MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS OF HENRICO COUNTY HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN THE HENRICO COUNTY GOVERNMENT COMPLEX ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1999, AT 9:00 A.M., NOTICE HAVING BEEN PUBLISHED IN THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH ON DECEMBER 2, 1999, AND NOVEMBER 25, 1999.

Members Present: Richard Kirkland, Chairman Daniel Balfour, Vice-Chairman

Gene L. McKinney, C.P.C., C.B.Z.A.

James W. Nunnally

R. A. Wright

Also Present:

Benjamin Blankinship, Secretary Susan W. Blackburn, County Planner II Priscilla Parker, Recording Secretary

Mr. Kirkland - Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the December meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals. I would like to let you know that there are conditions in the back of the room for each case. If you wish to read them during the meeting they are there for your convience.

Mr. Blankinship - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, ladies and gentlemen. The rules for this meeting are as follows. As Secretary, I, will call the case. Then the applicant will come to the podium to present their case. At that time I'll ask all those who intend to speak, in favor or opposition, to stand, and they will be sworn in. The applicant will then present testimony. When the applicant is finished, anyone else will be given an opportunity to speak. After everyone has spoken, the applicant, and only the applicant, will be given the opportunity for rebuttal. After hearing the case and asking questions, the Board will take the matter under advisement. They will render a decision at the end of the meeting. If you wish to know what their decision is, you may stay until the end of the meeting, or you may call the Planning Office at the end of the day. This meeting is being tape recorded, so we will ask everyone who speaks, to speak directly into the microphones on the podium, and to state your name for the record. In the back of the room on the table, there is a binder, which has the staff report for each case, including the conditions of approval suggested by the staff.

Mr. Kirkland - Do we have any requests for deferrals for the 9:00 am agenda?

Mr. Blankinship - We have one, I believe. We do not have the request in writing yet, but I spoke to the applicant on behalf of Cary L. Bowen, A-153-99. I believe they are going to defer the request until the January 2000 meeting.

Mr. Kirkland - Is Mr. Bowen here? Or Neil Ingram? If not, we will pass this by and come back to it later. If you would, call the first case.

A -151-1999 Trinity Baptist Church requests a variance from Sections 24-94 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a church at 3601 Dill Road (Tax Parcel 128-A-1A), zoned M-2, General Industrial District and R-4, One-family Residence District (Fairfield). The building height and number of stories are not met. The applicant has 65 feet in height and 4 stories where the Code permits 45 feet in height and 2.5 stories. The applicant requests a variance of 20 feet in height and

Mr. Kirkland - If anyone wishes to speak on this case besides the applicant, please raise your hand and be sworn in by the Secretary.

1.5 stories.

Mr. Blankinship - Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Scott - My name is Spencer Scott. I am representing the applicant

Mr. Kirkland - Have all your notices been turned in according to the County Code? They are in the file, thank you sir.

Mr. Scott - The applicant is a 5,000 member church located at 2811 Fenwick Ave. The Church has acquired this 12-acre site, with the purpose of constructing a new sanctuary and accessory structures that will house its chapel and church offices, choir, classrooms and multi-purpose areas. It is designed to meet the recreational and meeting needs of the church. As your staff summary indicates, the project is divided between the M-2 and R-4 zoning districts. The M-2 zoning district allows for 3 stories and a 50-foot building height. This zone contains about 80% of the total square footage of the project. In this particular zone, we also have the sanctuary, which is a 61-foot tall structure but has the median height of 40.5 feet. So it complies with the code.

In the R-4 zone we have a portion of the building that is 4 stories in height and only 43 feet in height. We received a variance last year for parking in the front yard. This is that same plan that was submitted with that request, but we failed to address the height of the building and the number of stories.

We think that the hardship conditions that were spelled out in the prior request are the limitations of the site. We are claiming there are exceptional topographic concerns that have to be met. Under the circumstances, the strict application of the ordinance, as it relates to the number of stories, would unreasonably restrict the applicant's use of the property. Finally, I want to address the massiveness of the structures. There are only 3 stories of this building out of the ground. This 43-foot high structure is 140 feet from the road and it is another 220 feet from the nearest house, which is across the street.

80		
81 82	Mr. Kirkland -	Any questions by the Board Members?
83	Mr. McKinney -	Mr. Scott, if this should not be granted, what would your next
84	avenue be? To lowe	
85	Mr. Scott -	What is devicing the project is the size of the construct. One
86 87		What is driving the project, is the size of the sanctuary. One about that. We are talking about classrooms, and what would
88		ould reduce the number. If this were to happen, they would not be
89		Il measure of their program, because they have no other location on
90 91	the site to place the b	building.
92 93	Mr. McKinney -	What is the congregation number of Trinity Baptist Church?
94 95	Mr. Scott -	They have 5,000 members.
96	Mr. McKinney -	So you are a regional church. So you have congregation that
97	comes from the entire	e metropolitan area.
98 99	Mr. Nunnally -	What is the average Sunday attendance?
100	Wir. Namiany	What is the average ounday attendance:
101	Mr. Scott -	The average attendance would be split between 2 services.
102 103	The attendance would	ld be in the neighborhood of 1500 to 1700 people a service.
103 104 105	Mr. Wright -	How many does the sanctuary seat?
105 106 107	Mr. Scott -	It holds about 1700 people.
107 108 109	Mr. McKinney -	How many parking spaces?
110 111 111	Mr. Scott -	570 spaces or so.
112	M. Wright -	Mr. Scott, have you had any input from the surrounding
113 114	neighbors?	
115	Mr. Scott -	We have had positive input from the neighboring church.
116	They are glad that a	church is going to be built here instead of a possible warehouse.
117 118	Mr. Wright -	Have the people who live in the adjacent houses seen the
119	•	derstand the height situation?
120	M 0 "	
121 122	Mr. Scott -	I can't say personally that I have shown them all the plans. I ware of the project because of the hearing last year. We will have a
123	•	presented before the Planning Commission at a public hearing, and
124	they will be able to vo	pice their comments at that time.

126 127	Mr. Kirkland - Any o	other questions?
128 129 130 131	• •	Mr. Blankinship, this has to go for a POD, we haven't seen to for those that that young lady had. We received nothing in our be constructed of, Mr. Scott?
132 133	Mr. Scott -	It is masonry,
134 135	Mr. McKinney -	What type of masonry?
136 137	Mr. Scott -	Brick.
138 139	Mr. McKinney - floor, what is that to be co	So Brick and glassWhere it says second floor and third instructed of.
140 141 142	Mr. Scott -	Masonry.
143 144 145	Mr. McKinney - this.	And show us where you are above the height regulations on
146 147	Mr. Scott -	(Illustrates on the drawing)
148 149	Mr. McKinney -	Don't we have a portable microphone?
150 151 152 153	Mr. Scott - exceeds the height regulated height limitation. We are	Your question was where is the area that the building ation. It is at the top of the ridge. It is 5 feet above the 45-foot saying it is 50 feet.
154 155	Mr. McKinney -	Show us where this building is in compliance with the Code.
156 157 158 159 160 161 162	the roof deck. The roof of 43 feet we are looking at	The 43-foot dimension shown here (picture) is from the grade or the Code the height is measured from the grade to the top of deck is actually 2 feet below the parapet. Instead of looking at 41 feet. So that would make that section of the building within he Code. The skylight, which is 50 feet, is not visible from the
163 164	Mr. McKinney -	The total square footage of this building is what?
165 166 167 168	Mr. Scott - around 27,000 – 30,000 s purpose space.	The total square footage is 114,000 square feet. We have square feet in the sanctuary. The rest is in education and multi-
169 170	Mr. McKinney -	What will your hours of operations be here?

171	Mr. Scott -	I think the hours of operations will be like most churches.			
172					
173					
174	Mr. McKinney -	Sunday and Wednesday are normally the busiest times at a			
175	church.	·			
176					
177	Mr. Scott -	This building has a family services operation and the multi-			
178	purpose room has a gymnasium in it. They expect that the citizens will be able to send				
179	their kids to play basketba	all.			
180					
181	Mr. McKinney -	Will it have a daycare?			
182					
183	Mr. Scott	Yes.			
184	NA NA 17'				
185	Mr. McKinney-	Is that to run 5 days a week? And is it free and are the			
186	parents charged?				
187	Mr. Coott	Vac air, and they will be abarged			
188	Mr. Scott-	Yes sir, and they will be charged.			
189 190	Mr. McKinney-	Thank you sir.			
190	Wii. Wertiilley-	Thank you sir.			
191					
192	Mr. Kirkland-	Are there any other questions? Anyone else wishing to			
193		If not that concludes the case, you can get your answer this			
194	afternoon.	That that contacto the sace, you can get your answer the			
195	S				
196	After an advertised publi	ic hearing and on a motion by Mr. Balfour, seconded by Mr.			
197	Wright, the Board granted	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
198					
199					
200					
201		ur, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5			
202	Negative:	0			
203	Absent:	0			
204					
205	•	quest, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing			
206		e of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not			
207	materially impair the purp	ose of the zoning regulations.			
208	1. The property shall	be developed in substantial conformance with the plan filed			
209		changes or additions to the layout may be made without the			
210	approval of the Board of 2	·			
211					
212	2. This approval is su	bject to all conditions that may be placed on the proposed Plan			
213	of Development by the Pl	anning Commission.			

A -152-1999

214

215

Melani Brothers, Inc. requests a variance from Section 24-94 of

	_			
216		apter 24 of the County Code to construct a 10 foot x 15 foot		
217		nroom at 8372 Cardova Court (Northfield) (Tax Parcel 64-2-C-		
218	26), zoned R-2, One-family Residence District (Fairfield). The rea			
219	yaı	d setback is not met. The applicant has 42 feet rear yard setback		
220	where the Code requires 45 feet rear yard setback. The applicant			
221	rec	quests a variance of 3 feet rear yard setback.		
222				
223	Mr. Kirkland-	Anyone else want to speak on this case? If not, Sir will you		
224	raise your right hand ar	nd be sworn in by the Secretary.		
225	, ,	•		
226	Mr. Blankinship -	Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth,		
227	the whole truth, and no	thing but the truth, so help you God?		
228	·			
229	Mr. Kirkland-	Have all your notices been turned in according to the county		
230	Code? Thank you sir.	If you would please state your name and present your case.		
231	, , ,	, , , ,		
232	Mr. Terry Farrar-	We are designing a 10 x 15-foot sunroom and we have a 45		
233		ent and we are requesting to have a 42 foot setback which is a 3		
234		ardship is obviously the very odd shape of the lot. If you notice on		
235		the existing detach garage and this is the only place where we		
236		m on the home. I have some pictures		
237	orana praco are carrios.	Processor :		
238	Mr. Kirkland-	If you give that to us we have to keep it for 30 days.		
239		y = u g =		
240	Mr. Farrar-	The only difference from this picture is that there will be a 1		
241	foot brick skirting aroun	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
242	J			
243	Mr. Wright-	What is the size of this addition?		
244	G			
245	Mr. Farrar-	10 x 15 foot		
246				
247	Mr. Kirkland-	Any questions by Board Members?		
248				
249	Mr. McKinney-	You say your last name is Parham?		
250				
251	Mr. Farrar	Farrar- f-a-r-r-a-r		
252				
253	Mr. McKinney-	I am looking in my packet, and I am seeing a picture of a tri-		
254	level and a rancher. Do	o these houses back up to the property?		
255				
256	Mr. Farrar-	Yes, they do.		
257				
258	Mr. McKinney-	Is that the reason you are showing both of them?		
259				
260	Mr. Farrar-	Yes sir.		
0.61				

Mr. Kirkland- Any other questions? Any one else wish to speak on this case? If not that concludes the case. You can get your answer in the afternoon from the Planning Office.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board **granted** the case **A-152-1999**.

269	Affirmative:	Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright	5	
270	Negative:			0
271	Absent:			0

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

A -153-1999

Harry L. Bowen requests a variance from Section 24-41(e) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to construct a Florida room on the existing deck at 12013 Heiber Court (Worthington Hills) (Tax Parcel 56-10-B-5), zoned R-5C, General Residence District (Conditional) (Tuckahoe). The rear yard setback is not met. The applicant has 20 feet rear yard setback where the Code requires 30 feet rear yard setback. The applicant requests a variance of 10 feet rear yard setback.

Mr. Kirkland- Is any one here to speak on **A-153-99**? We will pass it by until the end of the meeting.

The Board **deferred** the request from the December 16, 1999 meeting to the January 27, 2000 at the request of the applicant.

A -154-1999

William Price Haynes requests a variance from Sections 24-94 and 24-9 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to construct a single family home at 3476 Darbytown Road (Tax Parcel 216-A-106C), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Varina). The lot width and public street frontage are not met. The applicant has 19.73 feet lot width and 19.73 feet public street frontage where the Code requires 150 feet lot width and 50 feet public street frontage. The applicant requests a variance of 130.27 feet lot width and 30.27 feet public street frontage.

Mr. Kirkland- Does anyone else wish to speak on this case? If you would sir, raise your right and by sworn by the Secretary.

Mr. Blankinship - Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Kirkland- Have all your notices been turned in according to the county Code? Thank you sir, If you would please state your name and present your case.

314315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323324

325

326327

My name is William Haynes. I applied for a variance for a Mr. Haynesparcel of land which I have always admired and wanted to build on for my parents. Since then, a few changes have taken place. Such as - someone has built right next door to my father's property. It was originally owned by my brother, who had sold it to Marshall Campbell. Since that has taken place, there is a 20 foot strip of land that runs from Darbytown Road back to where I want to build my house. On the left hand side of the property, there is an easement right of way which is accessible to anyone who lives on the property or adjoining the property. My hardship is that I have no other way of getting to the property other than these two access points. The width of the lot complies with the county regulation as to where I am putting my house. The side yard setbacks and front and rear yard setbacks are met also. As far as the neighbors are concerned, no one has any problem with me building back there. The property, which is 3434 Darbytown Road, is owned by my brother, sister and my self. We own that piece of property. Mr. Marshall Campbell has no problem with it either. The driveway is pretty much in place, which Mr. Campbell uses it and that is fine.

329 330

328

331 Mr. Nunnally- This will be your own personal home?

332

333 Mr. Haynes- Yes. Sir.

334

335 Mr. Wright- You have read the suggested conditions for this case?

336

337 Mr. Haynes Yes, sir.

338

Mr. Wright- If this case is approved, those would be the conditions of approval.

341

Mr. McKinney- Mr. Haynes, this road going into the property, who maintains

343 it?

344

345 Mr. Haynes- All of us do.

346347348

Mr. Haynes- The road maintenance agreement is simply through the family and has been for years. We all take care of it as far as keeping it up. That is the

What kind of road maintenance agreement do you all have?

easement right of way. I am going to use the driveway on the other side.

351352

Mr. McKinney-

Mr. McKinney -You are going to maintain that driveway? What I am getting 353 at is, if someone else buys the property in the future, and says I am not going to do 354 anything to keep that road up but I am going to use it. What are you going to do? 355 356 357 Mr. Haynes -If they don't want to use it that is up to them. 358 Mr. McKinney -Who is going to maintain it 50 years down the road? 359 360 Mr. Havnes -This driveway is part of my land, if I sold the house the land 361 would go with it. 362 363 Mr. McKinney -Your ingress and egress, will be maintained by you and no 364 one else, attached to your property? 365 366 Mr. Haynes -Yes sir. 367 368 369 MR. Kirkland -Any other questions by Board Members? Any one else wish 370 to speak on this case? 371 372 Mr. Haynes -I have already applied for my well and septic permit. 373 Mr. Kirkland That concludes the case. You can get your answer this after 374 noon. Thank you sir. Next case. 375 376 After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. 377 Wright, the Board granted the case A-154-1999. 378 379 5 380 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright Negative: 0 381 0 Absent: 382 383

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

2. Approval of this request does not imply that a building permit will be issued. Building permit approval is contingent on Health Department requirements, including, but not limited to, soil evaluation for a septic drainfield and reserve area, and approval of a well location.

395396

387

388

389

390391

392

393

3. If land disturbance will exceed 2,500 square feet, the requirements of Chapter 10 of the County Code apply. This includes water quality and erosion control requirements. The applicant is responsible for contacting the Department of Public Works.

A -155-1999 Shady Grove United Methodist Church requests a variance from Section 24-94 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to place two modular buildings in the side yard at 4825 Pouncey Tract Road (Tax Parcels 26-A-20A and -21A), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Three Chopt). The minimum side yard setback is not met. The applicant has 6 feet minimum side yard setback where the Code requires 40 feet minimum side yard setback. The applicant requests a variance of 34 feet minimum side yard setback.

410 Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise 411 your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

416 Mr. Wright- Mr. Chairman, I must disqualify myself.

418 Mr. Kirkland- Have all the notices been turned in?

420 Mr. Axselle- Yes sir they have.

422 Mr. Kirkland- If you would state your name for the record and proceed with 423 your case.

Mr. Axselle Chairman, Members of the Board, my name is Bill Axselle and I am here on behalf of Shady Grove Methodist Church. With me is Wilson Collie, who is one of the Trustees of the Church and will be able to respond to any questions that you may have that I am not able to address.

 Shady Grove Methodist Church is a church located on the east line of Pouncey Tract Road and has been since 1852 - A long time institution in our community. It is the northwest quadrant that has experience such tremendous growth in the County. In fact this church has doubled its size in 3 years. They now have a church Sunday services 3 different times on each Sunday. They have 2 Sunday schools. They are busting at the seams. They have just finished a new building and have submitted a master plan to the county showing new construction.

They need more space immediately. That is why they are requesting this temporary use permit for the trailers while the construction is being done. If I can orient you this is Pouncey Tract Road and this is the exiting sanctuary in the middle of the property is the new facility and area where the modular units are requested is in the upper right hand corner of the property.

What I would point out to you is that if you went out there today you would see the exiting facility and the new facility and the parking. The next phase is a 700 seat sanctuary to be constructed in the middle of the property and a 12000 education building and the parking around it. There is also a cemetery on the site.

The point I would make from that is that the church is in a rapid expansion mode. As part of that, the county asked that a master plan be submitted to coordinate the sewer and water and the parking.

What they propose to put in are 2 modular units 24 x 70 feet each, I am handing out a brochure describing the units. These are the type of units that are used in schools, churches. They will be on a foundation with a surrounding skirt and landscaping. As I looked at the brochure, I was pleased. These would be used for adult classroom space and they would be used about 1 ½ to 2 hours every Sunday. We have a requirement of 40 foot setback, and are asking for a 34 foot variance. The trailers will be placed 6 feet from the property line. The property, to the rear of where the location of the trailers, is owned by the Strikers Soccer Association. The question that the staff report asked is why are the trailers being placed here? I would suggest to you that there are 2 reasons:

- 1. We think this is the only option we have
- 2. We think this is the best location for the trailers.

The area in question is high, the drainage is good. The area is graveled and adjacent to a graveled parking and is close to the main sanctuary. It is a matter of convience to the old sanctuary. But that is not the basis for the request to day. It is the best location so that the trailers will not be visible from Pouncey Tract Road. The berm along the Striker Park will block it from the park and this location is the farthest from the adjacent homes.

Between these units and Striker Park is a berm and a fence and a utility shed. There is really no impact on the adjacent property. Another question might be "why can't you put it somewhere else on the Property"? If you look at the site, there is a forced main that limits the location and the cemetery and its access is also a limiting factor. We tried to keep the modular units away from the cemetery in respect to the families who visit the cemetery. That area also has bad drainage.

The other possible location on the site is where the proposed education building and sanctuary will be constructed. Consequently, the modular units would conflict with the construction of the permanent buildings.

This proposed location for the units is the most convient and due to the other activities on the site it is the most available location, the most consistent with good planning practices, and the least impact on adjacent properties.

We have notified all the property owners and have written letters explaining the 487 intentions of the church. I would be glad to respond to any questions that you might 488 have. 489 490 491 Mr. McKinney: Mr. Axselle, how long to you plan to have the modular units there? 492 493 Mr. Axselle: We had talked to the County Planning staff, and as part of the 494 revised POD, if the units are consistent with the policies they have, they could be there 495

497 **5 years.** 498

496

499

500

501

502

Mr. Kirkland; Mr. Axselle, in the photo of the little refreshment stand on Strikers Park, that backs up to these trailers, will people be able to come off that property and go right around these trailers? Is there a fence there to protect these? I know there are a lot of kids out there during the season, and these things are going to be there 5 years. Will that be covered under the landscape plan, Mr. Blankinship?

for 5 years. We just need them there until the new buildings are built, but that could take

503504

Mr. Blankinship: We would require them to show that on a landscape plan, I believe the fence they show here is on the Strikers' property. \

507

508 Mr. Axselle - That fence would remain, and we can add one if necessary, 509 The activities are all focused on the other side of that building. The church and the 510 Strikers have a very good relationship and it shouldn't be a problem.

511

512 Mr. McKinney - Do these trailers accommodate the Congregation today? Or would one do the job?

514

Mr. Axselle - One would not, and I would say two is not enough, we really need more.

517

Mr. McKinney - You say it has doubled in the past 3 years. What are you going to do if it doubles again in the next 3 years?

520

Mr. Axselle - That is why we are going to build the new buildings. They are having a hard time keeping up with the growth. They have the Sunday schools divided into different time schedules.

524

525 Mr. Kirkland - What is the realistic start date for this project?

526

Mr. Axselle - I would say 3 years by the time all the approvals and funding in place. That is a rough estimate. They need for the space is now.

529

530 Mr. Kirkland - Any other questions? Any one else wish to speak on this 531 case? If not that concludes the case.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. McKinney, the Board **granted** the case **A-155-1999**.

536	Affirmative:	Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally,		4
537	Negative:			0
538	Abstained:	Wright	1	

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

2. At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit the necessary information to the Department of Public Works to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the code requirements for water quality standards.

3. This approval is subject to the submittal of a revised plan of development submitted to the Planning Department showing the addition of the trailers on the site and all conditions that may be placed on the plant by the Planning Commission or Planning Department.

4. A landscape and lighting plan shall be submitted with the building permit for review and approval by the Planning Department.

A -156-1999

Country Club of Virginia, Inc. requests a variance from Sections 24-96(c) and 24-96(a) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to reconstruct the parking lots at 709 Gaskins Road (Tax Parcels 123-A-24A and -24B), zoned R-0, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe). The parking lot location and parking lot site are not met. The applicant has off-site parking and parking in the front yard where the Code permits on-site parking and parking in the rear yard. The applicant requests a variance to allow off-site parking and parking in the front yard.

UP- 45-1999 Country Club of Virginia, Inc. requests a use permit pursuant to Section24-12(b) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to reconstruct the parking lots and clubhouse at 709 Gaskins Road (Tax Parcels 123-A-24A and -24B), zoned R-0, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe).

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

579		
580	Mr. Blankinship-	Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth,
581	•	ng but the truth, so help you God?
582	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	g , , y
583	Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wrigh	t abstain from the case.
584	8	
585	Mr. Kirkland:	Have all notices been turned in according to the County
586	Code?	
587		
588	Mr. Condlin: `	Yes Sir. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board I have a
589	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	location of the parking lot across the street (south side of
590		permit. In discussions with the neighbors, it appears that this
591	•	n the neighbors. We want to continue to work with them on this
592		/ like to defer the variance request for the parking across the
593	street in order come to a a	agreement with the neighbors.
594	Marie de la companya della companya della companya della companya de la companya della companya	We have the left and a second the second to
595	Mr. Kirkland:	You want a deferral on which one, the use permit?
596	Mr. Condlin.	Not on the use negative only the negation of the verience that
597	Mr. Condlin:	Not on the use permit, only the portion of the variance that
598	deals with the parking acro	USS Gaskins Road.
599 600	Mr. Blankinship::	You can not divide the variance request. The Board can
601	approve a portion of a req	•
602	approve a portion of a req	uost.
603	Mr. McKinney:	You have opposition here and it is not fair to have them come
604		request. You have to defer the whole request or hear the
605	request today.	
606		
607	Mr. Kirkland:	That is correct. You either defer the whole A-156-99 or we
608	hear it.	
609		
610	Mr. Condlin:	We will go forward. Our primary objective is to get the use
611	permit and the front yard	parking for the Country Club of Virginia. At this location there
612	are two facilities, one of	which is the James River Course and the other is the Creek
613		taff report, this property was zoned A-1 before 1960 and parking
614	was permitted in the front	yard. In the I960 Comprehensive Rezoning, the property was

zoned to R-1, One family Residence District. Parking in the front yard is not permitted in that district, consequently, the existing parking is non-conforming.

The front yard is the street frontage along the public road. The first tee is across the street from the Clubhouse and there is the need to have the parking in the front yard.

Part of the reason of this request today is that the Country Club of Virginia is proposing to reconstruct the facilities, this includes the Clubhouse, maintenance buildings and parking. Show exhibits- existing and proposed.

The primary objective is to upgrade the facility including the parking. They are not increasing the membership of the club, which is contrary to the staff report, but would like to make the facilities more efficient. The other items they want to do in respect to parking is to eliminate the problem with inadequate parking during tournaments. There is an existing gravel lot that they would like to pave over. The goal is to provide enough parking for the needs of the facilities.

There is a second request for a parking lot across Gaskins Road from the Clubhouse. During tournaments, Gaskins Road is used as a drop off point which blocks the road. We propose to provide off street parking on the Creek Course side of the road to eliminate congestion within the right of way. This will help the flow of traffic and help eliminate the cross over from the existing parking lot to the other course. If the members can park on the Creek Course side they would not have to cross the road.

The neighbors have express some concern with the esstectics of the parking area across the street as well as the need. We will continue to work with them on this issue.

Finally, the Code states that a parking lot across a street from the principal use requires variance approval. If the Creek Course was a separate course the variance request would not be needed. Again, the Country Club is committed to working with the neighbors on the parking issues.

I will be happy to answer any questions.

649 Mr. McKinney: Have you ever thought about down zoning back to A-1?

651 Mr. Condlin: We have not discussed that option.

653 Mr., McKinney: That would fix your problem, wouldn't it?

655 Mr. Condlin: Yes Sir.

657 Mr., Kirkland: Are there any other questions? If not, let us hear from the others in the audience. Please state your name for the record.

Mr. Atkinson: Samuel T. Atkinson I am a property owner at 1 Lorraine Station Road. I have consulted with the other neighbors that have a interest in this property. The view points that I am going to present are generally the view points of all of those who are listed. At the request of some of those neighbors, I have reviewed the variance and the use permit, and our concerns are - .we have a special interest in this case because we have to pass by the Country Club to get to our homes south of the Club. I wanted to point out that a correction to their concept that letters submitted with the application clearly state that the facility would be about doubled in size. My recollection is that the current facility is about 17,000 square feet. The property facility is about 38,000 square feet. It is certainly going to be a large increase in the square footage of the facility and it also indicates that participation at the site would increase with the

increase in the size. It is easy to believe that there will be a total increase in activity on the site. Our primary concerns have to do with traffic. I have a letter here that several different neighbors have signed. And I want to submit it to the Board.

675 Mr. Kirkland: Has Mr. Condlin seen this letter.

677 Mr. Atkinson: No sir.

679 Mr. Kirkland: He needs to see a copy of them in order to review them..

Mr. Atkinson: I believed that we, the neighbors, could come to some sort of compromise in regards to the parking across the street. It became impossible to reach an agreement. Some of the neighbors having the opinion that it might be acceptable under certain conditions and others believing that it will not be acceptable at all.

I would like to read the paragraph, the undersigned having received notice of the proposed variance and being owners of the adjacent properties hereby notify you, the Board of Zoning Appeals. of objections to the proposed variance. It appears to us that the applicant seeks to avoid detrimental impact to his own landscape the southeast of the building by locating parking areas adjacent to South Gaskins Road where they present a detrimental impact on South Gaskins and diminish the character of residential accessed by South Gaskins Road.

With over 851 acres at their site, the applicant clearly has other options for parking that comply with the zoning regulations. The zoning ordinance functions to foster tasteful and appropriate development, to prohibit unattractive feature such as parking in the front buildings on public roads and to protect the neighboring property from adverse impacts that diminish the quality of the residential environment.

Front yard parking is a serious detriment to the surrounding properties and the character of the surrounding residential areas that depend on South Gaskins Road for their access. It does not comply with the R-0 regulations. An acceptable resolution would be to locate and maintain an effective visual barrier between the proposed parking areas on Gaskins Road. To be acceptable, the buffer must be dense evergreen plants installed and maintained at a height of 36-42 inches without the access that would permit sight line to the parking areas on Gaskins Road. The plantings must be located to screen the front of both sides of the parking area from Gaskins Road with conjunction with an acceptable landscape plan of the facility. The resolution of the impact would also require that any lighting for the parking areas be consistent with county standards and be light only when the facility is open.

Parking area proposed for the opposite side of Gaskins Road creates a serious traffic problem in addition to the unacceptable ethistic impact. The next matter is particularly important. All of those who use the proposed west parking lot will more than likely cross Gaskins Road to utilize the Clubhouse during their stay. It would be difficult to effectively

restrict the use of the proposed west parking areas to those who only utilize the facilities west of Gaskins Road.

Regarding the traffic issues. . . We are very concerned regarding traffic issues that we already have and concerned that additional issues that will arise from the additional parking across the road. Since there is no traffic outlet to the south, almost all vehicle traffic leaving the proposed west parking area will turn left. To execute this left turn safely, the driver must be visually from the vehicles approaching from the north and south . And from vehicles and golf carts exiting from the south and east parking area. The surrounding area is rich with a wide variety of distractions and unexpected actions by operators of vehicles and golf carts. Operators of golf cart and vehicles frequently fail to yield right of way to Gaskins Road traffic. Club House serves alcohol and the law does not impose strict standards for pedestrians or operators of golf carts. We believe that an inevitable increase of traffic crossing Gaskins Road that is unacceptable because it greatly increasing the risk of serious accidents involving vehicles and predestrians crossing Gaskins Road.

Some of use would consider withdrawing our objections to the opposite side of the street parking if all cars and golf carts crossing Gaskins Road were routed through a tunnel under Gaskins Road and landscaping for the across the road parking facility would met our approval.

To summarize, we believe the proposed front yard parking if it were properly landscaped would be a benefit and we do not object to the front yard parking variance provided that it complies with the landscape requirements and the lighting requirements as stated in our letter. I would like to make a few other comments. We believe there is a serious traffic problem in connection with the use permit and we believe that the most satisfactory way to that is to have the opportunity to participate in the planning and to have the plan reviewed by the Traffic Engineer where we would also be able to state our views.

We want to have an opportunity to review and participate in the landscape plan and the lighting plan regarding the parking areas. I would like to be reassured that the I would have the opportunity to be notified and participate in that whatever planning review that the County requires for approval. So that I can bring my neighbors concerns to the attention of people doing the review for final approval.

Mr. McKinney: Mr. Atkinson, you would get that opportunity at the POD session.

Mr. Atkinson, I am just a layman, and I have attempted to resolve this problem.
The area that seems to be the unanimous objection is the parking area across the road.
The consensus of the people that I have talked to is that this is a good plan f we address the issues that I have discussed

761 Mr. McKinney: How long have you lived in your residence?

763 Mr. Atkinson: Since 1987.

Mr. McKinney: So 12 years. . . . Do you think that this facility is going to increase the rounds of play at the Golf Course?

Mr. Atkinson: Your question is do I think so, I would have to say I think so.

770 Mr. McKinney: For them to increase the rounds on an average basis, they would have to take in more members?

Mr. Atkinson: What I learned from reading the material included in the application, it is not necessary that they could increase the members but this particular facility will become more attractive for the use by the existing members. It is certainly the intent of the Club to make it more appealing facility and is probably going to draw in additional participants. Even with not increasing the membership it will increase the use. I only bring this to your attention because it emphasis the need to take some extra care in traffic planning. The traffic presently presents some hazards and we may be able to reduce the hazards through careful planning.

 Mr. McKinney: In your 12 years of residence there, are you aware of any accidents that has taken place between the residence coming from your neighborhood to CC.?

Mr. Atkinson: No sir. I have not have witnessed any accident related to the golf course.

Mr. McKinney: Do you know of any?

Mr. Atkinson: No sir. Practically any one that you speak to can discuss mere misses with you. It is common to have a mere miss on the order from once a month. They result from several different areas. I confident that the Club is focused on addressing those matters. I would like to have the opportunity to be sure that the concerns of those of us who use the corridor are addressed and that the Traffic Engineer will include our input in his final determination.

Mr. McKinney:

He will have your input at the POD. I do not have any other questions.

Mr. Kirkland: Mr. Blankinship do we have concerns by Traffic Saftey on this project. Nothing has come up on this; Thank you sir. Any one else wish to speak?

Mr. Skidmore: My name is Alex Skidmore and I am residence of 2 Lorraine Station Road, just south of this facility. I wanted to address this safety issue of parking because that having driven this road for 10 years I can shed some light on it. There are about 40 or 50 people that use this road. The problem occurs when you confronted

either with a golf cart, individual walking or the cars parked. And of the three, the golf 808 809 cart is main concern. It is my contention that someone will be seriously hurt at this facility after this is put in. simply because of the traffic. You are forced to brake because 810 of someone forgetting to stop at the crossing. An analogy is to be drawn from the early 811 days at the Belmont Golf Course. It would be a hazard there with any type of a parking 812 lot on the other side of the road, it is a hazard here. The golf carts will still cross the 813 road. With the increase of two more egresses, the increase of an accident is just that. 814 With the use of the Club increases, an accident of a vehicle against a golf cart. We all 815 know how that works. I personally have a moderate amount of fear when entering the 816 area. I am also getting ready to have a 16-year-old son start driving. That is why I am 817 here. There is a great ad on TV now that shows a car driving with no one driving and all 818 of a sudden you see a young person come up with a CD and he is not in control of what 819 is going on he thinks he does. Any problem in this area will facility those who are guests 820 and not the residents. 821

822 823

Mr. McKinney: When you come from your home towards River road and you pass the Country Club what do you say if you are alert for 1,000 feet, right?

824825

Mr. Skidmore This will be the most crucial area., right?(looking at map) This is a 90 degree angle, where a golf cart 5% of the time will not stop.

828 829

830

831

Mr. McKinney: My question was, when you leave your home and you go through this facility how many feet do you think you really have to be aware from when you approach it and when you get through it and go out to River Road., 1,000 – 1,500 feet?

832 833

Mr. Skidmore Unfortunately, we are widening this road and also digging this road up.

836

837 Mr. McKinney: I am talking about just through this facility?

838

839 Mr. Skidmore About 600 feet. .

840

Mr. McKinney You have a son that is turning 16 years old and you have to really be on your toes for 600 feet, when you get out to River Road and go east on River Road?

844

Mr. Skidmore: I'd say that your height of awareness is reduced from A level to normal, which I would call C

847

Mr. McKinney: You are saying that you have a normal level on River Road with all the traffic on Gaskins Road, with all the traffic up there, is less than it is here?

850

851 Mr. Skidmore: Yes.

852

853 Mr. McKinney: Not me.

Mr. Kirkland

Please try to not be redundant.

856 857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869870

871

Mr. Hancock I am a resident at 5 Lorraine Station Road. I have been living there since 1983. I am opposed to the opposite of the road parking variance. The look will make it look more like an industrial area. The traffic complexity would be increased by this additional ingress/egress as well as the left turns created by the automobiles which now have to turn onto Gaskins as well as the golf carts. The safety issue to live on this road cannot be dismissed. I totally agree with my neighbor, I have probably 3 times the height of awareness as I cross this area as I do on River Road. I have had during the summer at least once a week have a golf cart go straight across the road in front of me and never even look. The driver is frequently talking to the passenger and they don't even turn their head. I have had to slam on the brakes. I have missed a cart by as little as 2 or 3 feet. I have reported this a dozen times over the last 5 years, requesting a speed bump or something because it is a down hill slope and the carts go flying. May they ar4e going 20 mph. There are stop signs but they don's stop. And it is just not the golf members but also the employees also that shuttle the carts. It is very dangerous. I am confident that a parking lot on the opposite side will make the safety issue much worse.

872873874

875

876

877

878879

880

Mr. McKinney: Mr. Hancock, suppose you had a speed limit of 5 or 10 miles per hour just through this area. Like you have for a wake for a boat, and get the people from the Country Club of Virginia to adhere to that with the operators also of the golf carts, I am not only speaking of the golf carts but also for the vehicles traveling on Gaskins Road. I know you said your height of awareness is a whole lot greater there. . .I have not heard of any accident there, but I have heard of a lot of accidents on River Road and these other roads. So maybe you best start watching out more when you get out of there then when you are in there.

881 882 883

But my question is to you, what would you think about a condition like that?

884 885

Mr. Hancock: I don't think that is appropriate to require we go that slow on the road we all use to get to our property.

886 887 888

Mr. McKinney: They do not have stop signs between the River Course and the Creek Course. What if they put stop signs up there for the golf carts?

889 890 891

892

Mr. Hancock: I think a speed bump would be more effective than a stop sign. As it exists now, a speed bump is need now. So they would slow down before they cross the road.

893 894

Ms. Wood: I am Delores Wood, I live at 1000 South Gaskins Road. I have lived there since I973. I think River Road is dangerous, but there is a light there. I know that yesterday, I was driving with my neighbor and got to that section of the road and slowed down because there was a golf cart driver cutting across the road not paying attention.

December 16, 1999

We received this letter from the attorneys by registered mail and we all got it at different times. So we have had to really scramble to get all of our thoughts together in such a short period of time.

Looking at the plans, I noticed that there were many places that they had added more parking on the front yard side of the road. This is a public road and not just a road for the Country Club of Virginia, there are residents that live on this road. I do not see the need to have 2 parking lots on either side of the road.

Mr. Kirkland: Any other questions? Does anyone else wish to speak? Mr. Condlin. . .

Mr. Condlin: A couple points of clarification. . .The plans included demolishing 5,000 square feet building currently used for housing carts and storage. The main floor is used locker rooms, events and restaurants is being increased from 17,000 to 20,000 square feet. The remainder of the increase in square footage is for the maintain and storage of golf carts. The up side of this is that is not a substantial increase in the actual facility but an attempt to make is more efficient and more open space.

In addition, the membership has internal limits that it does not increase more than ½% per year over the past 10 years. The play on the courses is just about max out.

In respect to the additional parking, the existing parking includes the gravel parking will be paved and reconfigured for the better use of the facility. The number of spaces will not be increasing.

We will continue to work with the neighbors in respect to the esthetics, landscape, lighting and traffic issues. Let me address that point about parking across the street. That seems to be the most controversial. There was discuss about a tunnel under Gaskins Road. This will not be possible due to the water lines (56 inch) that run adjacent to the right of way. The parking across the street was to address the traveling back and forth across Gaskins Road. There was reference made to Belmont, which is one course, These courses are two separate courses and the golfers will be kept on one or the other. The Courses are self contained and serviced by individual amentias.

 The cart lanes are going to be reduced from 2 to 1 and speed bumps can be placed in the new cart paths. The speed bumps could not be placed in the paths when they were shared with vehicles. The additional parking across the street was to eleviate the crossing of Gaskins Road not to increase it.

Mr. McKinney: How about the buffer Mr. Condlin?

Mr. Condlin: The buffer between the parking, the 39 spaces on the south side of the road?

Mr. McKinney: That was suggested by the opposition. They said 36-42 inch 946 947 evergreen screen on both sides of the parking. . 948 949 Mr. Condlin: We are looking at that now, those are the problems we will try 950 to work out with the neighbors. 951 Mr. McKinney: That will come up in landscaping. 952 953 Mr. Condlin: That is one of the later things to do. 954 955 956 Mr. McKinney: It could be a condition of the Board that a buffer be approved by the Planning Commission. How many rounds of golf are played at these courses on 957 the average? 958 959 Mr. Condlin: There are 30,000 a year on the James River Course and 960 24,000 on the Creek Course. 961 962 30,000 a year on the James River Course and 24,000 on the Mr. McKinney: 963 Creek Course. . . These rounds of golf are played primarily at what times of the day?. 964 965 Mr. William Harris: 966 967 Mr. McKinney: What I am asking is your rounds of play, and you have 968 neighbors that pas your facility, the bulk of the golf carts in and out, during the summer 969 is around 7 am. With this facility change is there any way possible that the you can 970 971 increase your rounds of play at drive time in the morning or in the evening. 972 Mr. Harris: We have limited play at the James River Course at 30,000 973 rounds. 974 975 What I am asking is between the hours of 7-9 in the morning Mr. McKinney:` 976 with the new proposed facility will that in any way increase the golf carts going from the 977 Creek Course to the James River Course? 978 979 Mr. Harris: I have no reason to think it would. 980 981 Or could it? 982 Mr. McKinney: 983 984 Mr. Harris: I would stand here and say probably not, because those are peak times of play and the tees are generally full so the carts are not crossing the road. 985 986 987 Mr. McKinney: And the same thing in the evenings? 988 Mr. Harris: Evenings are generally not full, No, not significantly. 989

991	Mr. McKinney:	, , ,	sh are you going to have more golf
992 993	carts going back ar	nd forth across the road than what	you have now?
994 995		er and nothing is going to change	e are running at peak capacity right e there. At the Creek Course, we
996 997 998 999	doing that, one th	ing we have done this past year ber of tournaments so to red	years we have been successful in to minimize the rounds, We had uce the number of guests and
1000			
1001	Mr. McKinney:	OK, thank you.	
1002 1003 1004	Mr. Kirkland: case, you may get	Any other questions of Mr. your answer this afternoon.	. Condlin? If not that concludes the
1005 1006 1007		I public hearing and on a motion I	by Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr.
1008	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	3	
1009	Affirmative:	Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally,	3
1010	Negative:		0
1011	Abstained:	Balfour, Wright	2
1012	The Deerd arented	this required too it found from the	widenes procested that authorizing
1013 1014 1015	this variance will	•	evidence presented, that authorizing to adjacent property and will not so
1016	materially impair an	o parposo or are coming regulation.	.
1017			parking lot in the front yard of the
1018 1019		rking lot across the Gaskins Roaking lots, will be subject to the con-	d. All improvements on the site, ditions of UP-45-99 .
1020 1021 1022	2. The golf car Gaskins Road.	rt paths shall have speed bumps	and stop signs where they cross
1023	O The secolities	of all all as I as See Too I as a street also	o to the Discrete Office for a te
1024			n to the Planning Office for review
1025 1026 1027		g the parking lots from Gaskins Ro	ous row of evergreen shrubs, 36" to ad.
1027 1028 1029		I public hearing and on a motion I	by Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr.
1030	, ,	•	
1031	Affirmative:	Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally,	3
1032	Negative:		0
1033	Abstained:	Balfour, Wright	2

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing the revisions to this use permit will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. The property shall be developed in substantial conformance with the plan filed with the application. No changes or additions to the layout may be made without the approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

2. If land disturbance will exceed 2,500 square feet, the requirements of Chapter 10 of the County Code apply. This includes water quality and erosion control requirements. The applicant is responsible for contacting the Department of Public Works.

3. This approval is not transferable, except that the holder of the first mortgage on the property may assume responsibility, after notification of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

4. The parking lots, driveways, and loading areas shall be subject to the requirements of Section 24-98 of Chapter 24 of the County Code.

5. A detailed site lighting plan shall be included with the landscaping plans for Planning Office review and approval at time of building permit submission for the temporary structures as well as the permanent structures.

6. All landscaping shall be maintained in a healthy condition at all times. Dead plant materials shall be removed within a reasonable time and replaced during the normal planting season.

7. Fire lanes shall be marked and maintained in accordance with the Fire Prevention Code in effect. Parking spaces shall be marked on the pavement surface with four inch wide painted lines. All lane lines shall be white in color, with the exception that those dividing traffic shall be yellow.

8. The temporary structures shown on the plan submitted with the case, i.e. a club house, pro shop, bag storage etc., will be subject to all the development standards required for the site and will be removed by December 31, 2001.

Richmond Assets, L.L.C. requests a variance from Section 24-96(b)(12) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to provide less parking than required at 1970 East Parham Road (Tax Parcel 52-A-5), zoned O-2C, Office District (Conditional) (Brookland). The parking requirement is not met. The applicant has 270 parking spaces where the Code requires 367 parking spaces. The applicant requests a variance of 97 parking spaces.

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Kirkland: Have all the adjacent land owners be notified of this request according to the County Code.? Have you turned in your notices?

Mr. Douglas Jones: Mr. Chairman, I am here on behalf on the developer and I believe that to be the case. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, I am Doug Jones and I am the administer officer with the FBI here in Richmond. The Richmond division of the FBI is moving forward with plans to relocate its field office operations from 111 Greencourt Road to 1970 Parham Road, known as Parham Place. As part of this planning process the FBI, respectfully requests that the number of parking spaces required by the Code be reduced to 270.

This request is based upon the following factors: the FBI requirement package specifies the need for 211 –286 parking spaces. Based upon approval of this parking variance requires the parking spaces to be eliminated will be in front of the building on Parham Road. This will allow the developer to landscape the property in a manner that is more pleasing. Less than 100 employees will work in the facility the flow of visitor traffic will be minimal. In fact all the visitor parking is outside the perimeter fence. I cannot think of hardly any occasions where the all 270 spaces would be occupied.

During our meeting with the various neighborhood groups, one of their prime concerns has been traffic in and out of the FBI building. In support of this requires today, I understand that the neighborhood support our request to decrease the number of parking spaces. Further the developer has agreed that if the FBI ever vacates this facility they will bring the parking requirements up to code.

I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

1112 Mr. Kirkland: You have read all the suggested conditions with this case?

MR. Jones: I cannot state that I have read them, no sir. I have not read them.

1113 (11

1116 \

1117 Mr. Kirkland: You just stated that the number of spaces would be added if the FBI was to move out. It also states here that the storm water management facilities would be upgraded also.

would be apply

1121 Mr. Jones; That is my understanding.

Mr. McKinney: Mr. Chairman, in a separate letter the applicant has assured the county that they would install the required parking but that is not a condition on the suggested conditions.

Any other questions of the applicant, any one wish to speak 1130 on this case? State your name for the record. 1131 I am an adjacent land owner, I live at 1823 Hungary Road 1132 Mr. Dan Rowe: which is adjacent to this property on the east side. I certainly report the require for this 1133 variance. I had not any contact with the applicant. I think it is good plan, I don't think 1134 they would every use the parking provided. I do not see the reason to pave spaces that 1135 were not needed. 1136 1137 Mr. Kirkland: Mr. Jones, is this a 5 day a week or 7 day a week operation? 1138 1139 Mr. Jones: 1140 7 day a week 1141 Mr. Kirkland: Any other questions? If not that that concludes the case, you 1142 may get your answer this after noon. 1143 1144 After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr. 1145 Balfour, the Board granted the case A-157-1999. 1146 1147 Affirmative: 4 1148 Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, 1149 Negative: 0 Abstained: 1 1150 Wright 1151 1152 The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not 1153 materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations. 1154 1155 Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be 1156 constructed pursuant to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the 1157 applicable regulations of the County Code. 1158 1159 2. This approval is subject to all conditions placed on the proposed Plan of Development 1160 by the Planning Commission. 1161 1162 3. To alleviate any parking shortage, the 97 parking spaces that are the subject of the 1163 variance will be constructed on the site, if deemed necessary by the Planning Office. 1164 1165 Such parking shall be provided within 120 days of written request of the County. 1166 The storm water management facilities shall be designed and constructed to 1167 accommodate the site development, including the potential build-out of 367 parking 1168

It is No. 5

1169 1170 spaces instead of the 270 parking spaces.

Mr. Blankinship:

Mr. Kirkland:

1127 1128

5. At such time as the Federal Bureau of Investigation leaves this location, the owner of the property shall install additional parking, up to 97 spaces, at the request of the Planning Office.

A -158-1999

Carolyn G. H. Butler requests a variance from Section 24-43(a) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a screened porch at 12717 Storrow Road (Northbrooke) (Tax Parcel 45-14-B-33), zoned RTH, Residential Townhouse District (Three Chopt). The rear yard setback is not met. The applicant has 31 feet rear yard setback where the Code requires 40 feet rear yard setback. The applicant

requests a variance of 9 feet rear yard setback.

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

1189 Mr. Kirkland: Have all your notices been turned in? Yes, we have them.

Ms. Butler: We are desiring to enclose part of any existing deck and expand across the back of the house to make a screened porch. The existing deck is in two levels, we want to enclose the upper deck and extend the lower deck. That would only extend 10 feet out from the windows, the existing deck extends 12 out from the windows. The existing screen porch would not extend any farther into the rear yard than the deck.

We feel that this is a hardship case because the property line actually curves in where we want to build the porch. That is a small creek bed that remains dry most of the time during heavy rains it does fill up. It drains through the back yard. Our neighbors behind us have a screen of evergreen shrubs along the property line and they have a parking area. It doesn't appear to be something that will cause problems. We have spoken to all our neighbors behind us and on either side and they are fine with the plan.

I turned in a note with my application from the Pediatrician about my son's fair skins. The porch would be nice protected area for him to play and it would provide a dining area.

1208 Mr. Wright: If the rear line were straight, you would not be here today,

1210 Ms. Butler: That is true.

Mr. Kirkland: Any other questions of Ms. Butler, any one else wish to speak on this case. If not that concludes the case and you can get your answer this afternoon.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Nunnally, the Board **granted** the case **A-158-1999**.

1219 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1220 Negative: 0
1221 Abstained/Absent: 0

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

A -159-1999 Steven Middleton requests a variance from Section 24-9 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a single family home at 9744 Old Dell Trace (Kingsbridge) (Tax Parcel 110-3-A-15(res)), zoned R-0, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe). The public street frontage is not met. The applicant has 0 feet public street frontage where the Code requires 50 feet public street frontage. The applicant requests a variance of 50 feet public street frontage.

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Kirkland: Have all your notices been turned in according to the County Code? Yes, I see we have them. Please present your case.

Mr. Middleton: My wife and I have a contract to purchase what is known as lot 15 of Kingsbridge Subdivison. I am here because the lot does not have road frontage. Five months ago we received a similar variance from you for a 10 acre lot that is immediately south of the lot 156 that is now under contract. We intend to build a one home for our family on the 10 acre tract. After we got that variance the owner of lot 15 with an offer to sell to us lot 15 the reason being the only way to access the property is through our 10 acre tract. All the adjoining property has been developed with single family homes.

1257 It is not clear why Lot 15 was created without any road frontage. However when it was
1258 platted it was labeled reserved for future convience to owner of lot 3 of Drouion Hills.
1259 When it was created in l963 it was conveyed to that property owner and has been owned
1260 by them ever since. Since l963 it has been a separately platted and taxed lot.

The home that we will build on this lot will b3e in the back yard of all the surrounding homes. That would be lot 1 of Kingsbridge, lot 2,3,and 4 of Drown Hills and lot 16 is vacant. It would comply with all the other setbacks and buffers required by Henrico Co.

We don not anticipate the need to seek any other variance

The greatest impact of granting this variance would be on my wife and I who are the owners of the adjoining 10 acres tract of land that will provide access to the lot. We would anticipate the home on this lot will approximately 4,000-5,000 square feet brick home, 2-story, probably with a debasement. The staff report says that this request is a recurring situation. It is not my intent to be a recurring situation. The 10 acre lot that we own is restricted by deed for one home and can not be further subdivided. Lot 15 is zoned for 1 acre home so any further variances would required rezoning or violated the deed restriction. We certainly don't intend to do that. The staff report also suggest creating a subdiviso9n, that does not appear to be feasible to get a public road back there and we cont sant a fubsubidntion. That would have a greatest impact.

We agree with the other staff recommendations within the report.

Mr. Wright: Mr. Secretary, where is the building line on this site?

1282 Mr. Blankinship: That is a good question, Mr. Wright

Mr. Wright: How is it that we are not granting the variance in that respect.

We usually do, you have to have a building line....

1287 Mr. Kirkland: Where is the building envelope?

Mr. Blankinship: We would have to see a plat showing that. It appears to be adequate in width.

Mr. Kirkland: Any other questions, any one else wish to speak on this case? If not that concludes the case and you can get your answer this afternoon.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Balfour, seconded by Mr. McKinney, the Board **granted** the case **A-159-1999**.

1298 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1299 Negative: 0
1300 Abstained/Absent: 0

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing this variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1. Approval of this request does not imply that a building permit will be issued. Building permit approval is contingent on Health Department requirements, including, but not

limited to, soil evaluation for a septic drainfield and reserve area, and approval of a well location.

2. The applicant must present proof with the building permit application that a legal access to the property has been obtained.

3. The owners of the property, and their heirs or assigns, shall accept responsibility for maintaining access to the property until such a time as the access is improved to County standards and accepted into the County road system for maintenance.

4. At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit the necessary information to the Department of Public Works to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the code requirements for water quality standards.

A -160-1999

Virginia V. Throckmorton requests a variance from Section 24-9 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a dwelling at 7756 Osborne Turnpike (Tax Parcel 224-A-86(part)), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Varina). The public street frontage is not met. The applicant has 0 feet public street frontage where the Code requires 50 feet public street frontage. The applicant requests a variance of 50 feet public street frontage.

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Kirkland: Have all your notices been turned in according to the County Code? Yes, I see we have them. Please present your case.

Ms. Larrine Isaac: Mrs. Throckmorton the present owner of this parcel of land is in her 90's and has had a stroke. And although she can still live independently, the family wants someone to be near her. To this end, her son has moved back to Richmond in order to oversee her finances and to provide whatever care she may need. The problem is he has no where to live. Ms. Throckmorton existing house where she live is too small for the some family. The family decided that the acre at the rear of the property would pass to her son at this time instead of at his mother 'death as stated in her will.

- 1348 If the variance is granted, he will be able to build a house large enough for his family and still be close enough to his mother to provide what ever care she may need.
- 1350 I will happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Nunnally: Ms. Isaac you have read the suggest conditions and you are agreeable with them?

1355	Ms. Isaac:	Yes.
1356	.	
1357	Mr. Kirkland:	Any other questions of Ms. Isaac? Any one else wish to
1358	•	e? If not that concludes the case and you can get your answer this
1359	afternoon. Thank y	/Ou.
1360		
1361		d public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr.
1362	Wright, the Board g	granted the case A-160-1999.
1363		
1364	Affirmative:	Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1365	Negative:	0
1366	Abstained/Absent:	0
1367		
1368	The Board granted	this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing
1369	•	not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not
1370		e purpose of the zoning regulations.
1371	, , ,	- 1 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3
1372	1. At the time of	building permit application, the applicant shall submit the necessary
1373		e Department of Public Works to ensure compliance with the
1374		e Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the code requirements for
1375	water quality standa	·
1376	water quanty etailat	3100.
1377	2 Approval of this	request does not imply that a building permit will be issued. Building
1378	• •	contingent on Health Department requirements, including, but not
1379		uation for a septic drainfield and reserve area, and approval of a well
1380	location.	sation for a septio arailmed and reserve area, and approval of a well
1381	iocation.	
1382	3 The applicant i	must present proof with the building permit application that a legal
1383	• •	erty has been obtained.
1384	access to the prope	arty rias been obtained.
1385	4 The owners of t	the property, and their heirs or assigns, shall accept responsibility for
		the property, and their riens of assigns, shall accept responsibility for to the property until such a time as the access is improved to County
1386	•	
1387	Stariuarus ariu acce	epted into the County road system for maintenance.
1388	A -161-1999	Ludia C Hactor requests a variance from Section 24 05(i)(2) of
1389	A -101-1999	Lydia S. Hester requests a variance from Section 24-95(i)(2) of
1390		Chapter 24 of the County Code to build an addition at 2730
1391		Fawnwick Drive (Lynn-Juan Acres) (Tax Parcel 226-2-E-8), zoned
1392		A-1, Agricultural District (Varina). The accessory structure location
1393		requirement is not met. The applicant has an accessory structure in
1394		the side yard where the Code allows an accessory structure in the
1395		rear yard. The applicant requests a variance to allow an accessory
1396		structure in the side yard.
1397		

Mr. Kirkland- Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary.

Mr. Blankinship- Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Kirkland: Have all your notices been turned in according to the County Code? Yes, I see we have them. Please present your case.

Ms. Hester:

I wish to enlarge my house and to make it handicap accessible living quarters for my mother. I here to ask this Board to approve my request to construct an addition onto the rear of my house. The slightly more than 1 acre property currently has a 2 car garage to the right rear of my house. I was told that the proposed addition would make my existing garage not conform because with the new addition, the garage would end up being located in the side yard instead of the rear yard. I ask you to allow this variance for the location of the existing garage in the side yard, this would allow me to expand and improve my home to be handicapped equipped accessible so that my mother can live with us.

She is currently living alone, but her health is reaching a point where this will no longer be possible. She is not able to climb steps or in and out of a tub. The planned addition includes walk-in shower with handicapped seats, grab bars, and all the necessary features. The handicap access ramp is also planned but that appears to not be in conflict with the zoning code. There is no direction other than the rear of the house to expand because of the setbacks requirements and the location of the existing well and septic fields. The side that has the most room is where the bedrooms are located in the existing house and there would be no accessibility from there to the common living quarters. Without the variance the hardship would be imposed because my mother would be unable to live in the house.

I am not sure why a variance is needed. In reading the ordinance I see no prohibition of the building being in the side yard. But I was told this is the current interpretation of Chapter 24. The Code section addresses the maximum percentage of the rear yard being able to be used for accessory buildings as 30%. In fact this maximum is mention 3 times in that one paragraph. In my mind making the crust and intent of the ordinance. No where in the Code does is there a prohibition of side yard structures. If the framers of the ordinance meant to prohibit accessory buildings in the side yard wouldn't they have said so?

 I realize that there are setback restrictions in relation to the placement of the structures and the property lien. My case 50 feet from the front and rear line, 20 minim and aggregate 50 feet from the side. My new addition would not come in conflict with any of these restrictions nor would the addition cause the house to come any closer to the neighbors.

Since refusing the variance would be a hardship for my family and caring for my handicapped mother I request that the Board grant this request.

1446	Mr. Kirkland:	Any questions for Ms. Hester?
1447 1448	Mr. Nunnally:	What is the size of this addition?
1449 1450	Ms. Hester:	It is 20 x 36.5 feet, a bedroom, bathroom and sitting room.
1451 1452 1453	Mr. Kirkland:	Is it constructed of brick also?
1454 1455 1456	Ms. Hester: would be similar to	No, it will be constructed of siding with brick foundation. It has white trim.
1457 1458	Mr. Wright: variance was requir	I would like the Secretary to explain to Ms. Hester why the
1459 1460 1461 1462 1463	inferred that they a	The ordinance specifically says that an accessory building ear yard. By stating that they are only allowed in the rear yard, it is not allowed and that has been the operation since this ordinance ordinance was adopted in 1960.
1464 1465 1466 1467 1468	Mr. Kirkland: speak on this case afternoon. Thank y	Any other questions of Ms. Hester? Any one else wish to rest that concludes the case and you can get your answer this ou.
1469 1470		public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mrd granted the case A-161-1999.
1471 1472 1473 1474	Affirmative: Negative: Abstained/Absent:	Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5 0 0
1475 1476 1477 1478 1479	this variance will r	this request, as it found from the evidence presented, that authorizing not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not be purpose of the zoning regulations.
1480 1481 1482 1483	constructed pursual	ovements shown on the plan filed with the application may be not to this approval. Any additional improvements shall comply with the ns of the County Code.
1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1490	A -162-1999	Latane D. Baker requests a variance from Section 24-95(b)(3) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a one-family dwelling a 8234 Rambler Drive (Valentine Hills) (Tax Parcel 62-7-B-5), zone R-2, One-family Residence District (Brookland). The total lot area is not met. The applicant has 10,275.7 square feet total lot area where the Code requires 11,000 square feet total lot area. The applicant requests a variance of 724.3 square feet total lot area.

1492 Mr. Kirkland-Any one else wish to speak on this case? If you would raise 1493 your right hand and be sworn in by the secretary. 1494 1495 Mr. Blankinship-Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? I am going to pass out 2 1496 letters that we have just received on this case. 1497 1498 I do (unison) 1499 1500 Mr. Kirkland: Have all your notices been turned in according to the County 1501 Code? Yes, I see we have them. Please present your case. 1502 1503 Mr. Baker: I am Latane Baker, the situation is my mother-in-law lives in 1504 Florida and she wants to build a lot on the house behind us. So she can be closer to us. 1505 The lot meets the setback requirements with no problem, but the lot area is short of the 1506 requirements of the Code. 1507 1508 On the street that this lot is facing on, there are several properties there that are exactly 1509 12,000 square feet so a small lot would not be out of place. That is pretty much it. 1510 1511 Mr. Wright: You say 12,000 square feet for the other lots. Your lot is 1512 11,000 square feet. 1513 1514 1515 Mr. Baker: I mean that there are several properties on that same street that are small lots, so this would not be out of place. 1516 1517 Mr. Wright: What size are the other lots? Does the Secretary have that 1518 information. . . 1519 1520 Mr. Blankinship: Not in detail. 1521 1522 1523 Mr. Baker: I propose a brick rancher with a full basement. This is in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood. 1524 1525 Mr. Baker, would it be possible for you to acquire the 1526 Mr. Wright: additional properties of land that would enable your lot to comply with the Code 1527 requirements? You would need to purchase additional land on the north side to 1528 straighten the line out. . . 1529 1530 Well, the owner is right here, and you can ask them. Mr. Baker: 1531 1532 1533 Mr. Wright: I did not know if you had explored the possibility or not. 1534 Any other questions, you will be allowed to rebuttal after Mr. Kirkland: 1535 1536 everyone speaks. Any one else wish to speak? 1537

- Mr. Berry: My name is William Berry and I am here representing my 1538 mother. Dear sirs, in response to the request for a variance for Lantane E. Baker 8217 1539 Woodman Road, to build a one family dwelling at 8234 Rambler Drive I am representing 1540 1541 Mrs. Berry, she would like to go on record as to opposing this request Mrs. Berry's address is 8215 Rocky Branch Lane and is directly adjacent to and southeast of Mr. 1542 Baker's property. She shares 234 feet of the property line with the Baker residence. 1543 1544 Mrs.,. Berry and her husband built their home in the early 1950's and have resided there since that time. Mrs. Berry reasons for opposing this variance are as follows 1545
- 1. Stated in section 24-95 (d)3. Of the Chapter 24 of the County Code total lot size of 11,000 square feet that's needed to construct a dwelling of this size. The Baker's lot is 10,275.70 square feet, and lacks 724.30 square feet to complete the project. The 724.30 square feet needed to bring the lot up to County Code is equal to 7% of the total lot size or the size of a footprint for a modest size home. Placing the structure here would make the Baker's property and the one they are proposing to build out of synch with the adjacent properties and the other lots in Valentine Hills.
- 1555 Mr. Kirkland: Has the applicant seen the letters of opposition?
- 1557 Mr. Baker: No I haven't. 1558

1554

1560

1562

1565

- 1559 Mr. Kirkland: Now you can proceed.
- 1561 Mr. Berry I have stated No.1 and now NO. 2
- Mr. McKinney: Mr. Berry, we have this letter and we are able to read you are reading this letter verbatim.
- Mr. Berry: I would like to read this letter, I think the Baker's need to hear 1566 it. Countless safety issues need to be addressed regarding of the condition of the 1567 existing property. It is unfit for habitation. The years since the Baker's have lived at 1568 8217 Woodman road the ;house and the property have continually declined., The yard 1569 has continued to look like a dump. Seasonal items are left out all year long and building 1570 materials are left strung around the yard. Most importantly, and this is of concern to Mrs. 1571 Berry in regard to this request, construction projects are started and never completed. 1572 This leaves the property in a constant state of disruption and disrepair. When the Bakers 1573 moved into the property in 1976, they stated to extend the chain-link fence by bolting 1574 extenders to the fence but never put the fence up. The summer of 1998, a privacy fence 1575 was started along the property line with Mrs. Berry. Post were sunk into the ground and 1576 fence panel sections were purchased but never installed. The panels sections remain 1577 today, 2 years later, never installed and stacked as ready for installation. A dog kennel 1578 was begun when the Baker's moved, but it was never completed. Due to County pet 1579 regulations, their plan for the kennel never materialized. 1580
- No. 3 Over the past years, many animals have resided with the confines of the Baker Property. This has created some unhealthy situations in warmer months. The stench

and air quality at times is unbearable due to a mix of animal fecal matter and chemicals used to clean up after the dog. The smell coming from the property alters between an animal pen and a vet office. In summer of l991 a septic system overflowed and leaked raw sewage into the Bakers and Mrs. Berry yard for months. Eventually the Bakers hooked up to public sewer. But only after creating a health hazard for an unreasonable period of time. That summer and during subsequent times rats were found dwelling on a about the property.

No.4 Since the Bakers moved in 23 years ago. The house has never been painted, the gutters have rusted and fallen off, a corner of the slate roof has fallen off, one side of the house is covered in ivy, the house appears to be ready for Halloween without even decorating. At times automobiles have abandoned in the yard, it is apparent that the Bakers cannot manage a building project that requires commitment and follow through. I would like for you to look at these photos.

No. 5 In a letter mailed to Mrs. Berry requesting the variance and outlining the plan for a new home to be built at 8234 Rambler Drive, Mrs. Baker states the design for the house was selected to be in keeping with the other homes in Valentine Hills. For this house to be in keeping the other homes in the area, it needs to be placed on an adequate size lot. A lot of at least 11,000 square feet but preferably a lot to at least to match the existing lots in Valentine Hills.

No.6 Property values of the existing homes surrounding the Baker lot are currently reduced due to the issues cited above. The proposed single family home would be positioned on a postage stamp lot and negatively impact the value of adjacent properties even further. The front property line facing Rambler Drive is only 65 feet of road frontage not enough for proper placement of a home and driveway. In conclusion, the Bakers have always been a peaceful and guiet family keeping to themselves and otherwise are good neighbors. Mrs. Berry wishes them no harm. In fact the Bakers have the right to enjoy their property in any way that gratifies them. If they decide to paint their home any color keep unusual pets with the allowance of the County Pet laws, or fly an American Flag these rights should be open to them to enjoy. Mrs. Berry also has the same rights and privileges to have her property protected. This state and county has instituted laws codes and regulations to protect the health safety and monetary investments of not only ourselves but those adjacent to us. We have freedom in this country to live as we desire but there are limits to maintaining a civilized society in an urban environment. So Mrs. Berry asked that the zoning board please not grant the application for a variance located at 8217 Woodman Road. (further explained photos)

Mr. Kirkland: Any questions of Mr. Berry by Board Members? Any one else wish to speak?

Mr. Maddox: Good morning. I am in total opposition to this request. My family and I have just moved into the neighborhood. And we are most happy with out home and the beautiful neighborhood in which we live. The land in question is not big enough for a house, it may give an appearance of being crammed into a small area.

1630 1631	•	g my back yard. The applicant states that the house designed entine Hills. I would have to take issue with the character of the	
1632 1633	applicant's home with the overall appearance of the property.		
1634 1635		ns that I and other neighbors believe that this will take away investments. Thank you.	
1636 1637 1638	Mr. Kirkland - Mr. M	laddox, which lot do you live on, No. 4?	
1639 1640	Mr. Maddox - No. 1	and 2	
1641 1642 1643	Mr. Kirkland - to make a statement.	Ok, any other questions of Mr. Maddox? Mr. Baker would like	
1644 1645 1646 1647		Well, a few years ago I had some serious financial setbacks. maintain it like we should. Things are better now and we are in that. As I said before, the lot is small but marginal.	
1648 1649	Mr. Kirkland -	Thank you, any other questions?	
1650 1651 1652	Mr. McKinney - in-law?	Mr. Baker, you say you will build this house for your mother-	
1653 1654	Mr. Baker -	That is correct.	
1655 1656 1657	Mr. McKinney - house?	Have you thought about putting an addition onto your own	
1658 1659 1660	Mr. Baker - lady.	She would prefer to live by herself. She is an independent	
1661 1662	Mr. McKinney -	How old is she?	
1663 1664	Mr. Baker -	She is 80 years old	
1665 1666 1667	Mr. McKinney: that house. What would y	If she changes her mind, and decides not to come and live in you do, just market it and sell it to someone else?	
1668 1669	Mr. Baker:	My son probably would move into it.	
1670 1671	Mr. Kirkland:	That concludes the case.	
1672 1673 1674	After an advertised public Wright, the Board denied	the case A-162-1999 .	
10/4	Affirmative: Delfa	ur Kirkland Makinnay Nynnally Wright F	

Affirmative:

1675

Balfour Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright

1676 1677		0 0
1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684	The Board denied your request as it found from the evidence presented that authorized this variance would be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or would make impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.	_
1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690	On a motion by Mr. Balfour, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board adjourned until 327, 2000.	January
1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697	Richard Kirkland, Chairman	
1698 1699	Benjamin Blankinship, AICP, Secretary	