

1 Minutes of the work session meeting of the Planning Commission of Henrico, Virginia, held in the
2 County Manager's Conference Room of the County Administration Building, Parham and Hungary
3 Spring Roads at 5:00 p.m. on June 13, 2002.
4

5 Members Present: Allen J. Taylor, C.P.C., Three Chopt, Chairperson
6 Eugene Jernigan, C.P.C., Varina
7 Lisa Ware, Tuckahoe
8 Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Brookland
9 Frank J. Thornton, Board of Supervisors, Fairfield
10 John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary, Director of Planning
11

12 Others Present: Randall R. Silber, Assistant Director of Planning
13 Joe Emerson, Principal Planner
14 David O'Kelly, Principal Planner
15 Mark Bittner, County Planner
16 Thomas M. W. Coleman, County Planner
17 Lee Householder, County Planner
18 Debra Ripley, Recording Secretary
19

20
21 Mr. Taylor - Ladies and Gentlemen, members of the Planning Commission,
22 and members of the Planning Staff, this is a work session for the Urban Mixed-Use Ordinance
23 Amendment and we have with us from the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Thornton. I will turn it over
24 to Mr. Marlles.
25

26 Mr. Marlles - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are scheduled to have a work
27 session starting at 5:00 and hopefully we'll have dinner at 6:00 p.m. or maybe a little bit earlier.
28 Mr. Archer is not able to make the meeting tonight, so we will be short one Commission member,
29 but of course we can still conduct business.
30

31 Mr. Vanarsdall - It will be shorter because...
32

33 Mr. Marlles - It will just be shorter, that's right. I'm going to be making the
34 presentation tonight. I do have a formal presentation, but I do want to make this informal in the
35 respect that if you have any questions that come up during the presentation, by all means just
36 ask away. Hopefully everybody has received a mailing that includes an Executive Summary of
37 the proposed Urban Mixed-Use District. We have a draft Land Use Plan Amendment and we also
38 have a copy of the draft Urban Mixed-Use District Zoning Ordinance Amendment. If anybody
39 sitting over here would like copies of these, they are right here on the table.
40

41 Mr. Coleman, are you ready?
42

43 Mr. Coleman - Yes sir.
44

45 Mr. Marlles - Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission.
46 As I'm sure you will recall at a work session last May, the County Administration presented to the
47 Board and Planning Commission the proposed Comprehensive Revitalization Strategy. A number
48 of specific recommendations for implementation of that Strategy were also presented at that
49 time. Earlier this week, in fact, at Tuesday's Board meeting, two of these proposed Ordinance
50 Amendments, and I am sure that you will recall them; the Multi-Family Mixed Use Development
51 Ordinance and the Accessory Apartments over Commercial and Offices Ordinance Amendment
52 were approved by the Board. At this time, I will be presenting a new Ordinance Amendment
53 proposing the establishment of a new zoning district for the Commission's consideration. I will

54 also be discussing a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that would establish a new
55 Land Use classification for Urban Mixed-Use Development, as well as guidelines and criteria to
56 use or that will be considered when it comes time to actually locate or site one of these proposed
57 mixed-use developments in the County, but we will talk about that shortly. And, as I am sure
58 you are aware, the proposed Urban Mixed-Use District really does represent an entirely new
59 approach to land use regulations in the County.

60
61 In the past, just by the way of background to help you understand how this concept differs from
62 some of our current zoning in the County, traditional zoning ordinances would separate land uses
63 with really little or no mixing of residential, commercial or office development. These ordinances
64 were structured, if you want to think about it, somewhat like pyramid, with the most protected
65 land use classification being single-family residential housing at the top of the pyramid and
66 industrial development with fewer restrictions at the bottom of that pyramid. These ordinances
67 were and still are commonly found in both suburban and urban communities across the nation.

68
69 *Mixed-use development represents a very different concept and I can tell you this, looking and*
70 *reviewing the literature and the research we've done in the Planning Office, you will find various*
71 *definitions for what constitutes mixed-use development. In our case, we consider mixed-use*
72 *development to be development characterized by a mixture of three or more land uses, either in*
73 *a single building or on a single site. That is the definition that we are using and going by. Over*
74 *the past 10 or 15 years, many communities, especially if they are urbanizing, are starting to*
75 *encourage mixed-use development. Mixed-use development has become more popular in urban*
76 *areas because it provides the vehicle necessary to encourage the redevelopment of older,*
77 *commercial industrial and residential areas. Even in strictly suburbanizing areas, mixed-use*
78 *development has been gaining popularity because it can help reduce traffic on local streets by*
79 *creating housing closer to employment opportunities, it can help balance the local tax base by*
80 *establishing a minimum threshold for commercial and office development, and it can be a more*
81 *effective use of the existing infrastructure and often result in higher quality of design than is*
82 *possible under traditional zoning.*

83
84 A summary of the proposed mixed-use district has been mailed out to you and hopefully you've
85 had a chance to take a look at it. I am going to briefly review it, but again, if you have any
86 specific questions as I am going through my presentation, feel free to stop me.

87
88 The intent of the urban mixed-use district is to encourage redevelopment and revitalization in
89 older commercial, industrial and residential areas in the County. The major differences between
90 the proposed urban mixed-use district and the County's current zoning ordinance has to do with
91 the mix of uses that are permitted in the district, and the degree of regulatory flexibility. We
92 have tried to, in this slide, highlight some of the major differences between the current Code and
93 the proposed urban mixed-use district. Like most traditional ordinances, the County's current
94 zoning ordinance carefully defines requirements for each district. For example, and I know you
95 are all familiar with this, each district spells out the specific permitted uses that are permitted as
96 a matter of right, and those uses that are permitted by special exception. In addition, each
97 district regulates different types of land uses. We have districts for different types of residential
98 development, commercial development, office development and industrial development. The
99 proposed urban mixed-use district would permit multiple uses on the same site or even in the
100 same building. The current ordinance also spells out the specific yard requirements for each
101 district, including such things as lot area, lot width, set backs, etc. The proposed mixed-use
102 district would not include such requirements, however, the proposed district does require a
103 minimum project size of 20 acres. The current ordinance also spells out the permitted density in
104 each residential district. The proposed urban mixed use-district, as currently drafted, would
105 permit residential density up to 40 units per acre, as a matter of right, and we can talk about

106 how that was calculated, but it is based on the total acreage of the site. Densities greater than
107 40 acres per unit would require a Provisional Use Permit from the Board of Supervisors.

108
109 The current zoning ordinance also specifies the maximum permitted height in each zoning
110 district, and, again, I know that you are familiar with these, but, for example, in the R-1, R-2 and
111 R-3 Districts, dwellings can be up to 35 feet in height and in the R-6 District they can go up to 80
112 feet in height. Some of our office classifications are a little bit higher. The O-3 District allows
113 structures up to 110 feet in height. By comparison, the proposed mixed-use district would permit
114 height up to 45 feet as a matter of right, unless a greater height is approved by the Board of
115 Supervisors, subject to the approval of a Provisional Use Permit. The current zoning ordinance
116 *does not specify what percentage of the development must be in office or commercial*
117 *development; however, the proposed permitted mixed-use, as currently drafted, specifies that a*
118 *minimum of 25% of the building square footage in the district must be developed for commercial*
119 *or office uses, unless otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors. Having this particular*
120 *standard in the ordinance assures that we are going to get a minimum amount of office and*
121 *commercial, so that we don't end up with a totally entire residential product. These are just a*
122 *few of the differences between the County's current zoning ordinance and the proposed urban*
123 *mixed-use district ordinance, again as currently drafted.*

124
125 A couple of things to keep in mind is that the proposed urban mixed-use district is not intended
126 for general application throughout the County. Proposed sites would have to be evaluated on a
127 case-by-case basis. As currently drafted, the ordinance would require that a proposed urban
128 mixed-use district be served by adequate infrastructure, sewer and water. We wouldn't want
129 development of this intensity, for example, to be served by septic tank or wells. It just wouldn't
130 support it. Proposed sites in the district would have to be served by adequate transportation
131 facilities. For example, ideally the site would be close to public transit, close to an interstate
132 highway, interchange, rail centers. It would have to be serviced by roads to support the intensity
133 of the development. The district would have to front on a primary or major access road, a major
134 collector or minor arterial or major arterial roadway as designated on the County's Major
135 Thoroughfare Plan.

136
137 Another important point: Before a site is rezoned for urban mixed-use development, currently
138 staff is recommending that the Land Use Plan must be amended first to show that area proposed
139 for urban mixed-use development. Staff has prepared a draft text amendment to the County's
140 Comprehensive Plan. Again, a copy of that has been sent out to you. What that text amendment
141 attempts to do is to develop a new land use category for urban mixed-use development. It also
142 includes guidelines and criteria to assist the staff and Planning Commission and developers
143 determine suitable areas within the County for this type of development. I can tell you that the
144 draft is undergoing changes and by the time we come to public hearing, we will be revising that
145 and have some changes for you to consider.

146
147 The requirement for a Land Use Plan amendment will help to insure that the proposed Urban
148 Mixed-Use Development is compatible with the surrounding area and will provide for early public
149 review of the proposed development. One of the questions you might have is, what areas would
150 be suitable for this type of development. The areas, for example, that staff feels would be
151 suitable for this type of zoning classification would be, for example, industrial and commercial
152 brownfield sites, of which we have several along the James River, vacant or underutilized malls,
153 such as Azalea Mall, perhaps some of the older commercial corridors or commercial centers could
154 be sites for an urban mixed-use district. Certainly some of our older, more urbanized areas near
155 the *boundary lines with the City of Richmond may be suitable for this type of district. But again,*
156 *each site would have to really be looked at on a case-by-case basis.*

157

158 An applicant for a proposed urban mixed-use development would have to go through a fairly
159 significant review process, including the steps that are outlined on the slide. There would be a
160 mandatory pre-application conference with staff. The applicant would have to seek an
161 amendment to the County's Land Use Plan. This is actually a map amendment. Once the map
162 amendment was in place, the applicant could submit an application for conditional rezoning, an
163 application for a Provisional Use Permit, and as each phase of construction occurs, just like they
164 do in the current process, they would submit a plan of development for that phase of
165 construction.

166
167 Mr. Vanarsdall - Who would be in the pre-application conference?
168

169 Mr. Marlles - With a development of this size, I think it is probably going to be
170 senior staff or multiple staff from different agencies. It depends. These are fairly complex, large
171 developments. It is not your typical rezoning.
172

173 Mr. Vanarsdall - It might be a good idea to have the Board member and the
174 Commission member there, too.
175

176 Mr. Marlles - These are complex developments and as a result the amount of
177 information that we are requiring up front is more substantial than we get with a typical rezoning
178 application. In addition to the rezoning application itself and proffers that would come along with
179 it, the applicant would also be required to submit an application for a Provisional Use Permit.
180 The PUP process gives the County the opportunity to add conditions, to address issues. The
181 applicant will also be required to submit a detailed master plan. And that master plan is really
182 important information, because that is going to show us, what the development is going to look
183 like, what types of land uses are being proposed, where buffers are being proposed, where the
184 open space is going to be, etc. It is a much more detailed master plan than what you typically
185 get with a normal rezoning.
186

187 The other piece that we will be getting with the application, and this is an important piece, is
188 what we call the Development Impact Statement. There will be information submitted on
189 potential traffic impacts from the development, what the fiscal impact of the development is
190 going to be, not only what revenue is it going to bring into the County, but what the cost of this
191 development is going to be in terms of public services. We don't currently get this type of
192 information. We will be asking the applicant to provide us with information on what they see as
193 the potential land use impact, and the impact on the environment. That is a whole piece of
194 information that we currently do not get under our current zoning process that is appropriate to
195 ask for with a mixed-use development. As far as the next steps, tonight we are in the Planning
196 Commission work session. On July 9, we are asking the Board to pass a resolution initiating both
197 the ordinance amendment and the comprehensive plan. Depending upon how the Commission
198 feels tonight, we may be asking the Commission to schedule a public hearing on either July 11 or
199 August 14. That will be followed up by, either a work session with the Board or a public hearing
200 on both the ordinance and the comprehensive plan text amendment. Those are what we see as
201 the next steps in the process.
202

203 Actually, let's go on, because we do have some examples to show you.
204

205 Mr. Taylor - May I ask a question at this particular time?
206

207 Mr. Marlles - Sure.
208

209 Mr. Taylor - It seems to me that there has to be one continuous omnipotent
210 development, one manager for the duration of the project. I don't see that in here. Is there
211 someone like Rouse at Columbia to be the urban mixed-use district manager?
212

213 Mr. Marlles - That is certainly one concept or one option, to have a master
214 developer who comes in and basically oversees the development of the entire project but once
215 the master plans approved it is possible that the project could be developed by a combination of
216 different developers or builders.
217

218 Mr. Taylor - So there is no standard authority?
219

220 Mr. Marlles - There is no requirement that there be just one master
221 developer.
222

223 Mr. Taylor - Thank you. That was my question.
224

225 Mr. Marlles - One of the questions that came up at the Board's work session
226 was the issue of height. We don't have a lot of tall buildings in the County. This particular slide
227 shows 5100 Monument Avenue, is about 112 feet high. The density, we figured is approximately
228 40 units an acre. This is the tallest building, I believe, in the County. Why don't you go on the
229 next one (referring to slide)?
230

231 During the process of drafting this ordinance, we did go out and look at projects in other
232 communities. This slide shows Freemason Harbor in Norfolk, and what you have is small shops
233 and offices, and retail on the first floor with condos or multi-family above.
234

235 Mr. Vanarsdall - Is that building behind it?
236

237 Mr. Marlles - Actually, what you are seeing is just a close-up of the street.
238

239 Mr. Vanarsdall - That is main level?
240

241 Mr. Marlles - Right. That is the first level.
242

243 Mr. Vanarsdall - You can see the awning sticking out here now.
244

245 Mr. Marlles - That lower slide illustrate some of the issues that we are going
246 to have to deal with. For example, you can see awnings that are encroaching over the public
247 sidewalks. You can see that urban landscaping is different than what we often see in suburban
248 settings. We have apartments or condominiums over offices, and retail. It is more of an urban
249 environment.
250

251 Mr. Vanarsdall - John, do you know the height of the building you showed?
252

253 Mr. Marlles - It is a four-story building.
254

255 Mr. Vanarsdall - Probably about 50 feet.
256

257 Mr. Marlles - Yes, I think 50 to 60 feet. One of the questions that comes up
258 is, "How do you handle parking in these types of development?" What you are seeing here are
259 some inside shots (referring to slides) showing the inside of the block. In Freemason Harbor you
260 had residential units and offices fronting the street on all four corners, and then within the
261 interior of the block, you have a combination of surface parking, which is what you can see here

262 (referring to slide), and then underneath the units they have garages. With mixed-use
263 development, we are going to have more parking on the street. We are going to have more off-
264 site parking; not all of the parking will be able to be accommodated on site.

265
266 This is a project called The Town Center (referring to slide) in Virginia Beach. What you are
267 seeing is really a rendering. Virginia Beach has a mixed-use district. Their goal in Virginia Beach
268 is actually to create a downtown for Virginia with high rises, etc. They are currently developing
269 the first office building as a part of this site. We did visit the site and meet with the architect.
270 This slide is intended just to give you some sense of relative height (referring to slide). Right
271 now, to the far left, you have a 45' building which would be permitted as a matter of right.
272 Anything taller than 45 feet would require a PUP. 5100 Monument Avenue is 112 feet and the
273 height of the stadium approved at RIR is a little over 200 feet. This will just give you a relative
274 sense of what these heights look like next to each other.

275
276 This is actually a slide of the Rockett's Landing site (referring to rendering), which is a site some
277 of you are familiar with. This is a proposal being discussed right now. The project itself
278 stretches for about a mile along the James River east of downtown. Andy Conclin and Bill
279 Axselle are here and could probably speak to that. We did want to show you some slides to
280 illustrate that this is an example of a mixed-use development. It is a project that, I think, could
281 be accommodated under our mixed-use district. Our mixed-use ordinance was in development
282 almost for about a year before this project was announced about a month ago. What you have
283 is a combination of office, retail, entertainment, and about 1,500 residential units that are
284 proposed as part of the project. But, again, this is a mixed-use project. These are just some of
285 the renderings that we borrowed from the developer (referring to slides). It gives you the feeling
286 of an urban village. There are plazas along the river. There is a proposal for a linear park along
287 the river, and then some shops and some residential and some of the mixed use and commercial
288 areas. We could also have some high-rise office-type buildings or combination of office and
289 commercial.

290
291 That concludes the presentation. It is a lot of information. It is a major ordinance amendment.
292 I think it is about 19 pages long. Again, the proposal came out of the County's Comprehensive
293 Revitalization Strategy, and we see it as a tool encourage the redevelopment of our older
294 commercial and industrial areas. Staff, obviously, is recommending it.

295
296 Mr. Jernigan - John, I have a question for you. If we are going to have density
297 of 40 units per acre and 25% business, most of these buildings are going to be four stories. Are
298 we using 45 feet as a control factor? Most restaurants have a 12 to 14 foot ceiling. So, if you
299 have a 14-foot ceiling on the main floor, you have two feet between each floor for your air
300 conditioning and plumbing, and the apartments have 8-foot ceilings, you have used 44 feet and
301 you're without a roof yet. Now, do we want the 45 feet to control everything a little tighter?

302
303 Mr. Marles - I think that is probably an accurate statement.

304
305 Mr. Jernigan - Because everything is going to need a PUP.

306
307 Mr. Marles - That is true. The thing to remember is that we are still a
308 suburban county in many respects and 45 feet is the height you typically find in most parts of the
309 County. We don't know or we can't assume that this type of development is only going to go
310 along the river or near the city. So, we want to have a height that we would have some control
311 over, and the Board would have the ability to grant exceptions through the PUP process. But, we
312 are certainly open to suggestions from the Commission and from the Board, and we did have
313 some discussions with the Board about a similar question.

314

315 Mr. Jernigan - It looks like everybody is going to have to file for a PUP.
316
317 Mr. Marlles - The proposed ordinance requires a PUP for the Master Plan.
318
319 Mr. Jernigan - If you increase the height to 50', that would probably facilitate a
320 lot of the engineers and they would not have to go through the PUP process. It is just a
321 suggestion. If you put it at 50, a lot of those people probably fall right in there and wouldn't
322 have to apply.
323
324 Mr. Vanarsdall - I think what you're saying is a good idea, but you still have to
325 have a PUP to do this. If you had to go further, wouldn't that be an exception?
326
327 Mr. Marlles - Yes. It would require a PUP.
328
329 Mr. Jernigan - Are you saying that the PUP for the height will be included with
330 everything?
331
332 Mr. Marlles - Yes. The way we envision it is that as part of the rezoning
333 application and the request for the PUP the applicant will submit a master plan. The applicant
334 should have a pretty good idea of where the land use bays are located within the project and the
335 height of the building. They should know where they will need exceptions to the 45 ft. height
336 requirement.
337
338 Mr. Vanarsdall - What did Bill Abeloff say that the buildings on Rockett's Landing
339 would be? It wouldn't be real high. Do you remember what he said?
340
341 Mr. Marlles - I am going to ask Bill Axselle to correct me, it I'm wrong, but
342 what I read in the newspaper was the buildings closest to the river would be up to 60 feet and
343 then further back 150 feet.
344
345 Mr. Axselle - Yes. Our plan is that right along the riverfront, heights would be
346 50 or 75 feet and beyond that, it would be varied with no more than 150 feet.
347
348 Mr. Vanarsdall - Did he talk about the height of the building?
349
350 Mr. Axselle - Yes. This building, I think, was close to 150 feet, but you would
351 not have a full series of them. You could have a mixture of them, but that would be back from
352 the river for obvious reasons.
353
354 Mr. Marlles - The requirement for a PUP does give us a lot of control over the
355 height of individual buildings. In some places we may not have a problem with a building that is
356 150 feet, but in other places maybe we wouldn't want to allow them that tall.
357
358 Mr. Jernigan - It's all included in one PUP.
359
360 Mr. Silber - Mr. Jernigan, I think you made a good point. I don't think we
361 want to have every single aspect of this development to be required to get a Provisional Use
362 Permit. I think some aspects that seem reasonable we should permit by right. We shouldn't be
363 giving consideration to 50 or 60 feet by right. We shouldn't go for that, but go for the PUP.
364 Otherwise, we could have a situation where every building in here is going to require...
365
366 Mr. Jernigan - That is what I am saying. Everyone that has 50, and that is the
367 way it works out, and every building that goes up will require a PUP.

368
369 Mr. Silber - I think it is a good point.
370
371 Mr. Marlles - We can certainly adjust that. It is not set in stone, that is why
372 we are asking for input.
373
374 Mr. Marlles - One of the questions at the Board Meeting was why have a 20-
375 acre minimum acre project size. Our explanation for that is you have to have a minimum parcel
376 size to get the proper mix of uses to accommodate buffers and open space, and to promote
377 quality development. This is a new concept for Henrico County and we looked very carefully at
378 potential sites including some of the older mall sites, and some of our brownfield sites along the
379 river, and 20 acres seemed to us to be the appropriate size to start off with for our County. That
380 is something that could be looked at in the future, but right now that is what staff is
381 recommending.
382
383 Mr. Taylor - Any questions by the Commission? Any further comments or
384 questions or comments from our patient on-lookers?
385
386 Ms. Phyllis Blackwell - ...what I would like to know is when does this pre-application
387 and all of that sort of thing begin to work? At what point will citizen input be allowed and the
388 other question is, "Will there be a citizen work session before this goes to the Planning
389 Commission?"
390
391 Mr. Marlles - One of the reasons for requiring the Land Use Plan Amendment
392 is that it provides an additional step before the rezoning occurs for early notification to the
393 community and to allow surrounding property owners to have input into the process. The
394 process of amending the Land Use Plan, considering the rezoning application and the Provisional
395 Use Permit is open to the public and a public hearing is required. I think there will be lots of
396 opportunities for public input into the process, if that helps you.
397
398 Mr. Vanarsdall - You may want to write to Mr. Marlles or someone...(mike not
399 picking up remarks) and that would help you some.
400
401 Ms. Blackwell - I looked through all of this and it is pretty heavy reading right
402 off the bat, so we'd like to (unintelligible).
403
404 Mr. Marlles - What I will be asking the Planning Commission to do tonight is
405 to schedule a public hearing date. That would be the first formal opportunity for public input. Of
406 course, the public can comment on this at any time, and I would encourage anyone who is
407 interested to contact our office and we would provide copies and try to answer questions and
408 take input. The first formal opportunity would be at the public hearing.
409
410 Mr. Taylor - Are there any other questions?
411
412 Mr. Jernigan - For projects that would be along the James River, are we going
413 to have a setback rule designed mainly for river front property?
414
415 Mr. Marlles - Not in this district. Again, that would all be looked at and
416 reviewed as of the required master plan. But those types of issues would be worked out as part
417 of the review of the master plan, and again, we have the ability as part of the PUP to add
418 conditions. The applicant has the ability, just like he does right now, to add proffers to address
419 concerns.
420

421 Mr. Taylor - I know we are all right on this project, because I know they are
422 (unintelligible), but what I was thinking about was further down the river.

423
424 Mr. Marlles - It would have to be looked at on a case-by-case basis, and
425 would have to be worked out as part of the approval of the master plan.

426
427 Mr. Taylor - I can see that is reasonable from the standpoint that every site
428 is going to be unique. For instance, in Rockett's Landing, we will have to consider things like
429 flood zones, drainage areas, whereas some of the sites may not have those. I guess with every
430 site we would have to have some kind of communication with the public, which is what the lady
431 mentioned, and have open forums with regard to what it is, where it is, and how it is going to
432 operate, because each one of them basically is going to be unique with a set of construction
433 conditions, geological conditions, and area conditions that are going to be unique to that site and
434 require specific engineering. I see they would be kind of in the discovery phase, in terms of
435 defining what you have and seeing if it is good, and testing it to meet with the public, and have
436 the engineer, of course, work with them, until we really define a concept and say, "This will be
437 20 acres, this will be 30 acres."

438
439 Mr. Marlles - And remember this concept is not necessarily suitable for every
440 area of the County, and the sites are going to have to be looked at, really very carefully on a
441 case by case basis.

442
443 Mr. Vanarsdall - One size does not fit all.

444
445 Mr. Jernigan - I think, what I was trying to say, I know with this project we
446 have green space out front, but, you know how it happens. You go three or four years down the
447 road and you've got one so close you can drop a line out the window, and I don't think we want
448 that. I think sometime we want to set a limit. Maybe give them an idea, so they don't do, spend
449 a lot of time and do a drawing just setting right up on the waterfront.

450
451 (Unintelligible conversation -- mike does not pick up)

452
453 Mr. Taylor - Are there any other questions from the gallery?

454
455 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Commission if you are
456 comfortable with this concept, and I realize it is a lot of information we are throwing at you. If
457 the Commission is comfortable, I would like to ask the Commission to consider two dates for the
458 public hearing. The earliest date would be July 11.

459
460 Mr. Vanarsdall - I thought you said the Board had to take action or something.

461
462 Mr. Marlles - On July 9 the Board is going to initiate the Ordinance and
463 Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The earliest that the Planning Commission could hold a public
464 hearing on this item is July 11. I am asking you for two dates because staff is continuing to it
465 work on the amendments. The earliest we would be ready to hold a public hearing is July 11.
466 The second date is August 15. This is a public hearing to get community input and receive
467 additional comments from the public.


468
469 Mr. Vanarsdall - Do you see any reason why we would not be ready by the 11th
470 of July? Today is the 13th of June.

471
472 Mr. Marlles - That would be the earliest possible date.

473

474 Mr. Taylor - Does everybody here feel that is adequate? Do we need a
475 motion for that? That is OK with us.
476
477 Mr. Marlles - July 11 and August 15.
478
479 Mr. Taylor - I move that we agree to either the 11th of July or the 15th of
480 August. Is there a second?
481
482 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.
483
484 Mr. Taylor - Motion made and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say
485 aye. All opposed say no.
486
487 Mr. Vanarsdall - We would have it before the 7:00 meeting, wouldn't we?
488
489 Mr. Marlles - We could.
490
491 Mr. Silber - We could advertise it for 7:00 p.m. and start the zoning cases at
492 7:30 p.m.
493
494 Mr. Taylor - Or advertise it for 6:30 p.m. and get an early start, in case we
495 run late. We don't know what the caseload is going to be. I would move that we start the public
496 hearing at 6:30 instead of 7:00 p.m.
497
498 Mr. Marlles - Also, if questions come up, and obviously they will, feel free, I
499 think most of the staff here is familiar with both the Zoning Ordinance Amendment and the Comp
500 Plan Text Amendment, so feel free to give us a call and talk to us.
501
502 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I think that is far-sighted proposal, and I just
503 think it is futuristic and I think it will work, and with that, is there a motion we adjourn for
504 dinner?
505
506 Mr. Jernigan - I make a motion that we adjourn the meeting.
507
508 Mr. Taylor - Is there a second?
509
510 Mr. Vanarsdall - We don't want to adjourn, do we?
511
512 Mr. Taylor - Well, a motion that we have something to eat and go on from
513 here. And we will reconvene downstairs. Thank you very much, Mr. Director. Thank you very
514 much, those in the gallery for attending. We will adjourn.
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526


Allen Taylor, PE, Chairman


John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary