

1 **Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of**
2 **Henrico, Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building, Parham and**
3 **Hungary Spring Roads at 7:00 p.m., on November 15, 2001, Display Notice having been**
4 **published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on Thursday, October 25, 2001 and Thursday,**
5 **November 1, 2001.**

6
7 Members Present: C. W. Archer, C.P.C., Chairperson, Fairfield
8 Elizabeth G. Dwyer, C.P.C., Vice-Chairperson, Tuckahoe
9 Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C., Brookland
10 Allen J. Taylor, C.P.C., Three Chopt
11 Eugene Jernigan, Varina
12 David A. Kaechele, Board of Supervisors, Three Chopt
13 John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary, Director of Planning
14

15 Others Present: Randall R. Silber, Assistant Director of Planning
16 David D. O'Kelly, Jr., Principal Planner
17 Mark Bittner, County Planner
18 Thomas M. W. Coleman, County Planner
19 Lee Householder, County Planner
20 Debra M. Ripley, Recording Secretary
21

22 Mr. Archer - The Planning Commission will come to order. Good evening, everyone.
23 I would just like to recognize the members of the press. Mr. Lapis, I see you over there, even though I'm
24 not looking at you. How are you sir?
25

26 Mr. Lapis - Doing pretty well.
27

28 Mr. Archer - From *Henrico Citizen*. I almost said the other one, but I didn't. Anyone
29 else here from the press? If you are and you didn't care to identify yourself we love you anyway, and we
30 thank you for being here. We are starting early today because we have the Williamsburg
31 Road/Technology Boulevard Corridor Study. That's early on the agenda. With that, I'll turn it over to our
32 Secretary, Mr. Marlles and we'll begin.
33

34 Mr. Marlles - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have a full quorum tonight and can
35 conduct business. The first item on the agenda is Requests for Withdrawals and Deferrals. Mr. Bittner,
36 are you going to handle that?
37

38 Mr. Bittner - Actually, I don't believe we can start them until 7:00.
39

40 Mr. Marlles - Ok. Then the first item on the agenda is the Public Hearing.
41

42 **Williamsburg Road/Technology Boulevard Corridor Study:** The Planning Commission will
43 consider amendments to the 2010 Land Use Plan in the form of a new Recommended Major
44 Thoroughfare Plan and Land Use Plan for the Williamsburg Road/Technology Boulevard Corridor study
45 area. The study area is generally comprised of the area bordered by Seven Pines, New Kent County,
46 Meadow Road, and Charles City Road. The Recommended Plans may be examined in the Planning Office
47 on the second floor of the County Administration Building.
48

49 Mr. Bittner, you're going to do the staff presentation on that?
50

51 Mr. Bittner - Yes sir, I am.
52

53 Mr. Marlles - OK.

54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106

Mr. Archer - Good evening, Mr. Bittner.

Mr. Bittner - Good evening, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to begin my fairly brief presentation tonight with an explanation about why this area was chosen for this particular land use study. The Williamsburg Road Corridor and surrounding property comprises a very dynamic portion of the County that includes residential communities, agricultural-zoned properties, and the White Oak Technology Park.

The area is developing rapidly, and we believe this development will continue. The Technology Park has already begun to impact adjacent properties, some of which have recently been zoned Office and Office/Service. This area of Henrico represents a tremendous planning opportunity with a large employment base that is beginning to affect other land values in the area.

In addition to this major employment base, this area has an extensive road system including the crossing of two interstate highways. There are also several arterial and collector roads. Access to this area is tremendous. There is a significant opportunity here to develop more intensely than in some other places in the County. This land use study was undertaken to insure that the highest quality of development could be achieved in this area of Henrico.

The study process itself has involved many different people representing varied interests including local landowners, business people, development professionals, County staff, and elected and appointed government officials.

The study process began with the hiring of a private consultant, Mr. Dick Keller, who is with us tonight, and he is seated behind me in the second row. Mr. Keller and his staff collected and organized extensive background data on this area of the County. They also provided the County with several development options and recommendations concerning transportation and land use. In addition, Mr. Keller has provided the County continuous assistance and professional advice throughout this process.

Upon completion of the background research, a citizens advisory committee was formed to help compose a recommended plan for the study area. This committee met several times throughout the past year and some of its members are also with us tonight. This committee, in consultation with County staff and Mr. Keller, composed the recommendations that are before you tonight.

Two components comprise these recommendations – The Recommended MTP (or Major Thoroughfare Plan) and the Recommended LUP (or Land Use Plan). The MTP is basically the road plan for the area while the LUP would guide development and use of property.

This slide (referring to slide) is the Recommended MTP for the study area. I realize this is a large area and this slide can be difficult to read. Therefore, I will be focusing on smaller sections within the study area on upcoming slides. We also have the Recommended Land Use Plan on this next slide (referring to slide). Again, upcoming slides will focus on smaller areas.

I will first focus on the Memorial Drive Corridor, and let me go back to the MTP to do this. We feel it is important to have a major north/south connection through the study area so that traffic does not collect or bunch up on I-295 and the Williamsburg Road Corridor. We feel that Memorial Drive could be that major north/south connector. Our recommended alignment shows Memorial Drive extending to the I-895 & I-295 interchange.

This picture (refer to rendering) is the interchange for I-895 and I-295. I-895, at this point, is not going to be a full cloverleaf. We have drawn it that way to show the potential Memorial Drive connection.

107 Along with this connection, we are recommending a new alignment for Charles City and Turner Roads as
108 an easier way to funnel traffic around the interchange.
109

110 Our next slide (referring to slide) shows property east of I-295 along the Meadow Road corridor, which is
111 north of I-64. The area labeled SR-2, in the middle of the picture (refer to rendering), is now currently
112 designated for industrial development on the Land Use Plan. It was rezoned around 1990 as the IMG
113 Industrial Tract. The plan at that point accessed this property from the south by a road crossing over I-
114 64 and connecting to Williamsburg Road. As you are aware, nothing has developed industrial-wise on
115 this property. One of the reasons for this is that it would be difficult and most likely expensive to cross
116 over I-64.
117

118 We examined this property and felt it would make sense to have access from Meadow Road instead of
119 from the south. Meadow Road is already recommended for Rural Residential development on the current
120 Land Use Plan. We feel anything accessed from Meadow Road should be residential instead of industrial.
121 Our Plan recommends that property on the south side of Meadow Road be designated single-family SR-2.
122

123 This next slide (referring to slide) moves to the south across Williamsburg Road. We are recommending
124 the large yellow area for SR-1 low density, single-family residential development. We think this could
125 become a pocket for high-quality residential subdivisions. As you continue heading southwest, heading
126 towards the White Oak Technology Park, we are recommending a transition up in density going to SR-2
127 and further up to Urban Residential as well.
128

129 One of the issues that surfaced during the study process was the transition of the border along Elko Road
130 where the White Oak Technology Park would meet residential property. The possibility of introducing
131 commercial development as a transition use was discussed but ultimately withdrawn. Instead, we feel
132 that great care should be taken with development on both sides of Elko Road to insure that any conflicts
133 would be minimized between these differing uses.
134

135 Further to the west is an area we are recommending for mixed-use development. This area borders I-
136 295 on the west and is south of Williamsburg Road. Our vision for this area is perhaps best described as
137 "Innsbrook East." You can see that on the MTP, which is the left picture on this slide (referring to slide),
138 we are recommending a new roadway through this area called W1. We envision this road being similar
139 to Cox Road through Innsbrook, in the west end of the County.
140

141 We are also recommending, as you can see in the lower left corner, a new interchange at I-295 and
142 Portugee Road. We do not envision this being a full-fledged cloverleaf necessarily, but we do think it
143 would be very advantageous to have this as a backdoor entrance to new development in this mixed-use
144 area.
145

146 Continuing north, we come to the Harmon Tract, which, as most people probably know, is the proposed
147 location for the new State Fairgrounds. On the Recommended Land Use Plan, a Semi-Public designation
148 is shown for the Fairgrounds. But, as I think most are aware, the State Fairgrounds is sort of up in the
149 air at this point.
150

151 Because of this uncertainty, we have also drafted an alternative Land Use Plan, which is shown here on
152 the right side of this slide (referring to slide). This alternative recommends Office, Office/Service, and
153 Commercial Concentration in place of the Fairgrounds. When combined with the Commercial
154 Concentration and Mixed Use designations on the south side of Williamsburg Road, the intensity of
155 development in this area could be very significant.
156

157 Because of this, our consultant, Mr. Keller, looked closely at the traffic situation and what future
158 infrastructure facilities could best serve potential new development. Mr. Keller recommended separated-

159 grade facilities at the intersections of Williamsburg Road & Technology Boulevard and Williamsburg Road
160 and Memorial Drive.

161
162 These facilities would allow more efficient traffic flow through the Williamsburg Road corridor. They
163 would also allow the density of development that the market would likely demand in the future. With this
164 in mind, an alternative Non-Fairgrounds MTP has also been drafted and is also shown on the left portion
165 this slide (referring to slide).

166
167 Because of its proximity further from the I-64 interchange to the west, the Williamsburg/Memorial
168 intersection would likely need to be designed to accommodate more traffic than the
169 Williamsburg/Technology intersection. For vehicles leaving or exiting the interstate and heading to
170 destinations along the Williamsburg Road corridor, the Memorial Drive intersection would allow more time
171 and space for lane changing and vehicle maneuvering.

172
173 Williamsburg/Memorial could become a grade-separated interchange while Williamsburg/Technology
174 could either be an at-grade or grade-separated intersection with limited turning movements. This
175 alternative MTP plan is reflected in the relative sizes of the circles marking these intersections.

176
177 That concludes my presentation to you tonight. I would like to just reiterate that this area of Henrico
178 represents a tremendous planning opportunity, and we feel that this plan could be a significant tool for
179 ensuring quality growth and development. We hope it is viewed favorably, and I would be happy to
180 answer any questions you may have, as would our consultant Mr. Keller.

181
182 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Bittner. I would remind everyone that this is a Public
183 Hearing and we will entertain comments from the public. But first, are there questions or comments
184 from the Commission?

185
186 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Bittner, I had a question about that last piece that you talked about,
187 which is in the middle paragraph of the handout that you gave us. It has to do with the intersection at
188 Technology and Memorial and the Williamsburg Road intersection. I guess I don't understand why you're
189 saying the Memorial intersection should be the larger intersection, or should definitely be grade
190 separated. It seems to me that if people were coming off of the interstate onto Williamsburg Road, that
191 you'd have more traffic at the Technology/Williamsburg intersections. So that would be the larger, needs
192 to be larger because it was handling more traffic, whereas by the time you get to Memorial, some of that
193 traffic will have be siphoned off by Technology Drive.

194
195 Mr. Bittner - I'd like our consultant, Mr. Keller to speak to this further. But I believe
196 the basic issue is the distance from the interstate and that Technology could perhaps be too close to
197 allow the necessary vehicle maneuvering for cars coming off of 295 and needing to turn either right or
198 left from Williamsburg. And we're thinking, for instance, on the north side of Williamsburg, which is
199 where the Fairgrounds may or may not go, if that was to develop as something else, you've got cars
200 coming off of the interstate, and then having to get over to make a left turn into that property. Again, I
201 think Mr. Keller has much more expertise in this than I do. But there is a certain amount of distance
202 needed to do that safely. And with that, I would like to ask you to come up and perhaps address that,
203 Dick.

204
205 Mr. Archer - Good evening, Mr. Keller.

206
207 Mr. Keller - Good evening. It's a pleasure to be here. It is a very complicated
208 situation, but Mark is exactly right. This is a sketch we had done (referring to picture). Mark simplified it
209 with circles more for comp planning. But interchanges like this are actually built. This is a tremendously
210 large interchange, as you know. And you cannot take all the traffic and move it from here quickly up to
211 this site to the north, particularly with the higher built out densities with a non-fairground plan. So the

212 theory of these kind of interchanges, and I can pass this sketch around (referring to sketch) if you like,
213 then is to put sort of a half cloverleaf design at the first one, where the traffic can move more freely in
214 here, but more of the action has to occur out here where the traffic can weave on and off of the
215 interstate system. This sketch also shows that some of these ramps are woven together to avoid any
216 conflicts of weaving.

217
218 Ms. Dwyer - So what would the movement then be, if you are coming from the
219 interstate east along Williamsburg, what would you be allowed to do at Technology? What do you
220 recommend for that traffic?

221
222 Mr. Keller - What would probably happen at Technology, you would come off, say
223 northbound on 295 and you could move up and stay in the right turn lane and probably loop up and get
224 in by Technology, but you wouldn't want to weave left and try and get over into Technology too fast.
225 That is one of the theories of that build out. We actually tested this whole build out of this whole area
226 with a non-fairground density. And at 70% build out, we tested at grade intersections here with this
227 corridor being six lanes wide with dual left turn lanes, and these two at grade intersections failed.

228
229 Ms. Dwyer - So what you are saying, is that you are going to limit the maneuvers that
230 are possible at Technology and Williamsburg.

231
232 Mr. Keller - Yes ma'am.

233
234 Ms. Dwyer - Because you don't want all the maneuvers to be possible because it is to
235 close.

236
237 Mr. Keller - Yes ma'am.

238
239 Ms. Dwyer - But when you get farther away at Memorial and Williamsburg then you
240 don't...

241
242 Mr. Keller - You have more chance to weave and do things like that.

243
244 Ms. Dwyer - Ok. That wasn't clear to me from this...

245
246 Mr. Keller - Oh no, it's an excellent question.

247
248 Ms. Dwyer - I understand.

249
250 Mr. Keller - And I might finally add too, that this kind of, it looks very complex and
251 these have been built in many urban areas. But they are only required in this complexity and cost at
252 higher densities near build out.

253
254 Ms. Dwyer - Right. So that the Williamsburg/Technology intersection is really going
255 to be designed to limit maneuvers that are possible from Williamsburg Road?

256
257 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Bittner, can we put that on the screen? (referring to rendering)

258
259 Mr. Bittner - I'd just like to, perhaps clarify, that this is not any recommended design
260 necessarily. It's a possible design. But it is not necessarily what we are envisioning for this.

261
262 Ms. Dwyer - Right.

263
264 Mr. Jernigan - But it is considerably different than what we have been studying.

265
266 Mr. Keller - Well, this is a design. Years ago we designed something like this for the
267 Mobile Oil Headquarters in northern Virginia between Gallos Road at Mobile's headquarters, and a large
268 park called Fairview Park on Route 50. Initially the land was almost impossible to access, but with the
269 big users like that, Mobile and so forth, and users like you have in Technology Park, we believe that users
270 like that want to make sure that you have long-term access available, you know, over a long period of
271 time. One of the key features about this design is on the left-hand side, for example, and this can be
272 done with a spacing. You will notice as you come off of 295, there is a weaving of those ramps. There
273 is, actually, one ramp goes over the other one. You see (referring to rendering), just where that little
274 bridge is, the southeast corner of the interchange. There is one ramp going over the other one, and the
275 theory of that is you can put grade separation bridges on those ramps. It's been done up North, we did
276 it years ago and you eliminate the weaves totally. So again, it is only required ultimately. And this
277 corridor also has a lot of right-of-way available to it, so one of the ideas is to keep the buildings back, you
278 know, keep out a certain key quadrant for whatever design is finally adopted. And that way you always
279 have the room to put the loops in when you need them, maybe 20-30 years from now. It's that kind of
280 planning, the theory is also here that if you were to put singles in very close to the interstate system,
281 what happens is ultimately those weaves will occur, back-ups, to occur back in those ramps under the
282 interstate system. This way you don't have singles creating those...ultimately. So that is why it is done
283 this way.

284
285 Mr. Jernigan - Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt you. So what you are saying is
286 that you think this is a plan 20 to 30 years down the road.

287
288 Mr. Keller - Oh no, this actually could be, I would say maybe a 40 or 50 year plan
289 approximately. I mean, we actually have clients doing 50-year plans. And one of the theories we
290 brought to this study with Milt Herd, who did the land use planning and our economist, was this site is so
291 tremendous in terms of its regional access. It's one of the best sites in the East Coast, frankly. And
292 when the market comes to it, I think you would want to be sure that it has good access on and off the
293 freeway system for all of the movement.

294
295 Mr. Taylor - So it could be a 40 or 50 year plan.

296
297 Mr. Keller - Until it all gets built out.

298
299 Mr. Archer - OK. Are there further questions?

300
301 Mr. Jernigan - Well, I have a question for him. I'm trying to figure how to say it. Let's
302 say that the Memorial Drive extension was built three years from now and that it was actually in the
303 same situation right now, we didn't have the lots filled. Would you still make these separate grade or
304 would you just leave them, reserve the land for down the road?

305
306 Mr. Keller - Well, one of the advantages of having what I call a more detailed access
307 plan like this available to go along with a comp plan circle is it helps you better understand the ultimate
308 build out impact of traffic and the need for some of those loop ramps I've shown you. If you were to put
309 buildings and things in those loops, then those loops are gone forever and then you have another
310 solution. Now the theory of taking Memorial and extending it or Technology and extending it is you
311 might for many years have an at grade intersection with a signal and it would fine. But you might then
312 ultimately have to put a bridge over the top of Williamsburg Road and you want to put that offline with a
313 signal, left or right. And that then should line up with this ultimate road. So it all fits together like a
314 puzzle. That's our approach to this, in something this important. We recommend for some clients that
315 we actually sketch this up, and evaluate a design like this, to make sure it really works and that you keep
316 making available right-of-way.

317

318 Mr. Kaechele - Have you projected traffic volumes that would require this kind of
319 intersection, in general?
320
321 Mr. Keller - Yes, sir. Mark has a copy of a memorandum, kind of a report that we
322 did for the committee. And we reported that if the land all up in this area, particularly the non-fairground
323 density, which is quite high, should it not be a fairground, particularly north of Williamsburg Road
324 between there and 64. That land is just locked in there, and the only way in and out is by Williamsburg
325 Road.
326
327 Mr. Kaechele - All right.
328
329 Mr. Keller - And what we projected by projecting the build out densities, we looked
330 at that great intersection. We pushed the Williamsburg Road corridor to be six lanes, three lanes in each
331 direction with dual left turn lanes and things, and it failed at 70% build out of this density that you see.
332 And that just tells you that the turning volumes left and right are so high. That you either have to have
333 flyovers or triple lefts and things like that. This kind of design is not as costly as you think over a long
334 period of time, as all these users go in place. Because it is really a nice free flow operation where you
335 take loops and, you know, keep on moving. You don't have signals in it ultimately.
336
337 Mr. Kaechele - Right. Well will that volume be 60,000 cars or higher when you get to
338 that point?
339
340 Mr. Keller - Of peak hour or daily?
341
342 Mr. Kaechele - Daily.
343
344 Mr. Keller - I think it's higher than that. I don't have those numbers right in front of
345 me, but I can get them for you later. They are in my briefcase. We did estimate the build out of that.
346
347 Mr. Kaechele - That might be 30 years away.
348
349 Mr. Keller - Well, this kind of planning, I would just share with you, the Mobile
350 headquarters. One of the reasons for doing the plan up there years away was Mobile wanted to know
351 how there Corporate Headquarters would be accessed. And Fairview Park paid a lot of the interchange
352 on the other side of the beltway. But what's fascinating now when I drive that section, it works
353 beautifully. I mean, you just weave in and out of all the ramps and there's no stops at all. It really
354 allows you to move freely and its very good for large corporate users and high technology kind of user.
355
356 Mr. Kaechele - I don't disagree, I think the only question is the amount of timing.
357 Because I don't think anybody could project the year of that. Because that MSI property, as you've
358 described, is some of the best industrial property on the East Coast. Fifteen years ago when it was
359 rezoned and I remember the explanation at that time, and it's still setting vacant. So timing is hard to
360 project.
361
362 Mr. Keller - Well, a lot of our theories of longer range planning is to make sure that
363 you hold the plan there for when the market comes to you.
364
365 Mr. Kaechele - Right.
366
367 Mr. Keller - Particularly here, I would stress, because you have the crisscrossing of
368 the interstate systems. And I remember 25 years ago in the Washington area, the area on the east side
369 of the Beltway, was not active at all. All the development was to the west. Now what's happening are

370 the pressures are on the entire Beltway on the east. And that's why you need these plans, because the
371 market comes to you over a long period of time.

372
373 Mr. Archer - All right. Further questions from the Commission.

374
375 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I have some statements I'd like to make, but I think I
376 would like to hear the speakers first and make it at the end.

377
378 Mr. Archer - OK, certainly. Any more questions from anyone up here? If not then we
379 would like to open it up so that anyone from the public, who's visiting, may make comments or ask
380 questions, whatever your pleasure may be. Please state your name and your residence when you come
381 up, please.

382
383 Mr. Harmon - Good evening. My name is Craig Harmon, and I'm one of the owners of
384 the Harmon Track on Route 60 that we're studying tonight.

385
386 Mr. Archer - Good evening, Mr. Harmon.

387
388 Mr. Harmon - I worked on the committee with Mark Bittner and the other planners on
389 this, and as a whole I agree with the concepts and I agree with most of the general details. I have a real
390 problem with the time frame as been mentioned tonight. Number one, I don't understand, and nobody's
391 informed me as a landowner, how do we set aside this land for these cloverleaves? If I decide to develop
392 my property, is this property that I can't develop for so many years? If I want to put something on the
393 corner of Technology and 60, am I going to be denied it because 60 might widen 20 years down the
394 road? I have a real problem with the wording that's going in on how we set aside these things. And I
395 also, it's been said that this is a 50 year build out, but at the same time if these cloverleaves and these
396 grade separated intersections are adopted into the Major Thoroughfare Plan, a potential developer
397 coming along now is going to look at this, especially in light of what's happening to the Fair. I can't
398 afford to develop this because I've got to build all these cloverleaves, or I've got to set aside all this land
399 and save it for it, which I think, in my opinion, will probably never happen. I've been in this area all of
400 my life, 52 years, and we talked about what happened in northern Virginia. We talked about what
401 happened in the western Henrico. Eastern Henrico is not either one of these places. Sandston has
402 gotten a new bank under construction now, in the last 25 years.

403
404 My father bought this property in 1947 and we've got a Fas Mart and a Texaco, that's all. Oh, excuse
405 me, and a dentist office. That's all we've gotten on that road since 1947. I don't see the build out that's
406 projected. It goes a lot deeper and I don't want to take up your time on all tonight about it. But, I just
407 don't see the build out and the massive need for all of these grade separations. I think one big point that
408 the Board needs to consider, there are plans now I'm told to widen 64. And to do that the scales will
409 have to be moved and as a 25 year veteran in the trucking industry, I can tell you that if the scales move
410 the truck traffic that we experience on this corridor of 60 now that's a problem is going to disappear.
411 They are simply going on down the road as far as they can go and get off at a later point to dodge the
412 scales, wherever they are, down the road. So when that truck traffic is taken off of 60 in the next two,
413 five, six years, whenever the State gets around to widening 64, that's going to relieve a lot of traffic and
414 this is going to become more of a Broad Street, if that's the case. It's going to be less though traffic, and
415 I don't think the grade separations are going to be needed. Fifty years from now, who knows? I won't
416 be here in 50 years and I just, I have a problem with terminology and the language that's put in this
417 thing for the short term, the next 10 years. And I would like to see a little more study done on it. I was
418 very disappointed in the turn out of the people that were appointed to the committee. I heard the
419 number 28 were appointed and one meeting we had seven, and one meeting we had five. I'd just like to
420 see a little more time, a little more thought put into this thing before we vote on it and pass it, send it on
421 to the Supervisors. Thank you very much.

422

423 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Harmon, do you have any idea about the Fair? Do you know what
424 the status of that is?
425
426 Mr. Harmon - To my knowledge they are looking at all their options, is what I've been
427 told. I understand other counties have called them. The last I talked to Otis Brown, he was going back
428 looking at his options. He hadn't written it out, he hadn't boarded yet either. I'm in limbo, is what I'm
429 in. I have no more idea than the man in the moon of what's going to happen.
430
431 Mr. Vanarsdall - I just wondered, because I know they had your property in mind.
432
433 Mr. Harmon - Yes. I hope they still have it in mind.
434
435 Mr. Vanarsdall - Yes.
436
437 Mr. Harmon - But I have no idea.
438
439 Mr. Kaechele - Was there an option, there was an option on your property?
440
441 Mr. Harmon - Was an option and it has expired. They were wanting to extend it and
442 we felt like the extension time was too great, too long. They wanted a two-year extension on the basis
443 that their POD, which was approved by the Supervisors, is good for two years. On advice of our lawyers
444 we decided we couldn't go two years. So the option was left for them to come back if they ever want to
445 come back.
446
447 Mr. Kaechele - OK.
448
449 Mr. Harmon - I haven't shut the door on them, in other words.
450
451 Ms. Dwyer - Mr. Harmon, do you know how much land would be involved, if land
452 were reserved for these interchanges? How much of your property would need to be reserved?
453
454 Mr. Harmon - Well, the major intersection of Memorial Drive and Route 60 is not on my
455 property. If that's a cloverleaf, and the literature I've been shown, it's a cloverleaf, I would image we're
456 talking somewhere in the neighborhood of six acres for the entire cloverleaf or less.
457
458 Ms. Dwyer - You don't own that property.
459
460 Mr. Harmon - No, ma'am.
461
462 Ms. Dwyer - So it would just be Technology.
463
464 Mr. Harmon - Technology intersection, I don't know. We got into several months of
465 discussion on this study and in one of the last meetings it was brought up by the State that access north
466 of 60 is non-existent. The State, if I remember correctly, the State's position was when the road was
467 built, the County asked for it to be limited access, so the State made it limited access. The State's
468 position was that if the County wants another road, the State would go along with it. That upsets me a
469 lot. Because that tells me that should the scenario of the Fair come back again, we'll say, and they want
470 access to north of 60 and the County doesn't want them in there, they just simply say no access. And
471 then if Innsbrook comes down there a month later and said, "we want to build north of 60 and the
472 County wants Innsbrook," then they said, "OK we'll build a road." That limited access and that access
473 issue has not been answered to my satisfaction, as the landowner, and I think that's a problem that the
474 zoning board needs to look at and study a little bit deeper.
475

476 Ms. Dwyer - So do you know how much of your property would be affected by this,
477 the Technology...
478

479 Mr. Harmon - All depending, if they're just talking about two ramps. I've heard that
480 the build out, I was told was an overpass going north of 60, and that all traffic exiting my property north
481 of 60 would have to go over 60 and disperse either on Technology or come around to Memorial Drive or
482 whatever. You know something like that takes a minimum amount of land out of use. If you decide to
483 have left turn lanes and not right turn lanes and whatever then you take more. And here again, I can't
484 answer your question because as you travel around the State of Virginia, you'll find that a cloverleaf on
485 64 and West Broad takes probably a third of the land that the cloverleaf of 295 and 460 down in east of
486 Petersburg takes. It's when land is cheap, the State seems to buy twice as much and make the ramps
487 twice as big. When land is expensive, they tend to make them short and narrow and quick. So how
488 much exactly, I couldn't tell you.
489

490 Mr. Vanarsdall - And more dangerous.
491

492 Mr. Harmon - Yes, more dangerous. The higher the density the sharper and quicker
493 they are, and the more dangerous they are, but you know that's something that an engineer has to
494 express. I couldn't answer that.
495

496 Ms. Dwyer - Then how much property are we talking about here? How much acreage
497 total?
498

499 Mr. Harmon - Altogether.
500

501 Ms. Dwyer - Yes.
502

503 Mr. Harmon - I own 350 acres in this area.
504

505 Ms. Dwyer - OK. Then, maybe with a parcel that large, the kind of development
506 we're talking about, say the Innsbrook, a fair amount of road dedication would have to take place...
507

508 Mr. Harmon - Absolutely.
509

510 Ms. Dwyer - ...for it to provide access, appropriate access of this property anyway.
511 So we might not be talking about a whole lot more property that would need to be reserved, particularly
512 when talking about a parcel of that size.
513

514 Mr. Harmon - No, ma'am. And here again, let me say, if the build out goes on this
515 property, we'll say 30 or 40 years, then I do think these things would be necessary. What I'm after right
516 now, and I think Mr. Jernigan touched on it, I am looking at short term, 10 years. Are we going to tell
517 the next developer that wants to come in here and put a strip mall on 25 acres that he has to build these
518 cloverleaves, that he has to build all these access roads or whatever. In my mind, and I might be wrong,
519 but the only reason the Fair hasn't purchased my land today is the fact that the County put a 4 million
520 dollar flyover in the price tag. And I know we had some sewer problems, but when you add 4 million
521 dollars to the cost of something, just out of the clear blue, that's going to scare away almost any
522 developer. And I just want the opportunity as a landowner too, here again, I would love to sell my land
523 to Innsbrook, because I think that's the highest and best use. But I don't want to limit my options in five
524 years saying, "Well, I've got to wait 25 years for Innsbrook." At 50 years old I don't want to wait 25
525 years. So I don't want my options limited by a lot of lack of a better word, red tape. Developers coming
526 in, they're going to walk into your Planning Department first, and see these plans and see these land use
527 and whatever, and they'll just simply say, "I can't afford to do that," so they go somewhere else. I just
528 think we ought to have a little more time and fine-tune the terminology of all of this before we vote on it.

529
530 Mr. Marllles - Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would like to clarify this sketch, and I'm sure
531 Mr. Keller will verify this is not drawn to scale, first of all. And secondly, typically in situations like this, it
532 would be the right-of-way that would be set-aside during the rezoning process. For the time frame that
533 you're talking, Mr. Harmon, you probably would not be required to construct these major interchanges,
534 but probably what the County would be looking for is to set aside of the right-of-way or protection of the
535 right-of-way. And I think Mr. Keller tried to point that out in his presentation. So I don't know if that
536 helps clarify your questions at all, but...

537
538 Mr. Harmon - Somewhat. But I, you know, here again, it's a very complicated
539 situation. I can't begin. You know, I've had a lot more time, I reckon then other people to think of all
540 the possible scenarios that are possible with this. But, I can see right now in the next year or two, three
541 years, McDonalds, Hardees, whatever wanting to locate on Technology Boulevard. You've got 2,000
542 people going to Infintium everyday, they'd like to sell them a biscuit. Are we going to deny that type of
543 short term, I'd say, development because we've got to set-aside land for some 30 to 40 year plan? Or
544 we just going to set back and wait for another Fairgrounds that's going to buy the whole thing. I think
545 that's right far down the road to get somebody to come in there and buy the whole thing and work the
546 whole deal. I don't know. I might be wrong.

547
548 Ms. Dwyer - I understand that it sounds like that flyover related to Fair was kind of
549 alarming. It does sound like when we are looking at this size of a parcel, the potential for an Innsbrook
550 in here, that there's a fairly limited amount of land that we're talking about reserving.

551
552 Mr. Harmon - Yes ma'am. It's, and here again, this is probably nothing that the
553 developer is going to have to deal with on a daily basis.

554
555 Ms. Dwyer - Right.

556
557 Mr. Harmon - It's new to me as a landowner. I'm sure it's no big problem. I don't
558 know, it's just, I reckon from a amateur's point of view here, because I'm not a professional, the thought
559 of multi-grade interchanges, flyovers, cloverleaves, this jacks the price tag up with development to where,
560 I don't know, it's like an antique Rolls Royce. It's worth a lot of money but there's only a few people
561 going to buy it. And I think as a landowner this really narrows my options as to what I can do with the
562 property. That's my biggest concern. Overall, I think the plan is good. Overall, I agree with it, but I just
563 don't agree with some of the terminology in it.

564
565 Mr. Archer - Well, Mr. Harmon, you've raised some interesting points. And I wish I
566 had some special wisdom to be able to answer some of the questions that you have related to time. But
567 as Mr. Kaechele indicated earlier, it's always difficult to determine what timing will fall into place of any
568 project, or even a projected project. I would know how much specificity that we're dealing with now in
569 terms of where we're going with this. I think at this point and time it is very general in nature. It's
570 especially based on the fact that Mr. Keller said it could take 50 years before this occurs. And I guess
571 just in deference to the fact that there might be some other folks here to speak, maybe we can hear
572 some more observations and out of that we can gain some wisdom that might fit into place here.

573
574 Mr. Harmon - If I could just close with one thing.

575
576 Mr. Archer - I wasn't rushing you, but...

577
578 Mr. Harmon - No, it's a dumb cliché, but in this term I think it works and I think it fits.
579 I'd rather see a little more salt added at the table, then the salt cooked in now. Because I think if we
580 word this wrong and don't take our time and get it right, it's going to be very, very difficult to get that
581 salt out later on.

582
583 Mr. Kaechele - The question of timing is really a valid question, because Innsbrook as
584 you see it today, and that's about 1100 acres. That took 20 years to develop, although it was planned a
585 few years before that. And it's pretty full now, there's a little bit more room there. There's another
586 industrial park, West Creek, about three miles further west, and that's three times as big as Innsbrook.
587 And that's just beginning although the highways are coming through. So this region has a lot of potential
588 development, including Varina, and the timing is going to be a big question. I personally think it maybe
589 West Creek first and then the east end second.

590
591 Mr. Harmon - Absolutely. This is exactly the way I see it. People say, "Well, we've
592 gone as far in Henrico as we can go; they've got to come east now." Well, they are not, they are going
593 on into Goochland. They're not coming east.

594
595 Mr. Kaechele - On the other hand Technology Park is a very attractive park, industrial
596 park, and if the economy kicks up again and the chip industry, I think you are going to see a lot of
597 additions there, as well.

598
599 Mr. Harmon - Right.

600
601 Mr. Kaechele - But on the north side of, well 64 that's being changed. The north side of
602 Route 60 is a...

603
604 Mr. Archer - OK. Any other questions or comments for Mr. Harmon? I can certainly
605 thank you sir for your input and your comments.

606
607 Good evening. How are you doing?

608
609 Ms. Gatewood Stoneman - Good evening. I'm Gatewood Stoneman. I'm a grain farmer in eastern
610 Henrico. I'm also President of Henrico Farm Bureau. We have 3200 members and probably evenly
611 divided between western Henrico and eastern Henrico. A lot of them are associate members who do not
612 farm.

613
614 I thank you for the opportunity of attending the few meetings I was able to attend. As you know, my
615 grandson acted up at one of them, so I didn't come after that. But I'm just real concerned, I think we
616 need to plan for the future and I think everyone sitting up there understands why. I can talk about John
617 Rolfe Parkway and Ridgefield Parkway and some of those that you've had trouble getting the rights-of-
618 way for, but I just feel like that maybe we should have the plan in place if it ever comes to be that we
619 need it. I don't think that we're going to need it. You are talking 40/50 years. I would even go so far as
620 say 75 years, Mr. Kaechele, or leave it to that property over where Eddie Orange had his dairy farm,
621 that's all I know it as. In the early 60s they were talking about what they were going to put there. And
622 there is nothing there, and I think it's going to be quite some time. I do not expect to see anything there
623 in my lifetime. So, I don't see any harm in having this on paper, and surely we're not going to develop
624 so fast that, if necessary, we can't put this in. So, I don't think the whole thing should be written in
625 concrete, because this is the way it's going to be. None of us knows how things are going to be down
626 the road.

627
628 I personally think that Route 60 is one of the prettiest roads from Bottoms Bridge on up to Sandston. I
629 traveled it a lot in the last month, and I don't see a lot of beauty in separated elevations, flyovers,
630 whatever you want to call them. I think we have a unique opportunity with the interchange there that
631 has just been put in place, and I realize why that had to be done. I don't think its particularly pretty and
632 I certainly hate to see one a mile down the road. I think that we have a unique opportunity here,
633 whether it is the Fair, whether it is a shopping center, or whatever. And I wish Mr. Harmon luck if he can
634 get a strip shopping center on his property. I don't see it coming, as long as Eastgate Mall is setting up

635 there empty, an eyesore, but for the traffic coming from the Washington area west of Richmond, come
636 down and use the interchange there at Route 60 and 295, and go ahead and construct the interchange at
637 895 and have the traffic coming from Chesterfield and the south use that interchange, and have them
638 come down Memorial Drive and Technology Boulevard. The people who are coming to those areas can
639 drop off and then they just drive right across Route 60 into Mr. Harmon's property, and it would be no
640 reason to, for the people coming from that direction, to have to get from the right lane to the left lane in
641 a short space. This gentleman said that there wasn't any plan for the interchange up there. I would like
642 to know what they are doing up there right now, because it's a tremendous amount of land disturbed
643 along 295 pretty close to where 895 should come in. And it looks like an interchange, but that is a, I
644 think to go ahead and widen Memorial Drive and Technology Boulevard as is needed for whatever would
645 be the best use of our dollars. We ought to be able to widen a lot of roads for what these flyovers and
646 whatever this right here would cost to develop. I would like to say, we were talking about what they
647 would do with Mr. Harmon's property, and I don't think there's anybody up there that doesn't know that
648 I'm in of favor of the Fair being down there. I have little or no hope of it being there, as I speak to you
649 tonight. But if they cannot get this sewer easement, being a non-profit organization, how in the world is
650 anybody going to get them for Mr. Harmon's property? It sounds to me that a non-profit organization
651 should be able to get it easier than a private citizen.

652
653 I think that the, I didn't get to the Supervisor's Meeting on Tuesday night, but the previous ones they
654 were talking about signage. And I would just drop this in. I think that probably the signage in the
655 County should be addressed. I don't really, I think that these really high signs of the... is that, make
656 things look not quite so nice, and so I don't know where I would lower them to, but the ones that are at
657 a lot of gas stations and automobile dealerships are way up in the air. If they were brought down and
658 were more in line with what everything, everybody else's is, I think that our communities would look a
659 whole lot better and probably so far as signs are concerned, they ought to be required to be kept
660 reasonably painted, or else they need to take them down. I think that is part of the problem there in
661 Sandston now. And I would be glad to answer any questions. I thank you for your time.

662
663 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Ms. Stoneman. Are there questions? Is there someone else
664 who cares to speak?

665
666 Mr. Michael McQuade - Good evening. My name is Michael McQuade and I own some land on
667 LaFrance and 295. And I would like to say that there has been some good discussion this evening and if
668 some of these flyovers and cloverleaves do need to be reserved, I, of course, think that the various
669 landowners should be compensated justly for that, if the County deems that it's in the best interest of the
670 plan for those to be reserved. I have been through the condemnation proceedings in this State and it's a
671 very difficult process, and I've not be very satisfied. And I would just say that if that has to occur here,
672 which I'm sure it will, the people need just compensation for that and not railroaded.

673
674 Also I'd like to say that the County has a unique opportunity here and I think they should grasped upon
675 it, that there is a real jewel here. There's not that many areas where all these roads come together
676 where there is not a whole lot of development. The business cycle is down right now, but in three or
677 four years it may be booming, and this is a plum that may be good for all of Henrico County as far as the
678 tax base. Not just the landowners that are impacted by possible land use, but all the folks that may work
679 here and live here. It's a major asset of the County and I'm glad that the County recognizes it and it's
680 spending so much time on it and is giving so much thought to it. I'm sure there's particulars that this
681 person or that person may not really like, but there is a need to move forward with it in a broad sense
682 with some possible fine-tuning going along as you go. And I would like to think that the County will try
683 to deal fairly with the land reserve issues and stuff. Although my land is not particularly impacted by that
684 situation, it's easy for me to give away someone else's land. But if it was my land, I'd have a totally
685 different, you know, attitude towards it. So, if that land needs to be reserved for the public good, then I
686 just say, you know, try to deal fairly with those people that are impacted with that. And, you know, I

687 think you are doing a good job to make an asset for the rest of the County too, as far as job base and
688 tax base and that sort of thing. Thank you.

689
690 Mr. Archer - Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else? We had hoped to hold this
691 hearing to possibly an hour, so we have a few minutes left if there is someone else who would like to
692 comment? Mr. Secretary, what action are we expected to take on this tonight?

693
694 Mr. Marlles - Well, the Commission can recommend the Amendment to the Board of
695 Supervisors. There are also other actions that the Commission could take. We could recommend
696 deferral, or you can recommend denial.

697
698 Mr. Archer - I asked that because, you know, we are still dealing with the issue of
699 time here, especially in light of the first speaker. We are talking about a plan that may come to fruition
700 50 years from now. I don't know if we are in that big a rush to go forward with this. But I thought I
701 would leave that to Mr. Jernigan to talk about where you think we ought to go with it tonight.

702
703 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I...

704
705 Mr. Archer - The reasons I think that they can be tweaked, but at the same time it is
706 not something we want to drag on forever, either.

707
708 Mr. Jernigan - Well, I'm not going to drag this out. I've discussed with staff this week
709 and I've meet with Mr. Priestas, Mr. Foster, and Mr. Eure about the terminology on the cloverleaves being
710 at these intersections, and I expressed to them at that time that I thought we should change that,
711 because we didn't want to scare off a developer coming in, in the next few years. I do feel this is a good
712 plan and for the distant future it's great, but not for the immediate future, we needed to make those
713 changes. So, I'm against the split grade interchanges as far as going in now and I expressed that with
714 staff, and they're drawing up now some new terminology for page three. So, what I would like to do
715 tonight is defer this for 30 days, give the department heads time to run this by the legal staff and get the
716 changes made and we will vote on it next month.

717
718 Mr. Vanarsdall - If that is your motion, I'll second it.

719
720 Mr. Jernigan - That's my motion.

721
722 Mr. Archer - Motion made by Mr. Jernigan, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall to defer for 30
723 days, was it.

724
725 Mr. Jernigan - Yes, to December 13th.

726
727 Mr. Vanarsdall - December 13th.

728
729 Mr. Archer - December 13th. All those in favor of the motion say aye—all those
730 opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The deferral is granted. The vote was 5-0. Mr. Kaechele
731 abstained.

732
733 At the request of the Planning Commission, the Williamsburg Road/Technology Boulevard Corridor Study
734 was deferred to its meeting on December 13, 2001.

735
736 Mr. Archer - Again, we would like to thank staff for preparing all of this information
737 and all you folks who came out to speak to us. We appreciate your being here and we appreciate your
738 input. Thank you so much.

739

740 Mr. Archer - OK, Mr. Secretary we're not too bad in getting started with the agenda.
741
742 Mr. Marlles - OK, Mr. Chairman, we are on the 7:00 p.m. agenda. Again, the next
743 item is request for Withdrawals and Deferrals and those will be reviewed by Mr. Bittner. Good evening
744 again, Mr. Bittner.
745
746 Mr. Bittner - I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, are you ready to do the deferrals?
747
748 Mr. Archer - Yes.
749
750 Mr. Bittner - All right. Excuse me for that. Deferrals begin; well pretty much every
751 case tonight is deferred. They begin on page 1 of your agenda, in the Brookland District.
752
753 **C-59-01 Robert B. Wilton:** Robert B. Wilton: Request to rezone from R-3 One
754 Family Residence District to M-1 Light Industrial District, part of Parcel 61-A-68, containing 1.15 acres,
755 located on the east line of Old Staples Mill Road approximately 450 feet north of Staples Mill Road (U. S.
756 Route 33). A mini storage warehouse and office are proposed. The use will be controlled by zoning
757 regulations. The Land Use Plan recommends Light Industry.
758
759 Deferral is requested for two months to the January 2002 Meeting.
760
761 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there anyone here opposed to the deferment of P-59-01 to
762 the January Meeting? No opposition. Mr. Vanarsdall.
763
764 Mr. Vanarsdall - I'd like to ask Tom Coleman a question.
765
766 Mr. Archer - OK.
767
768 Mr. Vanarsdall - Tom, do you know why he wanted two months rather than one?
769
770 Mr. Coleman - I think he indicated that the December meeting might be a problem for
771 him.
772
773 Mr. Vanarsdall - OK.
774
775 Mr. Archer - What is the January date? Does anyone know?
776
777 Ms. Dwyer - The 10th.
778
779 Mr. Archer - The 10th, OK. All right, Mr. Vanarsdall.
780
781 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Chairman, I move C-59-01, Robert B. Wilton, be deferred to January
782 10, 2002 at the applicant's request.
783
784 Ms. Dwyer - Second.
785
786 Mr. Archer - Motion made by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Mrs. Dwyer. All those in
787 favor of the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The deferral is granted.
788 The vote was 5-0, Mr. Kaechele abstained.
789
790 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-59-01, Robert B. Wilton, to it's
791 meeting on January 10, 2002.
792

793 Mr. Bittner - Our next deferral actually came in today. It is not on the list in front of
794 your. It is in the Fairfield District.
795

796 **C-61C-01 Robert M. Atack:** Request to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural
797 District to RTHC Residential Townhouse District (Conditional), Parcel 32-A-8N and 9, containing 7.9 acres,
798 located at the southeast intersection of Woodman Road and Mountain Road. Residential townhouses for
799 sale are proposed. The densities in the RTH District cannot exceed nine (9) units per acre. The Land
800 Use Plan recommends Office.
801

802 The applicant has requested, is it one month, Lee?
803

804 Mr. Householder - One month deferral.
805

806 Mr. Bittner - One month deferral to December 13, 2001.
807

808 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here opposed to this deferral to the December 13th
809 meeting? All right. Then I move deferral of C-61C-01 to the December 13, 2001 meeting at the
810 applicant's request.
811

812 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.
813

814 Mr. Archer - Motion by Archer and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All those in favor of
815 the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The motion is granted. The vote
816 is 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
817

818 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-61C-01 to its meeting on
819 December 13, 2001.
820

821 Mr. Bittner - Our next deferral request is the next case on the agenda.
822

823 **C-62C-01 Darrell Hicks for Southside Investments:** Request to amend
824 proffered conditions accepted with rezoning case C-129C-88, on Parcel 129-A-59, containing 6.13 acres,
825 located at 1301 N. Laburnum Ave at the northeast intersection of N. Laburnum Ave and Creighton Road.
826 The property is zoned B-3C, Business District (Conditional) and O-2C, Office District (Conditional). The
827 amendment is related to building materials, building design, and permitted uses. The Land Use Plan
828 recommends Office. The site is also in the Airport Safety Overlay District.
829

830 This request is for two months to the January 10, 2002 Meeting.
831

832 Mr. Archer - OK. Is there opposition to this deferment? OK, seeing none, I move
833 deferral of C-62C-01 to the January 10, 2002 Meeting at the applicant's request.
834

835 Mr. Jernigan - Second.
836

837 Mr. Archer - Motion by Archer and seconded by Mr. Jernigan. All those in favor of the
838 motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The deferral is granted. The vote is
839 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
840

841 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-62C-01 to its meeting on
842 January 10, 2002.
843

844 Mr. Bittner - Our next deferral is in the Varina District, starting on page 2 of your
845 agenda.

846
847 **C-58C-01** **Andrew M. Conclin for Martin J. Bannister/Luke O. Bannister,**
848 **Sr.:** Request to amend proffered conditions accepted with rezoning case C-74C-98, on part of Parcel 140-
849 A-45, containing approximately 7.77 acres, located on the east line of Creighton Road approximately
850 1,600 feet northeast of Caddie Lane. The amendment is related to Proffer 9, home frontage on
851 Creighton Road and landscape buffers; and Proffer 11, dedicating property for Concept Road 140-1. The
852 Land Use Plan recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre, and
853 Environmental Protection Area. Part of the site is also in the Airport Safety Overlay District.

854
855 The request is for one month to December 13, 2001.

856
857 Mr. Archer - OK. Is there opposition to this deferment, C-58C-01? No opposition, Mr.
858 Jernigan.

859
860 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a deferral by Henrico County, an
861 Administrative deferral, to December 13th at no cost to the applicant. I don't think we have to vote on
862 that, do we?

863
864 Mr. Archer - Yes, we do.

865
866 Mr. Jernigan - Then I make a motion we defer it. Administrative deferral to December
867 13th.

868
869 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

870
871 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All those in
872 favor of the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The motion is carried.
873 The vote is 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.

874
875 The Planning Commission deferred Case C-58C-01, Andrew M. Conclin for Martin J. Bannister/Luke O.
876 Bannister, Sr. to its meeting on December 13, 2001.

877
878 Mr. Bittner - The next deferral request is Case P-19-01.

879
880 **P-19-01** **Wes Blatter for VoiceStream Wireless:** Request for a provisional use
881 permit under Sections 24-95(a) and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code in order to construct and
882 operate a 165' telecommunications tower and related equipment on part of Parcel 191-A-17, containing
883 10,000 square feet (0.223 acre) located at 6535 Barksdale Road approximately 800 feet north of
884 Kukymuth Road. The existing zoning is A-1 Agricultural District. The Land Use Plan recommends
885 Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre.

886
887 This request is for one month to the December 13, 2001 Meeting.

888
889 Mr. Archer - OK. Is there opposition to P-19-01 being deferred? No opposition, Mr.
890 Jernigan.

891
892 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to defer P19-01 to December 13th
893 meeting by request of the applicant.

894
895 Mr. Taylor - Second.

896

897 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Taylor. All those in favor of
898 the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The motion is granted. The vote
899 is 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.

900
901 At the applicant's request, the Planning Commission deferred Case P-19-01, Wes Blatter for VoiceStream
902 Wireless, to it's meeting on December 13, 2001.

903
904 Mr. Bittner - Our last deferral request is the next case, C-64C-01.

905
906 **C-64C-01 Richard T. Minter for CDGS Development Company, LLC:** Request
907 to conditionally rezone from A-1 Agricultural District to R-2C One Family Residence District (Conditional),
908 Parcels 149-A-46 and 54, containing 27.7 acres, located at 445 and 505 Hanover Road approximately 700
909 feet south of Rose Ann Lane and 900 feet north of Graves Road. A single-family residential subdivision is
910 proposed. The R-2 District allows a minimum lot size of 18,000 square feet. The Land Use Plan
911 recommends Suburban Residential 1, 1.0 to 2.4 units net density per acre, and Environmental Protection
912 Area. The site is also in the Airport Safety Overlay District.

913
914 This request is for one month, to the December 13, 2001 Meeting.

915
916 Mr. Archer - OK. Is there opposition to the deferment of C-64C-01? No opposition,
917 Mr. Jernigan.

918
919 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to defer zoning case C-64C-01 to
920 December 13th by request of the applicant.

921
922 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

923
924 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Jernigan and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All those in
925 favor of the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The motion is granted.
926 The vote is 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.

927
928 At the applicant's request, the Planning Commission deferred Case C-64C-01, Richard T. Minter for CDGS
929 Development Company, LLC, to it's meeting on December 13, 2001.

930
931 Mr. Bittner - That concludes our deferral request for tonight.

932
933 Ms. Dwyer - What did you do to everybody this month, Mark?

934
935 Mr. Bitter - I gave them the night off.

936
937 Mr. Archer - Thank you, Mr. Bittner. All right, Mr. Secretary do we have anything to
938 hear?

939
940 Mr. Bittner - We also have an expedited case.

941
942 Mr. Archer - Good.

943
944 Mr. Marlles - Why don't you review the expedited case?

945
946 Mr. Archer - Why not.

947
948 Mr. Bittner - It is on page two of your agenda in the Three Chopt District, Case C-
949 63C-01.

950
951 **C-63C-01** **Foster & Miller, P.C. for Highwoods Properties, Inc.:** Request to
952 amend proffered conditions accepted with rezoning case C-10C-84, on part of Parcel 37-2-E-1C,
953 containing 4.648 acres, located at the northeast intersection of Sadler Road and Innslake Drive. The
954 property is zoned O-3C, Office District (Conditional). The amendment is related to site coverage ratios.
955 The Land Use Plan recommends Office.
956
957 Mr. Archer - Is there anyone here who is opposed to this case? No opposition. Mr.
958 Taylor.
959
960 Mr. Taylor: I move approval of Case C-63C-01.
961
962 Ms. Vanarsdall - Second.
963
964 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the
965 motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. Request for approval is granted. The
966 vote is 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
967
968 REASON: Acting on a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall, the Planning Commission voted
969 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request because the change
970 does not greatly reduce the original intended purposes of the proffers.
971
972 Mr. Bittner - That concludes expedited cases.
973
974 Mr. Vanarsdall - I see Mr. Ayers in the audience and I think he ought to have some kind
975 of trophy or something tonight, being the only case in the house.
976
977 Mr. Archer - OK. Mr. Secretary, we will hear this case.
978
979 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the next case is in the Three Chopt District.
980
981 **P-18-01** **Glenn E. Ayers for Tuckahoe-Richmond Lodge #1163, Loyal**
982 **Order of Moose, Inc.:** Request to amend conditions accepted with provisional use permit P-6-90 under
983 Sections 24.51.1 and 24-122.1 of Chapter 24 of the County Code on Parcel 48-A-19, containing 3.86
984 acres, located at 4366 Springfield Road approximately 265 feet south of Gaskins Road. The amendments
985 are related to site improvements, outdoor activities, hours of operation, and permitted uses. The existing
986 zoning is A-1 Agricultural District. The Land Use Plan recommends Multi-Family, 6.8 to 19.8 units net
987 density per acre.
988
989 The staff report will be given by Mr. Mark Bittner.
990
991 Mr. Archer - All right. Is there opposition present to P-18-01? Mr. Bittner.
992
993 Mr. Bittner - Thank you again, Mr. Archer. The applicant seeks to amend several
994 conditions of a Provisional Use Permit (P-6-90) regulating the use of the Tuckahoe Moose Lodge located
995 at 4366 Springfield Road. The proposed amendments would allow outside activities, a children's play
996 area and increased hours of operation. These uses are all currently prohibited by P-6-90.
997
998 This application also originally included a request to allow bingo games on this site. Staff did not support
999 this request and the applicant has stated that they no longer wish to include bingo games with this
1000 application. Staff supports the removal of bingo from this permit application.
1001

1002 Staff does not object to the request for outside activities, a children's play area, or increased hours of
1003 operation provided that the proper conditions regulating their use are adopted. Staff's recommended
1004 conditions are listed in the staff report. These conditions include a recommendation that outside
1005 activities end at 8:00 p.m. The applicant had requested that this time be extended to 9:30 p.m. Staff
1006 did not support this extension. Staff and the applicant have agreed upon compromise language that
1007 would require outside activities to end at dusk instead of 8:00 p.m. This would be consistent with the
1008 closing time for County parks. The recommended language for condition 10 has been changed to reflect
1009 this. And we have passed out that recommended condition to you tonight. With the wording of the PUP
1010 conditions recommended in the staff report and the change to condition 10, the Moose Lodge would
1011 essentially be allowed to operate the same as clubhouses in the surrounding apartment neighborhoods.
1012 It would allow limited gathering opportunities for Lodge members, similar to what clubhouses offer
1013 residents of their respective apartment developments. Staff recommends approval of this application,
1014 subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, and the revised language for condition 10. I'd be
1015 happy to answer any questions you may have.

1016
1017 Ms. Dwyer - What is dusk?

1018
1019 Mr. Bittner - It depends on the day, time of year. I consulted with our Parks and
1020 Recreation Department, specifically. I spoke with Karen Mier, who said that they specifically use the term
1021 dusk because it's a manpower issue. They can't have somebody at every park at the exact time of
1022 sunset. Sunset is an exact time.

1023
1024 Ms. Dwyer - Right.

1025
1026 Mr. Bittner - The applicant and I have discussed this, as well as other staff members.
1027 It does provide some leeway in interruption. And what it is designed to do is, if there is ever an outside
1028 activity on this site, it goes into the night time hours and there's noise or some other impact and a
1029 neighbor complains, the condition will allow us to say, "You are not supposed to be out here at night
1030 time," and we would cite them for that. But to say exactly when dusk is, I could not tell you.

1031
1032 Ms. Dwyer - I'm just thinking out loud. I was curious about that word because it
1033 seems to me it's not an exact time and...

1034
1035 Mr. Bittner - Correct.

1036
1037 Ms. Dwyer - ...it's harder to enforce for that reason. I can understand why Parks and
1038 Recreation would have that reason that you said. With limited manpower, that can't be at all parks. So
1039 they have that sort of gray area, that window of time. But we're just dealing with one site here, why not
1040 just say sunset? If that is more enforceable...

1041
1042 Mr. Bittner - We could but our goal at this point was to simply be consistent with
1043 Parks, just to provide easier understanding for everybody. I don't think having sunset would be
1044 objectionable. Again, that's a different time everyday and...

1045
1046 Ms. Dwyer - But it's an exact time.

1047
1048 Mr. Bittner - It is an exact time. I mean, there could come an instance where we say,
1049 "Sunset was 8:30," and they say that they were out at 8:28, and someone said, "It was 8:32."

1050
1051 Ms. Dwyer - OK.

1052
1053 Mr. Bittner - I don't think that'll happen, but that's a possibility.
1054

1055 Mr. Vanarsdall - It goes through there with the beer laws when they close up. You close
1056 too early; my watch doesn't say that. They go through that. So you can't ever solve it or anything.
1057
1058 Mr. Taylor - I had asked that same question of Mark today and he gave me the same
1059 fuzzy answer. And looking at the realities of enforcement and the realities of the function, I think it's
1060 reasonable to let it slip and slide with the wording of dusk, however, that dusk is defined.
1061
1062 Mr. Jernigan - Dusk is early right now.
1063
1064 Mr. Kaechele - Dusk ends before darkness arrives, right?
1065
1066 Mr. Jernigan - Dusk right now is around quarter to five.
1067
1068 Mr. Archer - It's that never light.
1069
1070 Ms. Dwyer - I guess it's a, we shouldn't belabor it, but I mean if it's Parks and
1071 Recreation, they kind of have control over when, how they work with that. But if you've got a poor
1072 County enforcement guy going out there trying to figure out when dusk is. I just didn't want...
1073
1074 Mr. Kaechele I think most people distinguish between darkness and dusk. So when its
1075 dark, dusk is over.
1076
1077 Ms. Dwyer - Right.
1078
1079 Mr. Kaechele - Right.
1080
1081 Mr. Taylor - It's in that period when you can see and when you can't see.
1082 Somewhere in there we are going to call it dusk and get it into the ...
1083
1084 Mr. Vanarsdall - It's early.
1085
1086 Mr. Jernigan - It's early here, now.
1087
1088 Mr. Vanarsdall - Apparently in the evening it's not light seeing until the moon comes out.
1089
1090 Mr. Taylor - But the thing that convinced me is that Henrico County uses dusk and
1091 it's a name in practice and if it's good enough for Henrico County I think it should be good enough for the
1092 Moose.
1093
1094 Mr. Vanarsdall - Ok.
1095
1096 Mr. Archer - It's when you can't see the stick in the horseshoe pit.
1097
1098 Mr. Vanarsdall - I have another question of another nature for you Mark. What did you
1099 say about the bingo games?
1100
1101 Mr. Bittner - They have dropped that from the request. It is not longer part of this
1102 application.
1103
1104 Mr. Vanarsdall I was going to ask you about that if they didn't remove it, what would
1105 happen if they just had bingo for the members and no general public. Is that different?
1106

1107 Mr. Bittner - I think it would be different and under the language we are proposing
1108 that perhaps could take place. If it was simply for their members, a closed event.
1109
1110 Mr. Vanarsdall - That's what I thought.
1111
1112 Mr. Bittner - Our concern with the bingo is that you would open it up to the general
1113 public.
1114
1115 Mr. Vanarsdall - Another bingo parlor.
1116
1117 Mr. Bittner - In which case you could turn a bingo parlor into a reception hall and
1118 perhaps have a lot of traffic coming to there.
1119
1120 Mr. Vanarsdall - Thank you.
1121
1122 Mr. Taylor - We don't have to waive the time limit on this, do we?
1123
1124 Mr. Bittner - No, this is not a proffer situation.
1125
1126 Mr. Kaechele - Are the expanded hours of operation still a part of the request?
1127
1128 Mr. Bittner - Yes, it is.
1129
1130 Mr. Kaechele - Staff recommends that, from 1 to 2 o'clock.
1131
1132 Mr. Bittner - Yes, we do.
1133
1134 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Bittner, you said that the Moose Lodge was happy with the dusk
1135 terminology?
1136
1137 Mr. Bittner - Yes, they are.
1138
1139 Mr. Taylor - Interesting enough they were also happy with the bingo issue.
1140
1141 Mr. Jernigan - I can understand bingo, but you know that, like take this weekend it is
1142 suppose to be nice and warm around 80° on Saturday and dusk is going to be here real early. I mean,
1143 like around 4:30 to 5:00 range. But dusk in the middle of the summer is going to be up in the 9:00
1144 range.
1145
1146 Mr. Archer - Kind of why they want it.
1147
1148 Mr. Kaechele - Somebody could define...
1149
1150 Mr. Jernigan - Somebody gave up a little bit to get a little more at the time.
1151
1152 Mr. Kaechele - What does the dictionary say? Do you have that?
1153
1154 Mr. Bittner - I read it today and it's just as fuzzy as we have discussed tonight.
1155
1156 Mr. Vanarsdall - How about sundown instead of sunset? I was watching a western last
1157 night and you better get out of town before sundown.
1158
1159 Mr. Archer - You've been here too long.

1160
1161 Ms. Dwyer - We don't have enough cases here tonight.
1162
1163 Mr. Taylor - We have one case and we're picking on it.
1164
1165 Mr. Jernigan - The dusk issue will vary about a minute a day. Right, Mr. Taylor?
1166
1167 Mr. Taylor - At least. But dusk there ought and unto dusk there shalt return.
1168
1169 Mr. Archer - Mr. Taylor, do you need to hear from the applicant? Or would you
1170 rather not?
1171
1172 Mr. Taylor - No, Mr. Chairman. I think we've got this one under control. I will move
1173 for approval of P-18-01, Tuckahoe-Richmond Lodge #1163 as amended.
1174
1175 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.
1176
1177 Mr. Archer - Motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor of the
1178 motion say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The vote was 5-0. Mr. Kaechele
1179 abstained.
1180
1181 REASON: Acting on a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall, the Planning Commission voted
1182 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors **grant** the request because, when
1183 properly regulated by the recommended special conditions, it would not be detrimental to the public
1184 health, safety, welfare and values in the area.
1185
1186 Mr. Ayers - Mr. Chairman, if I may say one word off the record, if necessary. My
1187 name is Glen Ayers, representing the Moose Lodge. Mr. Taylor, thank you very much for sparing me
1188 what you'll have just gone through.
1189
1190 Mr. Taylor - You are very welcome.
1191
1192 Mr. Archer - Ok, Mr. Secretary I believe we have some minutes to approve.
1193
1194 Mr. Marlles - Yes sir, the minutes for the September 13th Meeting and the September
1195 13th Work Session and the October 11th Meeting.
1196
1197 Mr. Archer - OK. Are there any corrections to the minutes? We need to take them
1198 one at a time I believe. Do we not?
1199
1200 Mr. Marlles - Yes, sir.
1201
1202 Mr. Archer - Is there a motion for September 13th.
1203
1204 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move.
1205
1206 Ms. Dwyer - Wait.
1207
1208 Mr. Archer - There is a work session and then there are minutes.
1209
1210 Mr. Vanarsdall - Both of them. Oh, excuse me go ahead.
1211
1212 Ms. Dwyer - I have one change for the minutes. Page 19, line 580,

1213
1214 Mr. Archer - I believe I saw that.
1215
1216 Ms. Dwyer - Instead of disability it should be visibility.
1217
1218 Mr. Vanarsdall - Which line was it again?
1219
1220 Ms. Dwyer - 580. Visibility with a V.
1221
1222 Mr. Archer - I think disability works there.
1223
1224 Ms. Dwyer - That's all I had.
1225
1226 Mr. Archer - All right. Any further corrections.
1227
1228 Mr. Vanarsdall - With correction.
1229
1230 Mr. Archer - Ok. Do I have a second?
1231
1232 Ms. Dwyer - Second.
1233
1234 Mr. Archer Motioned by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Ms. Dwyer. All in favor of
1235 approving the minutes say aye—all those opposed by saying nay. The ayes have it. The minutes are
1236 approved. The vote was 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained. That was the work session there. Those were
1237 the ones we corrected.
1238
1239 Mr. Marlles - I think your motion Mr. Vanarsdall was for both sets of minutes, correct?
1240
1241 Mr. Vanarsdall - Both. Work session and regular and with correction.
1242
1243 Mr. Archer - Ok. All right. October 11th. I had a correction on page 19, line 622, I
1244 don't remember what it was, but I wrote it down.
1245
1246 Mr. Vanarsdall - 622.
1247
1248 Mr. Taylor - 622 is not on there.
1249
1250 Mr. Archer - I'm sorry, it was 652. The word tenancy should be tendency. That's the
1251 only correction I had.
1252
1253 Ms. Dwyer - I had one correction, page 16, line 569, instead of cling it should be
1254 between.
1255
1256 Mr. Vanarsdall - Page 69 what?
1257
1258 Ms. Dwyer - Page 16, line 569 instead of cling it should be between.
1259
1260 Mr. Archer - OK. Any further corrections. Correction in line 569 and do we have a
1261 motion for approval?
1262
1263 Mr. Taylor - Approval of minutes for October 11, 2001.
1264
1265 Mr. Vanarsdall - I second it.

1266
1267 Ms. Dwyer - As corrected.
1268
1269 Mr. Archer Motioned by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall that the minutes be
1270 approved as corrected for October 11th. All in favor of the motion say aye—all those opposed by saying
1271 nay. The ayes have it and the motion is granted. Vote was 5-0. Mr. Kaechele abstained.
1272
1273 Mr. Secretary, is there further business to bring before this commission?
1274
1275 Mr. Marlles - No sir.
1276
1277 Mr. Vanarsdall - Then I move that we adjourn Mr. Chairman. I always do that to make
1278 him nervous.
1279
1280 Mr. Taylor - Second.
1281
1282 Mr. Archer - We have a motion for adjournment by Mr. Vanarsdall and seconded by
1283 Mr. Taylor.
1284
1285 We have a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall, seconded by Mr. Taylor. The Planning Commission adjourned its
1286 meeting at 7:48 p.m. on November 15, 2001.
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292

Chris W. Archer, C.P.C., Chairman
1293
1294
1295
1296

John R. Marlles, AICP, Secretary
1297
1298