line right there (referring to slide).

Mr. Taylor - Is that area between where the marker is now where you have it, and her house a clear field, or it that wooded?

Ms. News - I believe it is clear on her property, but there are all woods and plants, existing plant material, on this property (referring to slide).

Mr. Jernigan - Would you like to speak again, ma’am?

Ms. Walters - I just want to say I think it is about a 13-acre field between my house and their property there. I have sold part of my property to the Nature Conservatory, but I still have 195 acres.

Mr. Archer - All right. Mr. Jernigan. I believe you were about to waive the time limits.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to waive the time limits on landscape plan LP/POD-32-99, on October 24, 2001.

Mr. Taylor - Second.
Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is granted. Mr. Kaechele abstained.

The Planning Commission voted to waive the time limits on LP/POD-32-99, St. Paul’s Baptist Church - Creighton Road.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I’d like to move for approval of Landscape Plan LP/POD-32-99, with standard conditions for landscape plans.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion made by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is granted.

The Planning Commission approved Landscape Plan for LP/POD-32-99, St. Paul’s Baptist Church - Creighton Road, subject to the revised plan, the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for landscape plans.
Mr. Householder - The concern is that single-family homes are not being placed far enough from major roads to minimize the impact on these residents from these roads. Currently, the requirements of our existing Code, there are no specific setback requirements to apply to lots that abut major roads. This picture has kind of been our poster child for this Ordinance (referring to slide) and it is just an example of how some houses are being put close to major roadways. We added a few more photos this time to show how some houses are not quite set back as far as they could be in order to reduce the impact. This is along Nuckols Road (referring to slide). Also, at the last work session, there were some comments that not only major roads are a factor, especially when it comes to side yards, but sometimes entrances to subdivisions have houses that are almost right up on the subdivision street, so we went out and got a few examples of how some homes are right up on those streets, and we will get into that issue in a little while. But, we didn’t just want to show all of the negative things, so when I was on Nuckols I did find what I thought was a very good example of how these houses are, luckily they have preserved the buffer and they are setback significantly (referring to slide), and I think that is what we’d try to achieve with this Ordinance.

Also, this is an example (referring to slide), I don’t know if it is a good or a bad example, but this is a typical example of what we think a side yard should at least appear like, and we’ll get into that later, but this is what a typical side yard setback should be that is not too close, but maybe not too far either.

Additional background, this was actually recommended by the Planning Commission for approval on May 24, 2000. It was then given to the Board, who held three work sessions, and they raised three major concerns which regarded the landscaping that was proposed at the time, the increased setback distance that they thought it should be, and that it should be applicable not only to single-family but also to multifamily districts. The Ordinance was modified from a subdivision ordinance amendment to a zoning ordinance amendment, and it was remanded back to the Planning Commission in June of this past summer, and the Planning Commission work session was held shortly afterwards, on the 31st to review the Board’s ordinance and look at alternatives to that. A work session was held again on September 26th and we had a lengthy discussion and this was the ordinance that was proposed that I’m going to go over, and we have made slight changes. In general, as you know, the Ordinance requires 35-foot setbacks from major arterials, minor arterials and interstate highways for single-family homes. That would be the front, rear or side yards. Also, if it is a minor collector or a major collector, it would be a 25-foot setback instead. As it was proposed on that day, it was all districts, and it addressed fencing also, which would be any fence that is greater than 42 inches would be set back 15 feet. There is no landscaping requirement, and there is a fairly lengthy grandfathering provision, which still exists, now in the current
ordinance. So, any subdivision that has conditional approval or proffers that were related to buffers or a POD approval or an approved special exception would not be affected by the proposed ordinance.

One of the major discussion points at the July 31st work session was that there should be some sort of flexibility built in or a tiered approach, and staff recommended an exception provision be granted, and Mr. Kennedy went over this provision when it came up earlier in this public hearing, where he read off Section 19.4, and this would be the same section that would grant an exception for reduced setbacks that was gone over earlier. The changes come in the fact of the few concerns of the work session on September 26th. Some members of the development community felt that the Ordinance should not be applicable to R-5, R-6 or the RTH Districts. Staff felt the direction from the Planning Commission at that time was to reduce the setback requirements for multifamily districts, and that was done. We reduced the additional setback to 15 feet when adjacent to any road on the Major Thoroughfare Plan being major arterials, minor arterials, connector streets and controlled access ways. This 15-foot setback would not have any exception provision. The other major point of discussion at that work session was that the proposed amendment didn’t address the side yards on subdivision streets, which I was showing you the pictures of, and the Commission asked us to take a look at that requirement when it is adjacent to any public road. What we have done is we have revised the Ordinance to require a minimum side yard setback of 25 feet when a side yard is adjacent to any public street. This typically would be any corner lot, and right now we have a reverse corner lot with 25 feet, but you could have a corner lot that is not reverse corner and we’re saying that the minimum in any corner lot situation or any side yard situation shall be 25 feet. That is not an additional 25 feet; if it is an R-2 District with 15 feet, you would not add 25 feet. You’d just simply make it 25, and this would only apply...

Mr. Kaechele - Excuse me. Today the minimum is 15?

Mr. Householder - For an R-2 District. As an example, that leads me to my next slide actually. Where this kind of conceptually shows how an Ordinance would be enforced in an R-2 example, in this case if you are adjacent to a minor collector with a rear yard, so you would have the additional 25 feet plus the 45-foot requirement in the rear yard for the R-2 District, and also, you see that this area, here (referring to slide) is a regular side yard next to a public street, so that would be a 25-foot setback. In R-2, a minimum side-yard setback is 15, and I have a couple more examples that show how this would be enforced and this would be a major arterial example (referring to slide), a very similar situation. The only difference in this example is that this number is now 35 instead of 25. Also, this orientation could be for an R-2 lot, where a side yard was abutting a major road, and in this case the minimum side yard is 15. You would add 35 feet for a total of a 50-foot setback adjacent to a major arterial. Also, this line here (referring to slide) refers to fencing and that should be 15 feet. And, the last slide is an example of an apartment development with a 35-foot setback...
requirement for R-5 would then be added to 15 feet, so you'd have a 50-foot front yard setback in this example for an R-5 District. That will just summarize where we are with this Ordinance. It has not changed in concept from the last work session where we now have a 35-foot setback requirement or a 25-foot setback requirement, depending on the type of major road. Now this requirement only applies to single-family districts and the fencing would be the same 15 feet and when a side yard is adjacent to any public street, it would be a minimum 25. Also, we have multifamily and have kind of separated it out and an additional 15-foot setback for multifamily structures when adjacent to any major roads, and this again would not have an exception provision. That concludes my presentation and staff does recommend approval of this Ordinance, and I will take any questions that you may have.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Householder. Are there questions for the Commission?

Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Kaechele, I believe, you brought up last time something about - does this pertain to the streets that are going to the main - and I don't know if I ever understood what that does or does not?

Mr. Householder - I will address that. I think what we were talking about was this type of example (referring to screen), where a side yard is very short in a subdivision street, and that is why I added that 25 feet. In staff's view, that is how we addressed that concern, but it would not address rear or front. It would just be a plain increase in setbacks.

Mr. Archer - So the illustration in this case is, this looks like maybe 15 feet...

Mr. Householder - Yes. That is about 15 feet.

Mr. Archer - We would pick up an additional 10 feet with that Ordinance in effect.

Mr. Householder - Correct. And I was hoping that was addressing Mr. Kaechele's concern.

Mr. Kaechele - It is. I don't know how the development community may view this, but I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Archer - I do, too. That seems to be a little dangerous situation right there.

Mr. Vanarsdall - I think the development community is satisfied with this, from the one that spoke.
Mr. Householder - I think they agreed that it was an issue. Mr. David Root is here to speak on behalf of the development community.

Mr. Taylor - I have one additional question. Just a procedural question. Where we have a major arterial, we’ve got a distance in there of 80 feet. That is clear to me from the developer. What happens when a property owner decides he wants to expand his house, he wants to put an addition on the back. Is he precluded from doing that?

Mr. Householder - Let me pull up the 80-foot example.

Mr. Taylor - Suppose he wants to put an addition on the back. He can’t.

Mr. Householder - This example shows the house maxed out. Hopefully they would not build it to the maximum setback point, but in this example, yes, they would have to get a variance in order to put an addition on. A deck could go in.

Mr. Taylor - A swimming pool?

Mr. Householder - A swimming pool is an accessory structure, so that would be allowed.

Mr. Taylor - A swimming pool or bathing house?

Mr. Householder - That is also, if it is not connected to the house, it is still an accessory structure so that would not be affected. They could put that in that area.

Mr. Vanarsdall - They would be going to the BZA just as they are doing now.

Mr. Householder - Correct. Just like if the house was built at the 45-foot setback line...

Mr. Vanarsdall - The BZA already has twice as much and then some cases as they ever had because of all of this, so it would not be any different.

Mr. Householder - You are right.

Mr. Archer - I think it is also important to note that these are recommended minimums. It does not mean you have to build it out to the extent of the minimum every time you build, although I guess in most cases that will occur, but it is something for us to remember as a Commission, I believe, when we approve subdivision plans. OK. Any further discussion? Thank you, Mr. Householder. I believe there was someone here to speak from the development community. Good morning, sir.
Mr. Root - Good morning. I am David Root with the Richmond Homebuilders Association. We are satisfied with the proposal as you have it before you, and we are quite pleased that we have had an opportunity to work with Lee and you all to finally get to this point. At this point, we are very satisfied with it. I think that it accomplishes the goal that you all had had and it allows us also some flexibility in order to continue making our products. So, unless there are any questions, thank you.

Mr. Archer - We appreciate that, sir. All right. I suppose we need a motion for recommendation, do we not, Mr. Secretary? Would someone care to make that motion?

Mr. Taylor - I move approval of the Residential Setback Requirements as presented.

Mr. Jernigan - Second.

Mr. Archer - OK. Motion by Mr. Taylor and second by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no.

Mr. Kaechele - Mr. Chairman, I abstained.

Mr. Archer - Mr. Kaechele abstained. Motion passes.

Mr. Householder - Kevin wanted me to clarify something. I said the minimum setback in side yards is 15, but that was for R-2. It could be at an R-4 or R-3 District and be as little as 10 feet in some cases.

Mr. Archer - Now those are adjacent to side streets?

Mr. Householder - Correct.

The Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Residential Setback Requirements.
PUBLIC HEARING: 2010 Plan Environmental Element Update – Chesapeake Bay Act Compliance

Mr. Marles - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda, this is also a public hearing. This is an amendment to the County’s Land Use Plan, the Environmental Element. It does have to do with coming into compliance with two findings from the CBLAB. That presentation will be given by Ms. Audrey Anderson.

Mr. Archer - Good morning, Ms. Anderson.

Ms. Anderson - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. I just want to briefly review the information that I gave you during the work session we had on September 19th. There haven’t been any substantial revisions to this, to what the staff has proposed since that work session, but I can, just for the record, go through the presentation again.

Mr. Archer - What is your pleasure, members? No. The consensus is that we don’t think that it will be necessary, but we appreciate you offering.

Ms. Anderson - All right. Staff does recommend approval of the amendments that we proposed.

Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone else here to speak to this issue? Then we would need a motion for recommendation.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment as presented dated October 17, 2001.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. Those in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The motion is granted to recommend approval.

The Planning Commission voted to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors the 2010 Plan Environmental Element Update – Chesapeake Bay Act Compliance. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda is a Resolution. This has to do with a Substantially in Accord request for the Henrico Theatre Expansion. The staff report will be given by Ms. Audrey Anderson. I would note that Karen Maier, who is the Assistant Director of Recreation and Parks, is in the audience to answer any questions. She is actually here filling in for Chuck Schroll, who some of you may be aware or you may not be aware, passed away last weekend of a heart attack, and we are certainly sorry to hear that and offer our condolences to Recreation and Parks.

Mr. Archer - All right. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ms. Anderson, again.

Ms. Anderson - Thank you. On the Henrico Theatre Expansion and Renovation, the theatre first opened in April of 1938 and after 24 years of operation it closed in 1962, and reopened in 1966. The theatre closed again in 1996 and is closed until today. The County purchased the theatre property in 1999. The theatre is significant as an example of what is called art deco design, which is characterized by smooth exteriors with straight lines and accents of stone and metal. It also has what is known as stylized or naturalized motifs in the decorations on the interior of the structure. The theatre design is noted for its trim and accented with carved wood decorations, vertical light fixtures, exit door decoration and center ceiling stylized nature motif decoration in its auditorium.

The Division of Recreation and Parks proposes to reopen the theatre as a community facility. Some of the possible uses include visiting dramatic and local theatre groups, children’s and puppet theatre, movies, a place for meetings for the government, small-scale musicians and similar activities.

As noted on the vicinity map that is shown on the screen here, the theatre site is located in the Varina District on the southwest line of East Nine Mile Road at its intersection with North Linden Avenue at 305 East Nine Mile Road. The site consists of Parcel 148-A-14, which is the existing theatre site, containing approximately 1.45 acres. The area proposed for expanded parking consists of part of parcel 148-A-17, which is under contract for purchase, and part of parcels 148-A-12 and 148-9-L-1, which is proposed for shared parking in agreement with the Henrico County School Administration. The total site for the proposed renovation and expansion is approximately 2.5 acres.

The site’s characteristics are suitable for the proposed site. The theatre property is zoned for B-1, Business District. The property is surrounded by other business district zonings, and on the west side of the site and further out beyond the commercial corridor is surrounded by R-4, One-Family Residence District zoning, which represents the Highland Springs community.
As far as the topography on this site, it is basically a flat area, so there shouldn’t be any concerns with any of the expansion and renovation as far as topography is concerned. The Land Use Plan recommends the existing theatre property, parcel 14, for Commercial Arterial Development. The portion of parcel 17 proposed for additional parking is designated for commercial arterial and SR-2, Suburban Residential 2 development. Open space recreation is also on parcels 1 and 12. Although, the Plan does not designate the site for a public use, the proposed use supports a number of the historic and cultural goals of the plan that are designed to generally protect the cultural integrity of the County and guide development in the vicinity of historic resources.

Based upon the staff’s review of this site for the proposed use, we have concluded that the proposed improvements will create a cultural activity that is not in conflict with or a significant departure from the Comprehensive Plan, and the staff, therefore, recommends approval of the Resolution for the proposed Henrico Theatre Renovation and Expansion site substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan for the County. That concludes my report and if you have any questions, I will be happy to address those. Thank you.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Are there questions for Ms. Anderson or from the representative from Parks and Recreation?

Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I would like to just comment that, I think over the past years we’ve heard a lot about revitalization and redevelopment, but I think this is a very good example of an appropriate adaptive reuse of a vacant structure, and by bringing this structure back to life again, it will assist in the redevelopment and attract, what we think, new investment into this area. So, from a revitalization standpoint, it is very consistent with what the County’s plans and strategies are for redevelopment and revitalization.

Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Marlles.

Mr. Jernigan - Also, this is a good area to work with. Like she said, it is perfectly flat through there. They won’t have any topo problems, plus right to the west of that is the Henrico County Senior Training Center there.

Mr. Archer - Ms. Anderson, do we know what time frame we are looking at here in terms of starting and finishing the restoration? Or has one been done?

Ms. Anderson - I believe it was 2003, but Mr. Hart from General Services can answer that.

Mr. Archer - Good morning, Mr. Hart.
Mr. Steve Hart - Good morning. My name is Steve Hart and I am the project coordinator, and I work with Bill Smith in General Services. The renovation and addition projects is about a four and a half million dollar construction project and we hired an architect Guernsey Tingle and they are about 60% through design drawings. We plan to submit to the POD process in early December and we plan to have funding available to start construction in July of next year, 2002.

Mr. Archer - And that would last approximately how long?

Mr. Hart - About 12 months.

Mr. Archer - OK. That is all of the questions I have. Anybody else?

Mr. Jernigan - I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I’d like to see the blue prints and all on that when they are available if you have a copy.

Mr. Hart - OK.

Mr. Archer - OK. We need a motion for recommendation.

Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, being as that is in my district, I will make a recommendation to approve Resolution for Henrico Theatre Expansion - Substantially In Accord with the County of Henrico Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the motion say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have. Mr. Kaechele abstained. We have found this to be Substantially in Accord. Thank you, Ms. Anderson.

The Planning Commission voted to approved the Henrico Theatre Expansion and found it to be substantially in accord with the County of Henrico Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Anderson - Thank you.

Mr. Vanarsdall - I make a motion that we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. M arlles - Mr. Chairman, I just have two quick announcements, if I may. I would just like to recognize Mr. Kennedy, who was promoted to a Planner II position, from a Planner I.

Mr. Archer - They will give you more responsibility now.
Mr. Marlles- More work. Very little extra pay. Also, I would like to just note for the record, that last night at the Board meeting, the Board did recognize the Planning Commission and Planning staff as part of the Celebration of Community Planning Day. Officially, it is celebrated on November 8, but a Resolution was approved by the Board commending the Commission and staff and public and private planners in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Archer- You are so commended. Thank you, Mr. Marlles.

Mr. Marlles- One last item, Mr. Silber just reminded me, Mr. Chairman, and this is just for information purposes, but the information for the upcoming APA Conference in Chicago, Illinois is starting to become available on the APA web site. Mr. Silber has that web address if you need it. You can get it by just plugging in American Planning Association into your search engine, but as we found out last year, since you can now register for the hotel on line, the space, particularly at the main hotels, does fill up very quickly. So, we would encourage you to check that web site. As we get additional information, we will let you know, but we do need to monitor that very closely and make sure you register sooner rather than later. Otherwise, you may find yourself out of a hotel room.

Mr. Taylor - One thing about that registration on line, we have done it last year and in a few cases it is not fail safe, so if we can also get the phone number, some of us can just call and get a person to acknowledge that.

Mr. Marlles- It is on the web site, Mr. Taylor, but if we get any written information, and I do expect them to send us a mailing. They normally do.

Mr. Taylor - Well, just let us know the phone number. If we just get an e-mail or something to give us a phone number and a date, then we can do it. I want to put a plug in for some of the field trips that they said we were going to do. They are going to have open tours to the Field Museum to see the U-505. There are a couple of good field trips there.

Mr. Archer - I have a motion for adjournment. Do I have a second?

Mr. Taylor- Second.

Mr. Archer - The motion was made by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Taylor to adjourn this meeting. All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. This meeting is adjourned.
On a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by Mr. Taylor, the Planning Commission adjourned its meeting for October 24, 2001, at 11:38 a.m.
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