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, NOVEMBER 15, 2001, AT 9:00 A.M., NOTICE HAVING BEEN PUBLISHED IN THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH ON OCTOBER 25 AND NOVEMBER 1, 2001.

Members Present:

Daniel Balfour, -Chairman
R. A. Wright, Vice Chairman

Richard Kirkland

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

James W. Nunnally

Also Present:

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

Mr. Balfour - I call the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order please, and ask you to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Balfour - Mr. Secretary, if you'll read the rules please.

Mr. Blankinship - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, ladies and gentlemen. The rules for this meeting are as follows. The Secretary, myself, will call each case. Then the applicant will come to the podium. At that time I'll ask all those who intend to speak, to stand, and be sworn in. The applicants will then present testimony. When the applicant is finished, anyone else who wants to speak will be given an opportunity. After everyone has spoken, the applicant, and only the applicant, will have the opportunity for rebuttal. After hearing the case, and asking questions, the Board will take the matter under advisement. They will render all of their decisions 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 microphone on the podium, and to state your name for the record. Out in the foyer, there are two binders, which contain the staff report for each case, including

the conditions suggested by the staff. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any deferrals or withdrawals on this morning's agenda.

Mr. Balfour - Does anybody wish to defer or withdraw their case who hasn't yet told our Secretary? If not, I see we have one case deferred from a previous meeting. Mr. Secretary, if you would call that case.

A -119-2001 JAMES AND JOYCE CLIFTON appeal a notice of violation pursuant to Section 24-116(a) of Chapter 24 of the County Code with respect to tents erected at 2900 Mountain Road (Tax Parcel 31-A-46 and -47A), zoned R-2A One-Family Residence District (Brookland).

Mr. Balfour - Would all who plan to testify come forward or stand please. One person is the only one who's going to testify in this case? If others plan to testify, we'd like to swear you in all at once, so if you plan to testify, stand up.

Mr. Blankinship - All raise your right hand please. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Balfour - Would the people who plan to speak in favor come forward. That's in favor. Let me make a comment while he's coming up. Looks like about half a dozen more people stood up, and we're glad to hear from all of you, but due to our schedule, and in the interest of other people's cases, we ask that when you have something to say, please don't stand up and repeat what the person before you or someone else said. We'll hear you the first time, and we don't need some repetition. If you have something new to add, or some perspective we haven't thought about, that's fine, but we ask you not to just stand up here and repeat the previous person's remarks. Thank you. Yes sir, would you identify yourself?

Mr. Martineau - Good morning everyone. My name is Don Martineau. I am the Clifton's son-in-law. I am retired from Tredegar Industries, where I was the Director for Inter-Nations Services. I'd like to start off with a little bit of background. At the suggestion of the Board of Supervisors, from the Brookland District, the Cliftons applied for a provisional use permit to start a bed and breakfast, known as the Virginia Cliffe Inn. They applied on August 27, 1997. The County then created zoning and amendments permitting bed and breakfast operations as a provisional use in R districts. After a favorable staff report and upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, which incidentally was very helpful, and you can see from pages 2 through 10 of our handout, the Cliftons were granted a provisional use permit by the Henrico County Board of Supervisors

on November 18, 1997. The Clifton's plan of operation, submitted with the provisional use permit application, included, they could have up to 6 rooms for guests, a sign may be installed on Mountain Road, special events, such as weddings and social gatherings were allowed. This is stated in condition # 8 on page 11 of your handout, which is the provisional use permit. The Cliftons opened for business on January 1, 1998, and they did weddings in 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001. They found that there are many couples who want a garden style wedding arrangement and choose not to have a marriage in the church. Over a hundred weddings were held at the Inn, with no complaints from the wedding parties or the neighbors. With weddings going so well, the Cliftons thought about expansion, so in April 2001, the Cliftons asked the County about erecting a 40foot by 60-foot glass-enclosed building for weddings. It was at this time that the Henrico County officials revisited the Inn, and now made comment about the tent that was 1200 square feet in size at that time. The tent had been up for about a year. They said that we needed a tent permit, so the Cliftons applied for a tent permit, but were denied. Furthermore, they were told that the tent had to come down unless it was reduced to no more than 900 square feet in size. After numerous meetings between Henrico County officials and the Cliftons' attorneys, the Cliftons complied with this requirement by June 20, 2001. Our case is based on 2 key arguments.

94 95 96

97

98

99 100

101

102

103

104105

106

107

108109

110

111

112

113

75

76 77

78 79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86 87

88

89

90

91

92

93

The first argument is on January 27, 2001, 7 days after the tent was reduced in size, Mr. John Short a Deputy Director of Planning, came out and measured the tent, and agreed the tent was no more than 900 square feet in size. He then issued a Notice to Mr. and Mrs. Clifton, stating that they were in violation of the County Zoning Ordinance by having a tent on the bed and breakfast property without a temporary use permit. This notice is page 15 of your handout. Our contention, and the basis for this appeal, is that County officials, including the Director of Planning and his deputy, misinterpreted the zoning ordinances. As I've already stated, the provisional use permit for this bed and breakfast expressly permits special events as spelled out in the operations plan submitted by the provisional use permit application, which is page 3 of your handout, and in provisional use permit itself, which is condition 8 on page 11 of your handout. Other written materials in the County's files show that special events, including weddings, were addressed. If you look at page 5 of your handout, you'll note this. Since weddings are permitted by the provisional use permit, we contend that tents, or in this case a 30-foot by 30-foot canopy, covering the ground level deck, are obviously an integral part of outdoor weddings. We feel, therefore, that the tent, by implication, is already permitted by the provisional use permit, and does not require an additional temporary use permit.

114115116

117

118

The second argument in our case is this. In further support of the appeal, I must go back to the original notice of violation that states that a tent is illegal without a temporary use permit. The only place in the zoning ordinance that even refers to

temporary use permits, is in section 24-116. This section creates power for the Board of Zoning Appeals, to grant temporary use permits; however, this section does not indicate what kinds of uses require a temporary use permit. Furthermore, there is no other place in the Zoning Ordinance that spells out which uses must get a temporary use permit and which ones do not. We contend, therefore, that this sort of arrangement in the County Zoning Ordinance, essentially leaves it entirely up to the judgment of the County officials, to decide what uses require a temporary use permit. It is our belief that the Virginia Supreme Court Zoning Law explicitly prohibits allowing these kind of decisions up to County administrative officials. This concludes our case. I sincerely hope the Board agrees with the facts we've presented here. You know, we were just trying to do a good job here and provide a much needed service. We were not trying to break any rules, nor do we plan to do so in the future. I hope you see it in your minds and in your hearts to rule in favor of the Cliftons. I do have a couple of photographs of the tent on the property; they show the tent up during an actual wedding event, and it shows the tent down when there are no events. I also understand that there may be others present who are in support of our appeal. Thank you very much.

135136137

138

139

119

120121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130131

132

133

134

Mr. Balfour - I think he's going to put your picture up on the screen in a second. Are there any questions by members of the Board? You'll have a chance to respond later if there's anyone in opposition. Are there any others to speak in favor at this point? Yes ma'am.

140141142

143

144

145

146147

148149

150

151

152153

Ms. Clifton - My name is Janice Clifton. I am Mr. and Mrs. Clifton's daughter and very interested and involved in the bed and breakfast. Just a couple points of clarification. I hope that you will understand that probably about 80% of our business is driven by weddings. That does not mean that we have a wedding every week, but most of our guests who come in to stay are coming for the wedding event. We found many, many couples who enjoy the atmosphere of being together for the weekend by staying at the bed and breakfast and having their wedding. The reason that this tent is a major concern, is our weddings are garden style, outdoor weddings, and we do have to provide some type of alternative or provision in the event of rain. As you'll see with the tent down, we do keep the tent down when it's not in use, so it's not a year-round structure or tent that is up all the time. We do want the availability to be able to put it up when needed for our weddings. Thank you.

154155156

Mr. Balfour - Any questions by members of the Board? Any others to speak in favor at this moment?

157158159

160

161

162

Mr. Clifton - Good morning. I am James Clifton of the bed and breakfast inn. I don't speak too clearly, is the reason he's presenting this. I do feel that this is an asset to Henrico County. We bring people in from all over the world, and I figure that Henrico County is known considerably because so many people

come in and stay there from all over the states and all over the world. I think it's a 163 tremendous advantage to Henrico County to allow us to have this facility. Thank 164 165 you very much. 166 Mrs. Clifton -I'm Margaret Clifton, innkeeper, and I just wanted to 167 explain a little bit about the pictures. This is on the very back of our property, and 168 in the very back of that is the Cultural Arts Center. All the property is almost 169 completely surrounded by trees. You cannot see that tent from any other direction 170 except the very tip-top when it's up. If you'd like to see other pictures, I'll be glad 171 to show them to you. 172 173 Mr. Balfour -174 What position were these pictures taken from? 175 176 Mrs. Clifton -This one was taken from the back of the house. these other pictures that I have were taken from the other outskirt areas of the 177 178 property. 179 Mr. Balfour -Did I understand that someone in the County did tell you 180 that a 900-square foot tent was okay? 181 182 For building permit purposes. 183 184 185 Mr. Balfour -My partner here answered the question. I asked if someone in the County had told you that a 900-square foot tent was all right. 186 187 Mrs. Clifton -Yes they did. When we went to apply for the permit, and 188 the people in the office said, "well you don't need a permit for a 30 by 30 tent, so 189 we tried in every way possible that we could to comply with the County's 190 191 regulations. 192 193 Mr. Balfour -I think there may be a different permit, from what I 194 understand. Let me ask you a second question. What's the largest room inside? 195 Mrs. Clifton -Inside the house? 196 197 198 For purposes of use as a dining room or a ballroom or something of that nature. 199 200

205206

204

201202203

Mr. Clifton -

Mrs. Clifton -

Mr. Balfour -

18 by 22, whatever that is.

Any other questions by Board members?]

18 by 22.

Mrs. Clifton - Anybody else?

207208209

210

Mr. Balfour - You'll have a chance, if you like, to respond after we hear from people who may be in opposition. I don't know that at this point. Are there other people who wish to speak in favor.

211212

I want to see these pictures that she's got.

213214215

Mr. Balfour - Mrs. Clifton, would you like to leave your pictures here? You don't mind if we hold on to them?

216217

218 Mrs. Clifton - Not at all.

219220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227228

229

230

231

232

233

234235

236237

238

239

240

Good morning. I'm Fred Gibson, the Associate Minister Mr. Gibson of Glen Allen Baptist Church. This is the first and only bed and breakfast in Henrico County, and as such has struck sort of a historic nerve that many of us are very much concerned about, because I recognize that public officials have not wished to make this seem like a case involving harassment, but to the public eye, especially those of the people that I represent. It appears to be that kind of tact, and therefore is fairly much resented by the public. I am very much concerned about the potential interference of public institutions in the vicinity with the free enterprise that this institution represents, because I understand that that kind of tact is also, borders on the illegal, it certainly borders on the immoral. We're very much concerned about this family, not only their free enterprise, but the character that they lend to the entire community. I have performed several weddings there. It has not been for my financial benefit because I don't charge for weddings or for I think that these are times when people already have encountered enough expense, so that they don't have to have themselves belabored financially during this time, so I have nothing to gain by my support of their continuing to have weddings there. One of the weddings that I enjoyed conducting there was hampered by a considerable rainfall. Had it not been for the provisional tent, we would have had to unceremoniously go in wet with our clothing, dirt on our feet, and gone into some inappropriate place inside the house. I personally would like, and I feel that I represent the opinion of many people here and absent, so I would like to see their petition granted. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

241242243

Mr. Balfour - Any questions by Board members? Are you speaking for the church and congregation, or do you live in the neighborhood too?

244245246

247248

Mr. Gibson - I'm speaking for myself; I'm employed there. I am a resident of Henrico County, and I'm employed at the church. I'm a retired missionary from southeast Asia, and I've chosen to spend part of my retirement years in employment at the church.

How do you mean, you think, I believe I heard you say, maybe correct me if I'm mistaken, something to the effect about public buildings in the area and perhaps they were acting in a manner you didn't think was appropriate. What are you talking about?

Mr. Gibson - I didn't recognize how important the Cultural Arts Center was to our community until it was pointed out by the Cliftons themselves, because they were the first ones in the community to send a large amount of business to the resident dining room at the Cultural Arts Center, as well as to direct a large number of people, not only to the Cultural Arts Center, for their holdings, but also to Walkerton. It's come to my attention that Walkerton is planning to have, with the very small grounds and inadequate parking space, are planning to host weddings also. This is what I was referring to when I said I was very much concerned about the potential interference of public institutions with private enterprise, which I think may be highly questionable in Henrico County.

- Mr. Balfour Any questions of Board members? Thank you sir. Any others to speak? To keep it in order, let me know, is there anyone else to speak in favor or in opposition, so we don't want to intermix people speaking one way or the other. Identify yourself. Do we have any others to speak in favor at this point?
- 272 Three people, and we're not repeating ourselves.

Mr. Collier - I'm Roger Collier. I'm pastor of Glen Allen Baptist Church. I live a quarter of a mile from the Cliftons; I did not expect to be here, so I am not overly prepared to speak, but what I want to say is to affirm what my associate just said. I have also done weddings, and I ride by oftentimes when other individuals are having weddings, and I have never seen any problem, never seen any concern. I have never had a concern expressed to me, and I know the community very well. Our church family has been very upset with what has been happening the last 6 months with this, and I would rise to say I would affirm their petition and request that you grant it favorably.

Mr. Balfour - For use of the tent, we're not questioning having the weddings there.

Mr. Collier - Yes, for use of the tent. I have been there with the tent, and I haven't had a wedding when it rained, but I always wondered what we would do and when I saw the tent, it was a great help.

Mr. Balfour - I misspoke too, when I said we're questioning. We're not questioning anything; we're listening. Next? Yes sir.

294 Mr. Mallory - Thank you. My name is James Mallory, and I've lived in

the area where the tent is going to be, and have been there all my life. I really appreciate the fact that the Cliftons do such a great job of what they're doing. Also, I spent 34 years as a police officer with Henrico County. I have never experienced any problem with the Cliftons from all my years as a police officer. I know that anything that they run, in Henrico County or anywhere else, will be in compliance with all things. They need your compliance to allow them to have the tent, because they would not do anything that wasn't proper, and I feel like, as a resident who has lived in the area all my life, I can speak only highly of the Cliftons. They are the greatest people that could possibly be in the neighborhood. Thank you.

304305

295

296 297

298

299

300

301

302303

Mr. Balfour - Where do you live in relation to the Cliftons?

306307308

309

310

311

Mr. Mallory - I live about 4 blocks, on Lambeth Road. I have gone to church with the Cliftons all my life; I've known them ever since they've been in the area. I just know that there's nothing that they wouldn't do for Henrico County and the community and all of the people who are there. I know that their interests are for the County, for myself, and for everybody who lives out there. Thank you.

312313314

Mr. Balfour - Any questions?

315316

317

318

319

320

321

322323

324325

326

327

328329

330

331

332

333

Mr. Duke -Good morning, Chairman, Board members, my name is Michael Duke. I reside on Courtney Road and have for more than 20 years. I consider myself neighbors of the Cliftons, have watched the activities that go on at the bed and breakfast, and have enjoyed what all they bring to our community. I personally feel that the services that they provide to the public, as well as the facilities that they have on site at the bed and breakfast, are in fact compatible with our neighborhood, as well as with surrounding non-residential citizens. I feel like their services and facilities compliment our neighborhood, not only our residential neighborhood, but also those facilities that the County has. compliment and enhance those facilities as well in the immediate vicinity. There's a real ground swell of support for the activities and services that have been going on, on their property, and within our community, and I think you can see by the presence of the people who are here today in support and favor, and that there is no opposition. Amazingly enough, I've never heard of any opposition to the services that they provide or the facilities that they have erected on their property. I think people are kind of amazed and appalled that any challenge is made towards the bed and breakfast facility at all. Anyway, I concur with everyone here that they be allowed to continue the services in the future, as they have in the past. Thank you for this time.

334335336

Mr. Balfour - Thank you, Mr. Duke. Any questions? Anyone else to speak? Those 2 people in the corner wish to speak?

| 339 | Mr. Kirkland - | Mr. Chairman, could I ask the attorney just one question? | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| 340 | Mr. Martineau, would you come forward. The spokesman. In the report that we | | | |
| 341 | got, page 8 and page 9 show 2 drawings of the plat of the location. When was | | | |
| 342 | page 8 drawn, and when was page 9 drawn? | | | |
| 343 | , | | | |
| 344 | Mr. Martineau - | That was drawn approximately 2 or 3 weeks before we | | |
| 345 | applied for the application | n, before August 27, 1997. | | |
| 346 | | | | |
| 347 | Mr. Kirkland - | And then I see on page 9 that you added a porch to the | | |
| 348 | | deck to the outbuilding in the back. Is this the final | | |
| 349 | drawing that was used w | _ | | |
| 350 | 3 | | | |
| 351 | Mr. Martineau - | As far as I know, that was the final drawing. | | |
| 352 | | , | | |
| 353 | Mr. Kirkland - | And you didn't have any plans at that time to put a tent | | |
| 354 | on the drawing, or anything like that? | | | |
| 355 | ū. , | ŭ | | |
| 356 | Mr. Martineau - | Not at that time, because people who were having | | |
| 357 | | nting tents from tent rental companies in the Richmond | | |
| 358 | vicinity. | | | |
| 359 | , | | | |
| 360 | | How often is this tent used, just out of curiosity? I | | |
| 361 | assume it doesn't stav ui | o. You put it up when there's a call for it? | | |
| 362 | , | | | |
| 363 | Mr. Martineau - | How often is the tent used? We have approximately 50 | | |
| 364 | | used approximately 50 weekends and a couple of other | | |
| 365 | <u> </u> | ding related, like if somebody has a large rehearsal dinner, | | |
| 366 | they might hold it under | , | | |
| 367 | , 3 | | | |
| 368 | | So you average about once a week? | | |
| 369 | | , | | |
| 370 | Mr. Martineau - | About once a week. | | |
| 371 | | | | |
| 372 | | And you use it regardless of the condition of the | | |
| 373 | weather? | , and , and the second | | |
| 374 | | | | |
| 375 | Mr. Martineau - | We put it up regardless of the condition of the weather. | | |
| 376 | | ent taking place, we put it down. With few exceptions, we | | |

And the height, there's only one tent? You don't have several that are different heights?

have to clean the tent once in a while, and clean underneath it, so it might stay up

379380381

382

378

an extra day for that reason.

Mr. Martineau - No, we just have one tent, and it's approximately 14 feet at the most at the peak.

385

386 Mr. Balfour - Any other questions?

387

388 Mr. McKinney - How does this tent go up and down.

389

Mr. Martineau - Well, it's an ingenious invention of my father-in-law.
What he did was to put up 4 4-by-4 posts at the corners and hook up a pulley
system with a winch, and he raises the tent and puts the permanent posts under it
when he raises it. Then when he takes it down, he just lifts the tent up a little bit,
removes the permanent posts, and lowers the tent back down on the deck.

395

And that takes how long, approximately?

396 397

398 Mr. Martineau - Ten to fifteen minutes.

399400

Might want to get a patent.

401

402 Mr. Martineau - He's thought about it.

403

404 Mr. Balfour - Any other questions? Thank you. Any others at this 405 point?

406 407

408

409

410 411

412

413 414

415

416 417

418

419

420

421

422

Ms. Koontz -I'm Patricia Koontz, and we have an industry membership in the Wedding Guide, and we're actually in the same industry or business with the Cliftons, and I really feel as though we should dwell on the fact that this is a canopy. We all understand the reason of the tent regulation coming in to the law, and it speaks directly to egress, the size of egress for safety, but there are no sides on, like you're totally surrounded tent effect. My daughter and I are in this We have actually trained with the Cliftons; they were more than generous in helping us get started. We have a cultural arts center close to us also, and a person who's interested in being married indoors, is not interested in being married outdoors, and vice versa. There's actually no direct competition between the 2, in my feeling. The other side, as everyone has indicated, is the fact that I have not seen anything but extremely professional and attractive performances and services on this. As we all are aware, when we bring a wedding into an area, you're talking in terms of at least \$60,000 to \$80,000, by the time your guests are here, they're doing overnight lodging, their food and flowers. By the time you're through the whole thing, you're into a very serious, if any of you are fathers of the brides

423 424 425

I have 2 daughters – what were those

Ms. Koontz - Well this is your surrounding guests that bring their money into the area too, like Mr. Clifton said, from around the world.

I think I heard \$60- to 80,000.

432 Ms. Koontz - You've got it. And good luck with 2 daughters. Thank 433 you.

435 Mr. Balfour - Anyone else? Mr. Tokarz?

Mr. Tokarz - Members of the Board, my name is Tom Tokarz; I'm Assistant County Attorney

440 Mr. Balfour - Were you sworn in with the rest of them?

Mr. Tokarz - Yes. I'm here representing the Director of Planning, whose interpretation is the subject of this hearing this morning. I think it's important at the outset to clarify what this hearing is not about. The hearing this morning, in our view, is not about whether the tent is a good idea or not. The question is about, what are the procedures to be used for the tent to be used for the weddings. It is our view, based on the application that is before the BZA today, that the wisdom of the tent, or the use of the tent at weddings, is something to be resolved at a different level, either through a temporary use permit, granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals or by the Board of Supervisors in revisiting the Provisional Use Permit for amendment of the conditions to specifically allow the tent.

What I'm going to present to you today, though, are the ordinance reasons and the facts that were presented to the Board of Supervisors to indicate to you that at the time this provisional use permit was approved, there was no indication that there would be commercial activities using a tent for weddings on the property. What I'd like to do is go quickly through the exhibits with you.

Before you do that, did I hear you say you thought there'd be no problem with a special use permit?

 Mr. Tokarz - No, what I was saying is that is one of the 2 areas where I think the Cliftons could go to get approval for using the tents, go back to the Board of Supervisors, ask them to specifically approve a condition in the provisional use permit that specifically allows them to do the tent. I'm going to walk through what the Board of Supervisors had and what it approved, and it's our view that the Board of Supervisors never approved a tent, never even knew there was a tent for commercial use, which is at issue in this particular case.

Mr. Balfour - From what I understand, excuse me, is that you think they can go back now, since there is a tent, and ask for a different use, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Tokarz - They could certainly go back and ask the Board of Supervisors for an amendment of the conditions of the conditions of the provisional use permit, to allow them to use the tent for weddings. The reason that's important is, and I'm going to go through the ordinance, the intent of the bed and breakfast ordinance, which I was intimately involved in, in 1998 when it was passed, was to permit limited commercial activity in a residential zone, allowing a bed and breakfast home to exist in a residential zone, and as you know, residential zones do not allow commercial activity except in a very limited sense.

One of the pieces of information which we haven't gotten this morning, which I would hope the Board would wish to ask the applicant, is exactly what the revenue is from the weddings that are being held on the property. If you have 50 weddings a year, it's my understanding that some of the charges are up to \$3,000 per event. I don't know if that figure is correct; it's what I've been told. But that is a significant commercial activity in a residential zone. And that is the issue that really was addressed when the Board passed the bed and breakfast ordinance in 1998.

 If I can turn to exhibit 1, exhibit 1 is the section of the Code that you're very familiar with, and this is the section of the Code that says, "except as otherwise permitted by the ordinance, no building or part thereof, or other structure, shall be erected, located, reconstructed, enlarged, converted, or altered except in conformity with the regulations herein specified." Now what that basically means is, unless the ordinance permits it, it is not permitted, and you would have to get a special exception or a variance. We do not have a special exception or a variance for a tent in this particular case.

Exhibit 2, is the ordinance that was passed at the time the bed and breakfast was approved. I would say to you, I was very much involved in the drafting of this ordinance. This ordinance was written to allow the Virginia Cliffe Inn to operate as a bed and breakfast. This was directly brought forward by Mr. Glover, in order to permit the Virginia Cliffe Inn. There is no dispute about the operation of the Virginia Cliffe Inn as a bed and breakfast operation. But I do want to point out that there was a specific limitation in what was contemplated by the Board when it passed the ordinance. If you look at the definition of bed and breakfast home, it specifies that this will be a private, owner-occupied dwelling, with guest rooms, and it says in the last line, "the bed and breakfast function shall not detract from the primary residential use or appearance of the building." And the word "residential" is key here, because what we're talking about with the tent is a commercial activity, not a residential activity. It's a commercial activity. And this

is not consistent with what the Board intended when they passed the ordinance. If you turn to the next page, section 24-12.1, in section B-4, it specifically provides, "the exterior of the building shall not be altered from its single-family character." Once again the Board was trying to say, "if you're going to have a bed and breakfast operation, if you're going to have a limited commercial operation in a residential zone, we still want to maintain the residential character of the neighborhood." That was what was contemplated by the Board. You take a look at page 3 of 6, number 6, "parking area shall be located and designed to compliment the residential character of the lot." Once again, designed to make sure that the bed and breakfast operation was residential in nature, not commercial.

And finally, on page 5 of 6, if you take a look at the off-street parking requirements, in B-17, for bed and breakfast home, it says, "one parking space per guest room, in addition to the parking required for the principal residents." They didn't anticipate there was going to be a lot of parking for commercial activity. They only required one parking space per guest room. That was in addition to the parking for the principal residents. There was no contemplation of commercial activity on a large scale when this ordinance was passed.

If you'll turn to exhibit 3, exhibit 3 was the provisional use permit application that was submitted by the Cliftons. As you see at the top, # 1, they said that the request for the permit was to operate a bed and breakfast inn. They said that the present and proposed use of the property was a one-family dwelling. There is no mention in this application form as to any commercial activity, such as weddings. Page 3 of the application is the map, and this is one of the maps that may have been included in the first set, if you take a look at the map that was prepared by the Cliftons and submitted, there is no area on this map which shows a tent anywhere. There is no indication of a tent on the schematic whatsoever. If you take a look at the operations plan, which is on the page following, there is no reference to a tent. There is no reference to any commercial activities. They talk about the purpose is to obtain a provisional use permit, for a 5500 square foot, privately owned and occupied dwelling with 6 guest rooms and 4 bathrooms, where transient guests may stay for periods of up to 2 weeks. No reference to any weddings, no reference to any commercial activities.

The Cliftons then submitted, and this is exhibit 4, a memo on August 27, 1997, and in this memo they tried to explain further what they were going to do at the Virginia Cliffe Inn. And down near the bottom of this page, they say that there are many areas in the yard for additional parking for gatherings. On the site plan we show patio, porches and decks, available to guests for their use. The gazebo in the back of the house and spacious gardens are also for guests to use at their leisure. No mention of tents. No mention of commercial activities. Then you turn to page 2, and the last paragraph, and this is really I think, where the difficulty in this case

arises. I would say to you right now, I think this really was a situation where there was poor communication at the time of the provisional use permit application.

The Cliftons submitted something, and they may have had one thing in mind, the people reading this may indeed have had another thing in mind. Here's why I say that. What they said is, the activities we would like to plan on, are weddings and social gatherings. Next sentence. As private citizens, we have hosted these affairs for families and friends for the last 20 years. There is no mention of charging for these activities. There is no mention of doing anything other than to have private functions where you invite your family. You invite your friends to come onto the property. There is no mention of any tents; there is no mention of anything that has grown into what has happened at the Virginia Cliffe Inn. What I submit to the Board is, that when the application was submitted, there was no indication to the Board of Supervisors in approving the provisional use permit application, that they intended to have 50 weddings a year and a widespread major commercial operation.

I go to page 5. Look at the staff report. This was submitted to the Board of Supervisors, and the reason I submit this to you, is because this is what the Board of Supervisors acted on when they approved the provisional use permit application. And on page 2, I have highlighted the section that says, "the applicant proposes to host special events such as weddings and social gatherings. There is no reference to tents; there is no reference to commercial activities.

On page 3, the staff proposes certain conditions, and one of those conditions is condition # 8, which Mr. Martineau referred to earlier. The condition says, " the bed and breakfast home may host special events, provided such events do not require on-street parking, do not entail amplified music outside the home, and do not occur beyond 11:00 pm or on Sundays." And it also says in the comprehensive plan analysis, " this area is designated suburban residential 1." My only point is, everything that the Board of Supervisors had before it at the time of the provisional use application, said that there was going to be a desire to continue to have weddings for family and friends, as they had been doing for 20 years. There was no indication of commercial activity; there was no indication that a tent would be erected. And that is also verified when you look at the map that is attached to the staff report. Once again, there is no indication of any tent on the map, and this had been submitted by the Cliftons.

Mr. Balfour - Mr. Tokarz, it looks like to me that this station may be the tent, because I wouldn't suspect you'd run a bed and breakfast home that says, "may host special events," for free. In other words, you'd expect them to have special events, which I assume could include a wedding, and if you allowed them to do that, and you know they're going to charge people to stay there, they're going to charge for the event as well.

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624 625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633 634

635

636 637

638

639

640

641

Mr. Tokarz -I don't think that necessarily follows. I think it is true that the expectation would be, that guests may come to the inn and may have weddings on the property. I don't think there is an expectation from the information submitted that there would be a separate charge for the holding of the wedding, and that you would have this become the commercial operation that it's become. I am saying to you that that may have been what the Cliftons intended. I am also saying to you that was not conveyed to the Board of Supervisors, and my submission to you is that is not what the Board of Supervisors approved. It may have been poor communication. I'm not saying that anybody did anything wrong here. What I am saying though, is that the extent of the approval that was given by the Board of Supervisors has been overstated or misunderstood. The Board of Supervisors granted an approval for a bed and breakfast home, which is a limited commercial operation in a residential neighborhood. It did not, on the basis of what was submitted to it, approve a separate, stand-alone commercial activity for holding 50 weddings at a revenue, and I don't know what the revenue figure is, I think Mr. Clifton or Mrs. Clifton can certainly speak to that. But as I understood what the Cliftons' daughter said, that's 80% of their revenue. I would submit to you that that's far different than what the Board of Supervisors was told was going to be done with the bed and breakfast home when they approved this application in 1997. Now once again, please understand, I'm not saying this is a bad thing. The Director of Planning's position is not that you shouldn't have weddings. position is not that the bed and breakfast home is a bad thing. It's not even that the tent is a bad thing. The question, though, is this. The ordinance does not permit tents without having a temporary use permit. There is nowhere in the Code that permits tents without a temporary use permit, and in the last year alone, the Board of Zoning Appeals has granted temporary use permits for tents. In UP-18-2000, for the North Carolina Furniture Company, you were asked to approve tents for outdoor sales, for a commercial activity. In UP-35-2000, you were asked to, and did approve, tents for commercial uses for Plant Land. That was for the use of selling pumpkins. All we're saying at this point is, under the ordinance, the relief available to the Cliftons is not by this appeal. The relief available to the Cliftons is either by coming to this Board and getting a temporary use permit, or going back to the Board of Supervisors and requesting amendment of their provisional use permit application and asking for specific approval of the tent and for the commercial activities that are associated with the bed and breakfast activity. That is the proper way under the ordinance. That is why the Director of Planning issued the Notice of Violation. It does not go to whether the bed and breakfast home is a good thing, whether weddings are a good thing, or whether the tent is a good thing.

642643644

645 646 Mr. Balfour - I understand you. I think you're saying, though, that a special use permit would be to use a tent <u>and</u> to be able to charge for special events.

Mr. Tokarz - Yes sir. It would be to go beyond simply having guests in the home, which is what the application was for. I think a fair reading of the application would say, "when we have guests in the home, we're going to allow them to have a wedding in the garden." Perfectly fine, if they don't charge. Where we get into the difficulty is, the commercial activity, the revenue that comes with that, and associated with that is the tent in order to accommodate the commercial activity.

Mr. Kirkland - Mr. Tokarz, if we were to grant a temporary use permit down the road, would that still clear up the commercial issue? Don't you think the best direction would have been the provisional use permit to add another condition in there?

Mr. Tokarz - I believe the way to address everything that the Cliftons want to do, the preferred way would be to go back to the Board of Supervisors and either get a provisional use permit amendment, or to get rezoning of the property. Both of those have been offered to the Cliftons. I've been in a meeting where that was offered to representatives for them.

Mr. Kirkland - I don't think we would still be in a quandary here about the commercial use, I think if we had given the temporary use permit.

Mr. Tokarz - I think there is an underlying issue. I'm only addressing the temporary use permit because that is what is before the Board today.

Mr. Tokarz, isn't a bed and breakfast a commercial use?

Mr. Tokarz - Yes sir, but it is specifically permitted by the ordinance. The ordinance was amended specifically to permit the commercial use in the residential zone. Under the ordinance, the Board has the right to approve that commercial use in a residential zone if it specifically provides for it. It did not specifically provide though, for other commercial activities.

Mr. McKinney - Does the County have a problem with the Cliftons' charge for weddings? And how much they make out of weddings?

 Mr. Tokarz - That's not been the subject of a complaint at this point. I would simply say to you, I do not believe it is consistent with what the intent of the ordinance was when it was passed in 1988. The purpose of the ordinance when it was passed, was to allow the use of the home for paying guests to stay there.

Mr. McKinney - So if they held these weddings inside the house, if they

691 charged \$80,000 a wedding, the County would have no problem with that? 692 693 Mr. Tokarz -I can't speak for the Director of Planning on that, sir. I 694 believe, as I said earlier, that would be inconsistent with the bed and breakfast ordinance. 695 696 697 Mr. McKinney -But they said in here they would have weddings. 698 699 Mr. Tokarz -They said they would have weddings, yes sir. 700 701 Mr. McKinney -When they made the application, they said they would have weddings? So if they decided to have weddings inside and charge, the 702 703 County would have no problem with that, is that correct? 704 Mr. Tokarz -= I don't agree with that, Mr. McKinney. I understand the 705 706 question, but I believe a proper reading of the application is, when they said in the application, as they have done as private citizens, they've held them for family and 707 friends - unless they've been charging their family and their friends for weddings, I 708 assume that those have been at no charge. It's not been a commercial activity. 709 710 Mr. Balfour -711 I don't think we can resolve that issue here. I do agree 712 with Mr. McKinney that it's interesting to see that they can host special events, 713 and I don't think anybody in the world thinks a bed and breakfast place is going to 714 host special events free. That's not at issue before us right now. 715 716 Mr. Tokarz -All I'm saying is, I think if you read the ordinance as it was written, it was intended to permit the use of the home for paying guests. And 717 I think as a proper accessory use, if the guests want to do out on the grounds and 718 719 have a wedding without charge, that would be certainly within the anticipation of that use. I think it's where you bring people in and charge a fee and make it of the 720 721 scale that we're talking about, that you run afoul of what the intent was. 722 723 Mr. Balfour -I'm not sure that's really before us at this point. 724 725 Mr. McKinney -Let me ask one more question. When you say it's intended for the guests in the house if they want, but not if they want to go 726 outside and have a wedding? 727

728

Mr. Tokarz - No sir, what I meant to say is that if guests come to the house, paying guests, and the paying guests in the home is a specifically permitted use by the ordinance

732

Mr. McKinney - Let me ask you this. Say I want to get married at this facility, and I get in touch with the Cliftons. They say OK, we want to stay there,

we're going to have guests who want to stay there to the maximum, and we'd like to be married there, inside. Or if we want to be married outside, on the grounds, how much is it going to cost? Is that a problem? Whether it's in a tent or not, forget the tent.

Mr. Tokarz - Not if the charge is for the normal room and board rate that they would charge any other paying guests for the bed and breakfast. Where I think we have the problem is , there is as I understand it, and I'm not speaking because I don't know for sure, there is a separate charge for setting up the weddings, and you do not have to be a paying guest at the inn to use the grounds for the weddings, but whether you are a guest or not, the problem is the charge for the weddings. If you're a guest at the facility, and you want to go out and have one of the ministers who's spoken today, and go into the garden and be married, I don't think there's any issue at all, if there's no charge for that service. It's where we bring in a wedding party and charge \$3,000, whatever the charge is, and make it into a separate commercial activity, then I think it runs afoul of what the ordinance was intended to address. And that I think is up to the Board of Supervisors to resolve.

Mr. Balfour - Any other questions? No, we can't have discussions among the people in the audience with each other, except in the hall. Any other questions, Mr. Tokarz? Thank you. We're glad to hear from the people who are proponents, but I imagine I'm speaking for the Board and the opposition, if that's the phrase, or the County's position, doesn't really relate to whether or not you're in favor of the use or intent of the property or not; their issue is more of a legal issue, the interpretation of what the County Code says and what the provisions were when it was originally allowed to be a bed and breakfast. So I would like to suggest that rather than repeat that you're in favor of a bed and breakfast, if you have a response, and I know you're not an attorney, to what the County said, we'll be glad to hear from you. We'll hear from you in any case; I just don't want you to get up and repeat what you said before.

Mr. Martineau - I won't address all the issues that were brought up; I would like to address a few of them.

Mr. Balfour - Could you limit it to what the County's specifically talking about, and that is the provision relating to a tent and whether or not that's included in the original permit. I don't really think we need to hear about whether or not you charge and what you make, because that's not before us at this point.

Mr. Martineau - And I don't intend to bring that up. The first issue he brought up was the (unintelligible) provide the existing use of land, etc. Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code states that, ".... written application for permits shall be made to the Code Official, etc., but there are exceptions. Tent and air

supported structures that cover an area of 900 square feet or less, including all connecting areas or spaces, with a common means of egress or entrance, and with an occupancy load of 50 or less people is an exception." Two sides of this tent have no walls, so what is a common egress? We're talking about 60 feet here. 60 feet of egress space, I don't consider that to be a common egress, and the issue about 50 people or less? I'll be honest with you. We don't know how many people are under that tent at any given time; we don't count. If we did count, how long would somebody have to be under the tent before you'd consider them counted? So we think that the Virginia Uniform Standards Building Code gives us an exception for the tent.

Mr. Martineau, let me cut to the chase a little bit. I'm not sure I see why there's such an aversion to going the route that the County has suggested. You're asking us to, apparently, take a position that it doesn't appear that the County may allow us to do. I'm just speaking personally from what I've heard. You're asking us to kind of rush over what the Board of Supervisors said, to give you what you want, when there must be another way to get there.

Mr. Martineau - Let me assure you, we thought so too. We've spent in excess of \$16,000 on attorney's fees to try to get there, and got nowhere. That's why we're here today. So it isn't that we didn't try. It isn't that we didn't contact the Board of Supervisors. If you look at the last page of your handout, you'll see that we again pleaded with the Board of Supervisors to talk to us and get this resolved, and we got nowhere.

Mr. Balfour - That's not what the County suggested, I don't think. Have you already applied for a special use permit or a change in your provisional use permit?

Mr. Martineau - Well again, we had our lawyers try to resolve this issue without getting into a lot of legality, and every time we ran into a roadblock from Henrico County officials that we couldn't do it this way. So we said all right, we'll do it the right way, and we approached one of the Board of Supervisors to help us, because he offered to help us, and we got no response.

Mr. Balfour - How did you ask, well I guess that's none of my business how you asked them to help you, but I'm not sure I understand that answer, but go ahead.

Mr. Martineau - The last page of that handout I gave you, page 23 I believe, is addressed to the Board of Supervisors. The only issue that I want to bring up about the provisional use permit, we said we would hold special events, such as weddings.

Mr. Balfour - Why is it that you don't want to apply for a special use permit, I mean you've spent \$16,000, and you've talked to a lot of people it sounds like.

 Mr. Martineau - Why didn't we? Because we couldn't get the cooperation of the County to help us get to that point where we could go to the County to get that special use permit, number 1. Number 2, you don't realize, people make their wedding plans months in advance. We had commitments on the books to do these weddings for these people, and we had to somehow get us through the wedding season so that we could "resolve this in a legal manner."

834 Mr. Balfour - Is the wedding season over now? Now go file your 835 permit.

Mr. Martineau - We will, but we have to take this one step at a time. We have to get through this appeals process first. I'd like to point out in the provisional use permit, condition # 8, says where we can do special events, such as weddings. My understanding is, we don't need permission from the County to do non-commercial weddings. I can have a wedding in my home for hundreds of people, so long as I'm not "breaking any County laws," that's perfectly allowed. We assumed, and I agree with the gentleman from Henrico County, I agree there was a lot of misunderstanding about this whole provisional use permit. We assumed, whether it's legally or whether it's morally or what, we assumed that when we said we were going to have weddings, we assumed the County knew we were going to charge. Otherwise we wouldn't have even asked the County if we could do weddings.

Mr. Balfour - The only question before us right now is the tent. I don't care about what you charge at this point, that wasn't before us.

Mr. Martineau - I just wanted to clarify why there's such a misunderstanding about the permission

Mr. Balfour - I agree; I would just assume you charged too; I don't question that.

Mr. Martineau - So, in conclusion, we want to do the right thing. We want to get through this Board of Appeals situation, get that resolved. Hopefully you'll rule in favor of us being allowed to have a tent on the property. And we will go back to Henrico County and get this resolved the legal way. But we want to get the politics out of the way here. We need to get the politics out of the way of all this.

Mr. Balfour - Do we have any more questions by members of the

Board? Thank you sir.

Mrs. Clifton - This is the first paper that we received from County, to form our plan of operation by, and it should be the first paper that you have. Item # 12, and they say that they didn't know we were going to do commercial weddings – this is the outline they gave us to go by when we submitted our plan of operation. This is the very first paper we ever got from the County. Number 12 says, "Describe any other activities, such as weddings or social gatherings that may be held on the premises for paying guests. By that we thought we were talking about commercial weddings, because that's the very first on the outline. It comes before my plan of operation, which is entitled "MEMO" at the top, I believe. So what does that tell you?

Mrs. Clifton, I guess I speak for the members of the Board. I appreciate your sincerity, and I appreciate everything you're saying, but we don't really have the issue of whether or not you charge to have weddings here. It only came up as an aside from comments made. The only concern is whether or not that tent is allowed or not under the Code, and I think this impression that perhaps the County has given you a solution that for some reason perhaps you didn't want to take during the wedding season, and I can appreciate that. But I think you're pushing against a wall that's not giving, I shouldn't give you a legal opinion, but I'm just trying to help you out a little bit. You've got a nice business going, and your neighbors obviously think it's nice, and they don't mind your tent, and they're glad for you to have weddings. It's just that you've got to go jump the hoops to get there, and I think that you jumped the wrong hoops.

Mrs. Clifton - Well, from the responses we've gotten, we didn't think that was hardly possible that we could do it any other way. Thank you.

Mr. Kirkland - Mr. Chairman, let me ask you a question, and then maybe you can ask Mr. Blankinship. Mr. Blankinship, if we were to approve this today, that the tent could stay, would there be a need for them to go for a PUP, a condition, or a temporary use permit?

Mr. Blankinship - I'm not prepared to answer that, Mr. Kirkland

Mr. Kirkland because he made the statement that he was trying to get through one hoop at a time, if we do this today, does he have to go any further or is this it?

Mr. Blankinship - The notice that is under appeal is for having a tent on the property, and if you were to overturn the Director's decision on that notice, that notice would be rendered void. I would think the tent would then be allowed I could see in the future receiving a complaint about the use itself, that is, having the

weddings, that could result in a separate notice. You're kind of asking a 911 912 hypothetical question here that I'm not answering yes or no; I'm saying I'm a little 913 bit uncomfortable. 914 Mr. Kirkland -915 Mr. Martineau made the statement that he was trying to get through one step at a time, and this was one step, and I didn't understand it, if 916 917 this was turned down, were they going back, or if this was approved, would they stop. That's why I was trying to get the steps straight. 918 919 920 Mr. Blankinship -I'm not prepared to answer that. 921 922 Mr. Kirkland -That's all I need to know. Thank you. 923 924 Mr. Balfour -Any other questions by the Board members of Mr. Blankinship or Mr. Tokarz? Thank you, folks, for coming; we appreciate you time. 925 Sorry it took so long; we wanted to hear from everybody. Thank you. \\ 926 927 After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Kirkland, seconded by 928 929 Mr. Wright, the Board denied the appeal A-119-2001 of a notice of violation 930 pursuant to Section 24-116(a) of Chapter 24 of the County Code with respect to tents erected at 2900 Mountain Road (Tax Parcel 31-A-46 and -47A. The Board 931 sustained the notice of violation because it found there was no error in the 932 application of the County Code. 933 934 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5 935 Negative: 0 936 0 937 Absent: 938 939 Mr. Balfour -I ask the pleasure of the Board - do you want to take a recess now or keep on going for a while? 940 941 942 Mr. McKinney -Keep on going for a while. 943 944 Mr. Balfour -All right; call the first case. 945 946 A -147-2001 WILLIAM DEBENDER requests a variance from Sections 24-947 95(i)(2)(b) and 24-95(i) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to 948 build a detached garage at 11416 Wood Brook Court (Rock Springs Estates) (Tax Parcel 13-2-G-14), zoned A-1, Agricultural 949 (Brookland). The accessory 950 structure

951

952

953 954 requirement and accessory structure location requirement are

not met. The applicant wishes to build a detached garage in the

front yard with a height of 16.5 feet, where the Code allows

accessory structures in the rear yard with a height of 15.0 feet.

Mr. Balfour - Is someone here to speak on A-147-2001? If not, we shall pass it by, for the moment. Mr. Secretary?

A -149-2001

FRANCES BRISTOW YUAN requests a variance from Section 24-95(c)(4) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to add a covered front porch at 1702 Devers Road (Westhaven) (Tax Parcel 102-11-K-92), zoned R-3, One-family Residence District (Brookland). The front yard setback is not met. The applicant has 31.5 feet front yard setback, where the Code requires 35.0 feet front yard setback. The applicant requests a variance of 3.5 feet front yard setback.

Mr. Balfour -

Would all who plan to testify raise their hand please.

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

973 Mr. Balfour - Would you state your name.

Mr. Wilson - I'm Philip Wilson; I'm representing Ms. Yuan here. Then Ms. Yuan will speak as well. As a little bit of background, I do hold a Master's Degree from London University in Urban and Rural Planning, was a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute of Britain, a liaison officer for the Greater London Council on Development Control, as well as being elected Chairman of the Remodeling Council and Director of the Richmond Homebuilders' Association. The proposal here is to add a covered porch on the front of the house, with a depth of 8 feet, front to back, which would extend 3.5 feet into the setback requirements. The neighboring house at 1704 has a covered porch, 7 feet deep. The property at 6427 Millhiser Avenue, at the junction with Devers Road, has a covered porch 32 feet from the front boundary. The house at 6309 Millhiser has a covered porch 29 feet from its front boundary, so no precedent would be set. The houses in the area, built in '49, are not on a parallel line with the road frontage. Some are set slightly forward, and some are slightly back, so it's not like an even line here.

Let me ask you a question. While we're on that point, how wide are these other porches to which you refer?

Mr. Wilson - They vary in width.

Are they more than 6 feet in width?

997 Mr. Wilson - Oh yes. Some are much more than 6 feet (unintelligible) 998 they were built with the house.

Well I think that's pertinent, because that's the problem here; if this were only 6 feet, you wouldn't be here. You say the others in the area are more than 6 feet? Thank you.

Mr. Wilson -Yes that's correct; some of them go across the front of the house; some half, some 2/3; they do vary. And these properties I've mentioned all have the same zoning requirements. One of the reasons for requesting an 8-foot deep porch, as you can see, Ms. Yuan is incapacitated and she has a problem with maneuvering the wheelchair. Obviously, once you got the rails up, it actually reduces the width of the usable porch to 7 ½ feet, and you've got to allow for the out swing of the door. There used to be an uncovered stoop on the front of the house, which was demolished to allow for the location of the front door to be moved, because it really wasn't allowing for very good access, with the wheelchair. On the moving of the front porch, a lot of water damage was revealed, to the wood siding, the plate, and the band board. This is often the problem with uncovered porches, because you get splash back from rain from the hard surface of the porch onto the wood just below the door. As President of Virginia Home Improvement, we get called on many occasions to take care of this situation. Even having gutters doesn't help too much.

Aesthetically, the porch would certainly dress up the house, and there's no problem with that. As you can see from the photos, it's fairly plain. The fact that a lot of people have front porches so they can use them to sit out and look outside and get shade from the sun and protection from the rain; there's nothing unusual in the request to have a front porch. It certainly dresses up the curb appeal as well. The front boundary of the property does not directly abut the road; there is a further 10 feet from the hard surface of the road to the boundaries of the property, used for parking of vehicles, so it actually gives a clearance from the road, instead of about 35 feet, say about 45 feet. It adds another 10 feet to the actual road surface. That's fairly common in that neighborhood. Accompanying the request, there are about 50 letters from the neighbors, supporting the proposal, and from what I gather, no adverse letters have come in at all. Mr. Blankinship would confirm that.

Mr. Blankinship - That's right, and that sheaf of letters in favor is in the file.

Mr. Wilson - It is considered that to reduce the proposed depth of the porch would impose a physical hardship on Ms. Yuan, if not a financial one. She does need the extra space for maneuverability, and to ask for an 8-foot porch is really not excessive whatsoever. As I say, there are others in the area with the same depth and similar. Basically, we would like to request the Board to consider this request favorably. I wouldn't detract from the area; there's no site line issues here; there's quite a few trees in the front yard. It could only add to the property value, and let Ms. Yuan be allowed to use it the way she should be allowed to use

1043 it.

1044

1045 Mr. Balfour - Any questions?

1046

1047 Mr. Kirkland - On the porch – are you going to have any sides closed in, 1048 is it going to be screened?

1049

1050 Mr. Wilson - No, completely open. Just an open porch.

1051

Mr. Kirkland - I assume it's going to be handicapped accessible, so it's going to come out on the low end, is that what you're saying?

1054

1055 Mr. Wilson - You might be able to tell from that photo that the right front corner has a lower foundation than the left, so at the moment we're proposing 2 steps on the low corner, but depending on Ms. Yuan's condition, we may have to put a ramp on there as well, instead of coming from the back. One of the other properties in the neighborhood, on Millhiser Road, I noticed has a large ramp for access.

1061

1062 Mr. Kirkland - I've been out to the site several times, and it's a real improvement to what was there. The porches in the area. I rode the whole neighborhood.

1065

Mr. Wilson - So it will be an improvement. The neighbors are all in favor of it, and it has no adverse effect on the neighborhood whatsoever.

1068 1069

Mr. Balfour - Any other questions? Ms. Yuan, would you like to speak?

10701071

10721073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

Ms. Yuan - Yes. Can you hear me all right? Pardon my voice. I had worn my porch down on the high side of the yard. As you look at it, I'm on an incline, and it makes it much easier for me to go down fewer steps. Where it's located, the steps are in the center, it's 5 steps, and where the door is, it's 9 steps. If I carried it all the way to the right, I would have fewer steps to access. I'm not totally wheelchair bound; I just got out of the hospital yesterday, but I will be in my wheelchair for a while. My contention was if I was ever wheelchair bound, I would need access to be able to get out on my porch and be able to maneuver, and I'd like for that to be considered. I'd appreciate it.

10791080

1081 Mr. Balfour - Any questions for Ms. Yuan? Thank you ma'am.

1082

1083 Ms. Yuan - And I think it will be an improvement too as far as the visual improvement. Thank you.

1085

1086 Mr. Balfour - Thank you. Any other questions? If not, I assume there's

no opposition. Thank you for your time.

1087 1088

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Kirkland, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board granted application A-149-2001 for a variance add a covered front porch at 1702 Devers Road (Westhaven) (Tax Parcel 102-11-K-92). The Board granted the variance subject to the following condition:

1093 1094

1095

10961097

1. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. No substantial changes or additions to the layout may be made without the approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

10981099

| 1100 | Affirmative: | Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright | 5 |
|------|--------------|---|---|
| 1101 | Negative: | | 0 |
| 1102 | Absent: | | 0 |

11031104

1105

1106

11071108

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1109 1110 1111

Mr. Balfour - Next case.

1112

DARRYL C. GEORGE requests a variance from Section 24-A -150-2001 1113 95(i)(2)d. of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow the 1114 1115 existing garage to remain at 915 Clauson Road (Wildwood) (Tax Parcel 63-11-G-1), zoned R-2A, One-family Residence 1116 1117 District (Fairfield). The minimum side yard setback is not met. 1118 The applicant has 6 feet side yard setback, where the Code 1119 requires 10 feet side yard setback. The applicant requests a variance of 4 feet side yard setback. 1120

1121

1122 Mr. Balfour - Would you identify yourself please.

1123

1124 Mr. George - I'm Darryl George, the property owner.

1125

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

1128

Mr. George - I do. Basically, what happened here, is I purchased this home in 1992. In 1993 I hired a contractor to build a 720 square foot carport.

Application was made to the County of Henrico, building permit issued, and carport was built in 1993. This past July the funds were available for me to enclose the carport, so basically, I poured concrete, framed up walls, and put up doors. At the very end of the process, I would say late August, an individual from the Henrico County building permit department knocked on my door and asked me for a building permit for the work that I had most recently been conducting. I told him a permit was issued in 1993. He obtained the permit, came back on a subsequent visit, had the permit in hand, and said that the permit that was issued was for a carport, and I clearly had a garage.

I kind of explained that I didn't really think I had needed a permit to do the improvements, but showed him the work I had done. The footprint of the garage and carport did not change, the footers did not change, the headers did not change, it was the same exact setback. He said, "Well that's no problem Mr. George, we'll issue a building permit. All you have to do is submit plans to the department, and we'll issue one." But the problem here arises that the structure does not meet proper setback, and this was a total surprise to me. After all, the structure itself had been there since 1993. He had the 1993 building permit application in hand and identified and showed me, in fact, on the plan where it called and said the structure was 12 feet from the property line. He identified that the minimum setback was 10 feet from the property line, but the structure ended up being only about 7 feet, 6 feet from the property line. Obviously, we made a mistake, or the contractor made a mistake, while setting the footings and building the original structure in 1993. What I'm asking the Board to do is to grant a variance for the side yard setback for the actual garage.

1157 Mr. Balfour - Any questions?

1159 Mr. McKinney - What kind of business are you in, Mr. George?

1161 Mr. George - I teach driver improvement actually.

1163 Mr. McKinney - Driver improvement?

1165 Mr. George - Yes sir, I own a company called A-Aarons Traffic School, Inc., and the Virginia Driver Improvement Clinic.

1168 Mr. McKinney - Do you have any limousines?

- Mr. George In the past, going way back, I did operate a limousine service in the early 1990's, and most recently operated a sedan service that was licensed by the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles. You may be asking about the parking of cars on the premises. That was what your question would be in
- 1174 reference to?

- 1175 Mr. McKinney -I'm just asking the question. 1176 1177 1178 Mr. Balfour -How many cars do you park on the premises? 1179 1180 Mr. George -Currently I only have one car in that garage, actually it's not a car at all, it's a truck. Currently I have one truck in the garage. 1181 1182 1183 Mr. Kirkland -Have you contacted the contractor when you told him he missed by half? 1184 1185 Well, coincidentally, the contractor is also my next-door 1186 Mr. George neighbor, and actually we had a strained relationship over the summer regarding 1187 some other issues. So no sir, I did not. 1188 1189 Well he's your neighbor; he won't have any problem 1190 Mr. McKinney moving it, will he Mr. George? 1191 1192 1193 Mr. George -Believe me, if it was able to be moved the way it was 1194 built, I would certainly hook a chain up to it and drag it back. 1195 1196 Mr. McKinney -Oh it can be moved. 1197 I agree that anything can be done with the proper 1198 Mr. George motivation and funds available. 1199 1200 Mr. McKinney -What is the purpose of this garage? What are you using it 1201 1202 for? 1203 Mr. George -Just to park my vehicles in. 1204 1205 1206 Mr. McKinney -Your vehicles? 1207 Mr. George -Correct. Recently I had 2 vehicles; now I'm down to 1. 1208 1209 Mr. McKinney -So it's only for the purpose of parking your vehicles in the
- 1210 garage? Are you going to put a workshop in it? Maybe you should. 1211
- 1212 Mr. George -Well, the space is available, but no, I have no intentions of 1213 putting a workshop in there. 1214
- 1216 Mr. McKinney -But it will not be used for any type of commercial use? And you don't have a problem with a condition on that? 1217

| 1219 1220 | Mr. George - | I'm sorry, what was your question? | | |
|----------------------|--|---|----------|--|
| 1220 1221 1222 | • | You don't have a problem with putting a condition used for any type of commercial use? | on the | |
| 1223 | , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | | |
| 1224 | Mr. George - | No, I don't have any problem with that. | | |
| 1225 1226 | Mr. McKinney - | What were you getting ready to say when I brough | tht that | |
| 1227 | up? | what were you getting ready to say when I broug | int that | |
| 1228 | о.р | | | |
| 1229 | Mr. George - | I was going to address the suggested condition as of | | |
| 1230 | | omeone on staff at Henrico County that said, "O | - | |
| 1231 | improvements shown on the plan filed with application may be (considered) for | | | |
| 1232 1233 | | ncern was that that was in fact, going to be the st 't quite understand the wording. | ructure | |
| 1233 | that 3 now there. I didn | t quite understand the wording. | | |
| 1235 | Mr. Blankinship - | It's a standard condition. | | |
| 1236 | | | | |
| 1237 | - | Mr. Secretary, he still has to go get a building per | mit for | |
| 1238 | it? He has to have the r | normal inspections and so forth? | | |
| 1239 1240 | Mr. Blankinship - | Yes sir. Right. | | |
| 1240 | MI. Diankinship - | res sir. Trigitt. | | |
| 1242 | Mr. Balfour - | Any other questions? Thank you sir. Anyone else | on this | |
| 1243 | case? | , , , | | |
| 1244 | | | | |
| 1245 | • | lic hearing and on a motion by Mr. McKinney, secon | • | |
| 1246 1247 | | granted application A-150-2001 for a variance to all in at 915 Clauson Road (Wildwood) (Tax Parcel 63 | | |
| 1247 | | he variance subject to the following conditions: | J-11-G- | |
| 1249 | iii. Tho board grantod t | no variance subject to the following conditions. | | |
| 1250 | 1. Only the improve | ments shown on the plan filed with the application | may be | |
| 1251 | | this approval. No substantial changes or additions | | |
| 1252 | layout may be made without the approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Any | | | |
| 1253 | additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County | | | |
| 1254 1255 | Code. | | | |
| 1256 | 2. The structure sha | Il not be used for any commercial purpose. | | |
| 1257 | | | | |
| 1258 | Affirmative: Balfo | our, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright | 5 | |
| 1259 | Negative: | | 0 | |
| 1260 | Absent: | | 0 | |
| 1261 | | | | |

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1268 1269

Mr. Balfour - Call the next case, Mr. Secretary.

1270

A -151-2001 GLEN M. BROWNIE requests a variance from Section 24-9 of 1271 Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a single family house at 1272 8250 Yahley Mill Road (Tax Parcel 251-A-1 (part)), zoned A-1, 1273 1274 Agricultural District (Varina). The public street frontage requirement is not met. The applicant has 0 feet public street 1275 frontage, where the Code requires 50 feet public street 1276 frontage. The applicant requests a variance of 50 feet public 1277 street frontage. 1278

1279

1280 Mr. Balfour - Raise your hand and be sworn in please.

1281

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

1284

Mr. Brownie - Yes I do. My name is Glen Brownie. I am requesting a variance. I'd like to put a single-family dwelling on a piece of property which has no road frontage. There is an existing driveway that my father put in the property approximately 20 years ago, that I could use to allow me access to the property.

1289

Mr. Balfour - Excuse me, could you pull the microphone a little closer or bend over a little bit; we're having trouble hearing you.

1292

1293 Mr. Brownie - There is an existing driveway there, that I could use. I do 1294 not have to affect anybody else's property at the time to get to where I need to be.

1295

Have you read the suggested conditions on the back of your case, and you're agreeable with them?

1298

1299 Mr. Brownie - Yes sir. Yes sir.

1300

1301 Mr. Balfour - Any other questions of Mr. Brownie?

1302

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board granted application A-151-2001 for a variance to build a

single family house at 8250 Yahley Mill Road (Tax Parcel 251-A-1 (part)). The Board granted the variance subject to the following conditions:

1308 1. This variance applies only to the public street frontage requirement. All other applicable regulations of the County Code shall remain in force.

2. Only the improvements shown on the plan filed with the application may be constructed pursuant to this approval. No substantial changes or additions to the layout may be made without the approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Any additional improvements shall comply with the applicable regulations of the County Code.

3. 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.

4. At the time of building permit application the owner shall demonstrate that the parcel created by this division has been conveyed to members of the immediate family, and the subdivision ordinance has not been circumvented.

5. 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.

1331 6. The applicant shall present proof with the building permit application that a legal access to the property has been obtained.

1334 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1335 Negative: 0
1336 Absent: 0

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

JOHN R. ROCK requests a variance from Section 24-9 of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a single family house at 2542 Kingsland Road (Tax Parcel 260-A-1 (part)), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Varina). The public street frontage

| 1349 | requii | rement is not met. The applicant has 0 feet public street | | | |
|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1350 | frontage, where the Code requires 50 feet public stree | | | | |
| 1351 | frontage. The applicant requests a variance of 50 feet public | | | | |
| 1352 | street | t frontage. | | | |
| 1353 | | | | | |
| 1354 | Mr. Balfour - | All who plan to testify, raise their hands. | | | |
| 1355 | | | | | |
| 1356 | Mr. Blankinship - | Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is | | | |
| 1357 | the truth, the whole trutl | n, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? | | | |
| 1358 | | | | | |
| 1359 | Mr. Erdmann - | Good morning. I'm Craig Erdmann, the attorney for Mr. | | | |
| 1360 | Rock and Mrs. Sanderso | n. I don't know if you have copies of the maps, if I may | | | |
| 1361 | present to you. Mr. Roo | ck owns 36 acres around the exterior of this 3-acre parcel | | | |
| 1362 | that's been parceled of | f by survey. The problem here is once again the road | | | |
| 1363 | access. There is an exi | sting roadway; Mr. Rock's residence where he is now, is | | | |
| 1364 | sitting back off his easer | ment, and his housekeeper is wanting to build a 3-bedroom | | | |
| 1365 | single-family residence for her and her husband to live in, and we are looking for a | | | | |
| 1366 | variance from the access | requirement. | | | |
| 1367 | | | | | |
| 1368 | Mr. Balfour - | Any questions of Mr. Erdmann? | | | |
| 1369 | | | | | |
| 1370 | | You say she's his housekeeper? | | | |
| 1371 | | | | | |
| 1372 | Mr. Erdmann - | Correct. She's taking care of Mr. Rock and his aged | | | |
| 1373 | mother, and she and he | er husband plan to move into the 3-bedroom home that's | | | |
| 1374 | going to be built on the | corner of Mr. Rock's premises, and the property's going to | | | |
| 1375 | be deeded over to Mrs. S | Sanderson. | | | |
| 1376 | | | | | |
| 1377 | | How long has she been taking care of Mr. Rock? | | | |
| 1378 | | | | | |
| 1379 | Mr. Erdmann - | She's known him for several years. She's been working | | | |
| 1380 | for him for 7. Mr. Rock | is unmarried. | | | |
| 1381 | | | | | |
| 1382 | Mr. Kirkland - | Mr. Blankinship, do we have a problem with the | | | |
| 1383 | subdivision because she' | s not a family member? | | | |
| 1384 | | | | | |
| 1385 | Mr. Blankinship - | It would be the first division of the property since 1987, | | | |
| 1386 | so you're allowed one sp | lit. | | | |
| 1387 | | | | | |
| 1388 | Mr. Kirkland - | Okay, just wanted to make sure that went in the record. | | | |
| 1389 | | | | | |
| 1390 | | Mr. Erdmann, have you read the conditions? | | | |
| 1391 | | | | | |
| 1392 | Mr. Erdmann - | We have, and we have no objection. | | | |

| 1 | 2 | Λ | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | y | 3 |

1394 Mr. Balfour - Mr. Rock, did you want to say anything?

1395

1396 Mr. Rock -My name is John Rock. I've been a resident of Henrico County for about 40 years. I own some office and warehouse buildings over on 1397 Brook Road here, and I own Central Supply Company, and a franchise motorcycle 1398 dealership called Boss Hoss of Virginia. I am 70 years old, and my mom is 1399 approaching 90. Mrs. Sanderson has been a real big help to us, and at this time 1400 she and her husband live in south Richmond, so if I could get them over on my 1401 place, where she would be close by, it would really be a big help to me, and I 1402 1403 appreciate any kindness you could show me.

1404

Mr. Balfour - Any questions? Thank you Mr. Rock. Would she like to say anything. Anyone else wish to speak on this case? Thank you Mr. Erdmann.

1407

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. Kirkland, the Board granted application A-152-2001 for a variance to build a single family house at 2542 Kingsland Road (Tax Parcel 260-A-1 (part))). The Board granted the variance subject to the following condition:

1412

1413 1. This variance applies only to the public street frontage requirement. All other applicable regulations of the County Code shall remain in force.

1415 1416

14171418

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.

141914201421

1422

1423

3. 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.

14241425

1426 4. The applicant shall present proof with the building permit application that a legal access to the property has been obtained.

1428

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.

1433

1434 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1435 Negative: 0
1436 Absent: 0

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

1445 Mr. Balfour - Next case.

UP- 27-2001 VULCAN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS, INC. requests a conditional use permit pursuant to Sections 24-103 and 24-52(d) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to extract materials from the earth at New Market Road (Tax Parcel 270-A-1 (part)), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Varina).

1453 Mr. Balfour - You want to raise your right hand?

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

Mr. Lewis - I do. My name is Monte Lewis, with Lewis and Associates, representing Vulcan on this project. This is a site that has already been mined. We're in the process of reclaiming it. All of the grading for the reclamation has been done. It's just a timing issue that we weren't able to get grass established before the permit ran out, due to the dry conditions. We expect this to be done, hopefully this fall or at least by the spring. The area around the pond has been seeded and established, but we just ran out of time and weren't able to establish the whole thing before the permit ran out. Therefore, we're asking for an extension of the use permit. All of the permits have been obtained. The E&S bonds and the reclamation bonds are already in place; I don't know if it's needed to change your wording on the condition that the applicant shall maybe "maintain" the financial guarantees instead of "provide," because it's already provided.

Mr. Blankinship - It just says "before beginning work," they have to provide it; if you've already done it

1475 Mr. Lewis - I'll leave it up to your discretion, just for the record.

1477 Mr. Balfour - Any questions?

According to the staff report, they've got a good operation going on, Mr. Blankinship?

1482 Mr. Blankinship -Yes sir, we're not aware of any problems on the entire

1483 Curles Neck property.

1484

Mr. Balfour -Did you want to speak sir? 1485

1486

No sir. I'm just here. My name is Tom Brazell, I'm a 1487 Mr. Brazell geologist for Vulcan Materials, and if there were any questions that anyone had 1488 1489 about the reclamation that was ongoing at this site, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

1490

1491

1492 M. Balfour -Any questions of the Board members? Thank you.

1493 1494

1495

1496

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. Kirkland, the Board granted application UP-27-2001 for a conditional use permit to extract materials from the earth at New Market Road (Tax Parcel 270-A-1 (part)). The Board granted the use permit subject to the following conditions:

1497 1498 1499

This use permit is subject to all requirements of Section 24-103 of Chapter 1. 24 of the County Code.

1500 1501 1502

1503

1504

1505 1506

1507

1508 1509

1510 1511

1512

2. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall provide a financial guaranty in an amount of \$2,000.00 per acre for each acre of land to be disturbed, for a total of \$141,720.00, guaranteeing that the land will be restored to a reasonably level and drainable condition. This permit does not become valid until the financial guaranty has been approved by the County Attorney. The financial guaranty may provide for termination after 90 days notice in writing to the County. In the event of termination, this permit shall be void, and work incident thereto shall cease. Within the next 90 days the applicant shall restore the land as provided for under the conditions of this use permit. Termination of such financial guaranty shall not relieve the applicant from its obligation to indemnify the County of Henrico for any breach of the conditions of this use permit. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

1513 1514 1515

1516

1517

1518

1519 1520

1521

1522

3. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall submit erosion control plans to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Throughout the life of the operation, the applicant shall continuously satisfy the Department of Public Works that erosion control procedures are properly maintained, and shall furnish plans and bonds that the department deems necessary. The applicant shall provide certification from a licensed professional engineer that dams, embankments and sediment control structures meet the approved design criteria as set forth by the State. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

- 4. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall obtain a mine license from the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.
- 1528 Before beginning any work, the areas approved for mining under this permit 1529 5. shall be delineated on the ground by five-foot-high metal posts at least five inches 1530 in diameter and painted in alternate one foot stripes of red and white. These posts 1531 shall be so located as to clearly define the area in which the mining is permitted. 1532 They shall be located, and their location certified, by a certified land surveyor. If 1533 this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be 1534 void. 1535
 - 6. In the event that the Board's approval of this use permit is appealed, all conditions requiring action within 90 days will be deemed satisfied if the required actions are taken within 90 days of final action on the appeal.
- 7. The applicant shall comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and all state and local regulations administered under such act applicable to the property, and shall furnish to the Planning Office copies of all reports required by such act or regulations.
- 8. Hours of operation shall be from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. when Daylight Savings Time is in effect, and from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at all other times.
- 9. No operations of any kind are to be conducted at the site on Sundays, or national holidays.
- 1552 10. The applicant shall post and maintain a sign at the entrance to the mining 1553 site stating the name of the operator, the use permit number, the mine license 1554 number, and the telephone number of the operator. The sign shall be 12 square 1555 feet in area and the letters shall be three inches high.
- 1557 11. Routes of ingress and egress shall be over the applicants private roads to the loading area at the Jams River as outlined on the map filed with the application.
 - 12. The applicant shall post and maintain "No Trespassing" signs every 250 feet along the perimeter of the property. The letters shall be three inches high. The applicant shall furnish the Chief of Police a letter authorizing the Division of Police to enforce the "No Trespassing" regulations, and agreeing to send a representative to testify in court as required or requested by the Division of Police.
 - 13. All roads used in connection with this use permit shall be effectively treated with calcium chloride or other wetting agents to eliminate any dust nuisance.

1538

1539 1540

1545

1548

1551

1556

1559

1560

1561

1562

15631564

15651566

- 1569 14. The applicant shall maintain the property, fences, and roads in a safe and secure condition indefinitely, or convert the property to some other safe use.
- 15. If, in the course of its preliminary investigation or operations, the applicant discovers evidence of cultural or historical resources, or an endangered species, or a significant habitat, it shall notify appropriate authorities and provide them with an opportunity to investigate the site. The applicant shall report the results of any such investigation to the Planning Office.
- 16. If water wells located on surrounding properties are adversely affected, and the extraction operations on this site are suspected as the cause, the effected property owners may present to the Board evidence that the extraction operation is a contributing factor. After a hearing by the Board, this use permit may be revoked or suspended, and the operator may be required to correct the problem.
- 17. Open and vertical excavations having a depth of 10 feet or more, for a period of more than 30 days, shall be effectively sloped to a 2:1 slope or flatter to protect the public safety.
 - 18. Topsoil shall not be removed from any part of the property outside of the area in which mining is authorized. Sufficient topsoil shall be stockpiled on the property for respreading in a layer with five inches of minimum depth. All topsoil shall be stockpiled within the authorized mining area and provided with adequate erosion control protection. If the site does not yield sufficient topsoil, additional topsoil shall be brought to the site to provide the required five-inch layer of cover. All topsoil shall be treated with a mixture of seed, fertilizer, and lime as recommended by the County after soil tests have been provided to the County.
 - 19. No offsite-generated materials shall be deposited on the mining site without prior written approval of the Director of Planning. To obtain such approval, the operator shall submit a request stating the origin, nature and quantity of material to be deposited, and certifying that no contaminated or hazardous material will be included. The material to be deposited on the site shall be limited to imperishable materials such as stone, bricks, tile, sand, gravel, soil, asphalt, concrete and like materials, and shall not include any hazardous materials as defined by the Virginia Hazardous Waste Management Regulations.
 - 20. A superintendent, who shall be personally familiar with all the terms and conditions of Section 24-103 of Chapter 24 of the County Code, as well as the terms and conditions of this use permit, shall be present at the beginning and conclusion of operations each work day to see that all the conditions of the Code and this use permit are observed.

- 1612 21. A progress report shall be submitted to the Board on November 30, 2002.
- 1613 This progress report must contain information concerning how much property has
- been mined to date of the report, the amount of land left to be mined, how much
- rehabilitation has been performed, when and how the remaining amount of land will
- be rehabilitated, and any other pertinent information about the operation that would
- be helpful to the Board.

22. Excavation shall be discontinued by November 30, 2003, and restoration accomplished by not later than November 30, 2004, unless a new permit is granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

1622

1623 23. The rehabilitation of the property shall take place simultaneously with the mining process. Rehabilitation shall not be considered completed until the mined area is covered completely with permanent vegetation.

1626

24. All drainage and erosion and sediment control measures shall conform to the standards and specifications of the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook. Any drainage structures in place prior to October 14, 1992 and which do not conform to the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook may remain in place until such time as any reconstruction is required at which time said structures shall

be brought into conformance with the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook.

16321633

1634 **25**. Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall automatically void this permit.

1636

1637 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
1638 Negative: 0
1639 Absent: 0

1640

The Board granted the request because it found the proposed use will be in substantial accordance with the general purpose and objectives of Chapter 24 of the County Code.

1644

1645 Mr. Blankinship - You guys can stay here. The next case, for some reason, 1646 was inadvertently left off the agenda, Mr. Chairman, but I'm going to call it 1647 anyway, with your permission.

1648

1649 UP- 28-2001 VULCAN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS, INC. requests a conditional use permit pursuant to Sections 24-103 and 24-52(d) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to extract materials from the earth at Osborne Turnpike (Tax Parcel 213-A-2 (part)), zoned A-1, Agricultural District and M-1, Light Industrial District (Varina).

1655 Mr. Balfour - They're still under oath.

1656

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

1659 1660

1661

16621663

1664

1665

1666 1667

1668

1669

1670

1671

1672

1673

1674

16751676

16771678

Mr. Hinson -I do. My name is Paul Hinson; I'm with Koontz-Bryant. We're the engineer assisting Vulcan Materials on the Chatsworth project, Use Permit 28-2001. This is a re-approval of an existing mining permit on the site. We have submitted and received approval for an erosion and sedimentation control plan on the project. We have implemented all of the erosion and sedimentation control items on the site. We have almost completed all of our restoration for the previously mined areas. We also have some seeding to do, and some minor erosion damage that we need to repair, and we also have a change of ownership on this project, so we will be submitting new bonds in accordance with the new owner as well. It was previously owned by Tarmac Materials, and they were purchased by Vulcan Construction Materials. We did have one of the suggested conditions that we'd like to discuss with the Board as well. Condition # 24 discusses the topsoil must be stockpiled outside of the mining limits and that it cannot be used as part of the restoration. This permit was actually enacted prior to this condition being part of the conditions for the permit, and there was topsoil that was previously stockpiled in the setbacks for the project. On the previous renewal, the Board had granted an exception an exception to that, to allow us to use the topsoil that is in the existing setbacks as part of our restoration efforts, and we would also like for the Board to allow us to use that topsoil as part of our restoration efforts, that's in those setbacks on the site.

16791680

Mr. Balfour - So you're asking to amend it to say that the topsoil already there, as a result of the setbacks, be used.

1683 1684

Mr. Hinson - Yes sir, topsoil currently stockpiled in the setback areas be allowed to be used for restoration on the site.

1685 1686 1687

Do you see any problem with that, Mr. Blankinship?

1688

1689 Mr. Blankinship - No sir.

1690 1691

Mr. Hinson - We will not stockpile any additional materials in there, but we would request that we be able to use what's already there.

169216931694

You agree with the other 30 conditions?

1695

1696 Mr. Hinson - Yes sir, we have no objection to any of the other conditions.

1699 Mr. Balfour - Thirty-one kind of covers it anyway. Do you have any other questions? Thank you sir.

Mr. Brazell - My name is Ton Brazell. Once again, I just wanted to make note of the fact that those bonds have been transferred to Vulcan Materials, and we have gone through the change of ownership process.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board **granted** application **UP-28-2001** for a conditional use permit to extract materials from the earth at Osborne Turnpike (Tax Parcel 213-A-2 (part)). The Board granted the use permit subject to the following conditions:

1711 1. This use permit is subject to all requirements of Section 24-103 of Chapter 24 of the County Code.

2. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall provide a financial guaranty in an amount of \$2,000.00 per acre for each acre of land to be disturbed, for a total of \$154,000.00, guaranteeing that the land will be restored to a reasonably level and drainable condition. This permit does not become valid until the financial guaranty has been approved by the County Attorney. The financial guaranty may provide for termination after 90 days notice in writing to the County. In the event of termination, this permit shall be void, and work incident thereto shall cease. Within the next 90 days the applicant shall restore the land as provided for under the conditions of this use permit. Termination of such financial guaranty shall not relieve the applicant from its obligation to indemnify the County of Henrico for any breach of the conditions of this use permit. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

3. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall submit erosion control plans to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Throughout the life of the operation, the applicant shall continuously satisfy the Department of Public Works that erosion control procedures are properly maintained, and shall furnish plans and bonds that the department deems necessary. The applicant shall provide certification from a licensed professional engineer that dams, embankments and sediment control structures meet the approved design criteria as set forth by the State. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

4. Before beginning any work, the applicant shall obtain a mine license from the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy. If this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

5. Before beginning any work, the areas approved for mining under this permit shall be delineated on the ground by five-foot-high metal posts at least five inches

- in diameter and painted in alternate one foot stripes of red and white. These posts 1743
- shall be so located as to clearly define the area in which the mining is permitted. 1744
- 1745 They shall be located, and their location certified, by a certified land surveyor. If
- 1746 this condition is not satisfied within 90 days of approval, the use permit shall be void.

1748

1749 6. In the event that the Board's approval of this use permit is appealed, all conditions requiring action within 90 days will be deemed satisfied if the required 1750 1751 actions are taken within 90 days of final action on the appeal.

1752

1753 7. The applicant shall comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and all state and local regulations administered under such act applicable to the property, 1754 1755 and shall furnish to the Planning Office copies of all reports required by such act or regulations. 1756

1757

1758 8. Hours of operation shall be from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. when Daylight Savings Time is in effect, and from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at all other times. 1759

1760 1761

9. No operations of any kind are to be conducted at the site on Saturdays, Sundays, or national holidays.

1762 1763 1764

10. All means of access to the property shall be from the established entrance onto Osborne Turnpike.

1765 1766

- 1767
- 1768 11. The applicant shall erect and maintain gates at all entrances to the property. These gates shall be locked at all times, except when authorized representatives of 1769 1770 the applicant are on the property.

1771

12. The applicant shall post and maintain a sign at the entrance to the mining 1772 1773 site stating the name of the operator, the use permit number, the mine license 1774 number, and the telephone number of the operator. The sign shall be 12 square 1775 feet in area and the letters shall be three inches high.

1776

1777 13. The applicant shall post and maintain "No Trespassing" signs every 250 feet along the perimeter of the property. The letters shall be three inches high. The 1778 applicant shall furnish the Chief of Police a letter authorizing the Division of Police 1779 to enforce the "No Trespassing" regulations, and agreeing to send a representative 1780 to testify in court as required or requested by the Division of Police. 1781

1782

1783 14. Standard "Truck Entering Highway" signs shall be erected on Osborne Turnpike on each side of the entrances to the property. These signs will be placed 1784 1785 by the County, at the applicant's expense.

- 1787 15. The applicant shall post and maintain a standard stop sign at the entrance to Osborne Turnpike.
- 1790 16. The applicant shall provide a flagman to control traffic from the site onto the public road, with the flagman yielding the right of way to the public road traffic at all times. This flagman will be required whenever the Division of Police deems necessary.
- 1794
 1795
 17. All roads used in connection with this use permit shall be effectively treated with calcium chloride or other wetting agents to eliminate any dust nuisance.
- 1798 18. The operation shall be so scheduled that trucks will travel at regular intervals and not in groups of three or more.
- 1801 19. Trucks shall be loaded in a way to prevent overloading or spilling of materials of any kind on any public road.
- 1804 20. The applicant shall maintain the property, fences, and roads in a safe and secure condition indefinitely, or convert the property to some other safe use.
- 21. If, in the course of its preliminary investigation or operations, the applicant discovers evidence of cultural or historical resources, or an endangered species, or a significant habitat, it shall notify appropriate authorities and provide them with an opportunity to investigate the site. The applicant shall report the results of any such investigation to the Planning Office.
- 1813 22. If water wells located on surrounding properties are adversely affected, and 1814 the extraction operations on this site are suspected as the cause, the effected 1815 property owners may present to the Board evidence that the extraction operation is 1816 a contributing factor. After a hearing by the Board, this use permit may be revoked 1817 or suspended, and the operator may be required to correct the problem.
- Open and vertical excavations having a depth of 10 feet or more, for a period of more than 30 days, shall be effectively sloped to a 2:1 slope or flatter to protect the public safety.
- 1823 24. Topsoil shall not be removed from any part of the property outside of the area in which mining is authorized. Sufficient topsoil shall be stockpiled on the 1824 property for respreading in a layer with five inches of minimum depth. All topsoil 1825 1826 shall be stockpiled within the authorized mining area and provided with adequate 1827 erosion control protection. If the site does not yield sufficient topsoil, additional topsoil shall be brought to the site to provide the required five-inch layer of cover. 1828 All topsoil shall be treated with a mixture of seed, fertilizer, and lime as 1829 1830 recommended by the County after soil tests have been provided to the County.

1797

1800

1803

1806

1812

1818

Topsoil stored outside the mining areas under previous approvals may be used for reclamation.

25. No offsite-generated materials shall be deposited on the mining site without prior written approval of the Director of Planning. To obtain such approval, the operator shall submit a request stating the origin, nature and quantity of material to be deposited, and certifying that no contaminated or hazardous material will be included. The material to be deposited on the site shall be limited to imperishable materials such as stone, bricks, tile, sand, gravel, soil, asphalt, concrete and like materials, and shall not include any hazardous materials as defined by the Virginia Hazardous Waste Management Regulations.

26. A superintendent, who shall be personally familiar with all the terms and conditions of Section 24-103 of Chapter 24 of the County Code, as well as the terms and conditions of this use permit, shall be present at the beginning and conclusion of operations each work day to see that all the conditions of the Code and this use permit are observed.

27. A progress report shall be submitted to the Board on November 30, 2002. This progress report must contain information concerning how much property has been mined to date of the report, the amount of land left to be mined, how much rehabilitation has been performed, when and how the remaining amount of land will be rehabilitated, and any other pertinent information about the operation that would be helpful to the Board.

28. Excavation shall be discontinued by November 30, 2003, and restoration accomplished by not later than November 30, 2004, unless a new permit is granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

29. The rehabilitation of the property shall take place simultaneously with the mining process. Rehabilitation shall not be considered completed until the mined area is covered completely with permanent vegetation.

30. All drainage and erosion and sediment control measures shall conform to the standards and specifications of the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook. Any drainage structures in place prior to October 14, 1992 and which do not conform to the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook may remain in place until such time as any reconstruction is required at which time said structures shall be brought into conformance with the Mineral Mining Manual Drainage Handbook.

31. Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall automatically void this permit.

| 1874 | Affirmative: | Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright | 5 |
|------|--------------|---|---|
| 1875 | Negative: | | 0 |
| 1876 | Absent: | | 0 |

The Board granted the request because it found the proposed use will be in substantial accordance with the general purpose and objectives of Chapter 24 of the County Code.

Mr. Balfour - Next case.

A -153-2001

ANNE H. DECAMPS requests a variance from Section 24-95(c)(1) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build an addition at 9116 University Boulevard (University Heights) (Tax Parcel 101-10-C-B), zoned R-2, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe). The minimum side yard setback and total side yard setback are not met. The applicant has 4.8 foot minimum side yard setback and 19.2 feet total side yard setback, where the Code requires 7.8 feet minimum side yard setback and 23.4 feet total side yard setback. The applicant requests a variance of 3.0 feet minimum side yard setback and 4.2 feet total side yard setback.

Mr. Balfour - Anyone here on that case? We'll pass it by for the moment. Next case?

A -154-2001

DAVID HEPLER requests a variance from Section 24-95(i)(2) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a single-family house at 12315 Kain Road (Tax Parcel 26-A-52 (part)), zoned A-1, Agricultural District (Three Chopt). The accessory structure location requirement is not met. The applicant wishes to build a single-family house with accessory structures in the front and side yards, where the Code allows accessory structures in the rear yard.

Mr. Balfour - Raise your right hand please.

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

Mr. Hepler - Good morning; my name is David Hepler, and I've been a resident of Henrico County for about 25 years. This property has been in my family for about 35 years. Basically, my newly wed wife and I would like to build our home on this property, and have the restriction regarding the accessory structures to be in the front and side yards. I believe the zoning ordinance to allow

accessory structures in the rear yard of the dwelling would seem to be intended to prevent inappropriate or unsightly structures from being built in the front or side yards where they would adversely affect the surrounding area. In this case, I believe it's kind of a different situation, because the accessory structures already exist, and we wish to build the dwelling. Building the proposed dwelling will not make the accessory structures any more or less visible. In fact, neither the existing accessory structures, nor the proposed dwelling, are visible from the road or the surrounding homes, due to the distance from them, and also the many trees and bushes in the area. I don't believe that the variance, if it's granted, and the building of the proposed dwelling, would have any negative effect on any other property in the area. Basically, as I've already stated, because of the non-visibility One of the options that we were presented with, was of these structures. demolishing all of these accessory structures, which we actually have done, well we've demolished one of the structures, which is listed on the picture there. It says "to be razed. We've actually already demolished that, at a cost of over \$6,000, to tear it down and haul it off, so we also have a longer range plan to have some of these other sheds demolished as money and time permits. So we would just ask for your consideration in granting of this variance.

1935 1936 1937

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925 1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

Are these buildings usable at this particular time?

1938 1939

Mr. Hepler - Yes, they are usable; we're using them for storage. They could be used for a horse stall or something to that effect.

1940 1941 1942

Neither one of these is a garage?

1943 1944

1945

1946

1947

Mr. Hepler - Well, the picture that you see before you is actually more of a barn that could be used for storage or livestock, and has been used in the past for that purpose many years ago. There is one other structure shown that could be used for a carport or to house a tractor or some type of garden equipment or something like that.

1948 1949 1950

Is this some family property?

1951

1952 Mr. Hepler - Yes, this property's been in my family for about 35 years.

1953

Mr. Balfour - Are there any other questions of Board members? I gather you're a hundred yards back from the road, I've noticed too.

1956

1957 Mr. Hepler - Yes, I think it's about 300 feet, that's correct. And along 1958 Kain Road there's a large stand of trees, bushes, actually not only along the road, 1959 but between the proposed site and the road.

1960 1961

Mr. Balfour - Any other questions of Board members? Thank you sir.

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. McKinney, the Board **granted** application **A-154-2001** for a variance to build a single-family house at 12315 Kain Road (Tax Parcel 26-A-52 (part)). The Board granted the variance subject to the following conditions:

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.

3. The accessory buildings located in the front yard may remain until such time as demolition occurs. No additional accessory buildings may be located in the front yard. The existing accessory structures may not be replaced, restored, or expanded without additional approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

| 1982 | Affirmative: | Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright | 5 |
|------|--------------|---|---|
| 1983 | Negative: | | 0 |
| 1984 | Absent: | | 0 |

 The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

Mr. Balfour - Next Case.

 A -155-2001

HUNTER PETTUS, **JR**. requests a variance from Section 24-95(i)(2) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to allow an accessory structure to remain at 8107 Kingston Road (River Road Hills) (Tax Parcel 113-5-F-4), zoned R-1, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe). The accessory structure location requirement is not met. The applicant has an accessory structure in the side yard, where the Code allows accessory structures in the rear yard.

Mr. Balfour - Are there any others to speak besides the people at the rostrum? All of you stand and be sworn in.

2006

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

2009

Mr. Blankinship - Mr. Chairman, let me point out that there's a letter at each place that pertains to this case.

2012

2013 Mr. Pettus - I do. There's one more, if I could read it or give it to you.

2014

2015 Mr. Blankinship - Yes, pass it on up.

20162017

20182019

20202021

2022

2023

20242025

2026

2027

20282029

2030

20312032

2033

2034

20352036

20372038

2039

2040

Mr. Pettus -Because he is out of town, I thought he was going to be here. May I start? I'm Hunter Pettus. My wife and I live at 8107 Kingston Road, and we've been there for over 40 years. She was recently in an automobile accident, last November, and is physically handicapped. When we went to put up a tool and garden house, we had the help of a landscape architect, Karen Kelley, who will talk about it, and we didn't realize, after living there 40 years, we still didn't realize that you could not put a tool house on the side of your house. Now we have a funny-shaped lot, to start with, it's a pie-shaped lot. The front of the house is on Kingston Road, and it goes back to a point, and the lot goes uphill towards the back. That would not be too good of place for a person like Patsy to have to walk up to. Anyway, we went ahead and put the building up, not knowing that we were in default; we wouldn't do anything to purposely break the rules. It was a mistake; it was unintentional, and I don't know what we could have done to have not done it, to tell you the truth, because we did not know the rule on that. The builder of the house said a person here at Henrico County said that we did not need a building permit, and I think you have a copy of that letter from Tom, the builder. So we went ahead and put the house up where it was designed by Karen, and we also now have a signed letter from all of our nearby neighbors, or most all of them, said that they have no objection to the way the tool house is built, the construction of it, the looks of it. You can see it's on the side of the house; it's not on the front. Most people have said that it improves the looks of our lot, it's so attractive, and it's nicely landscaped. That's about all I can say, but we do have signed letters from neighbors on each side of us, in the rear of us, in the front of us, and also selected other ones; all saying that they have no problem with the location of the house.

20412042

2043 Mr. Balfour - Any questions of Mr. Pettus?

2044

Mr. Pettus - The main thing I wanted to get across is, we've been there over 40 years, and also we've got signatures from all of our nearby neighbors.

2049 Mr. Balfour - Anyone else want to speak?

Ms. Johnson - I'm Jane Jones; I live directly across the street. I do not have a problem with this structure whatsoever. I think it's very nice. Every time I walk out my front door, I do see it, and it doesn't offend me. They've gone to a lot of trouble to make it look nice, and it's very appealing.

Mr. Beatty - Good morning. My name is Bill Beattie, and I'm the closest neighbor to the right of that shed, and we have the property line that directly abuts that area. It probably does not show in the picture, but there are a stand of magnolia trees that are about 40 years old on that property line. If you approach the property from the southeast, it's impossible to see that building. If you approach it from the other side, it's set back far enough that you don't see that building until you are practically in front of the house. They have added significant shrubbery to the front of it, which will grow up and mask it as well. As Mr. Pettus said, I'm not aware of practically anyone in the neighborhood who objects to that location.

Ms. Kelley - I'm Karen Kelley, of Shipp and Wilson Landscaping, and just to make one correction, I am not a landscape architect. I am a landscape designer and nurseryman. I've been working with the Pettus's on their garden design. The structure was on the original plan, which you have a copy of. I was not aware of the requirement that tool houses be in the rear yard in this neighborhood. We assumed also that the contractor who built the tool house, when going for the building permit, would have any contact with the County on the structure itself. The structure was already up when the County representative came to the site and told us about this need for a variance.

Mr. Balfour - Any other comments on this case?

After an advertised public hearing and on a motion by Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board **granted** application **A-155-2001** for a variance to allow an accessory structure to remain at 8107 Kingston Road (River Road Hills) (Tax Parcel 113-5-F-4). The Board granted the variance subject to the following condition:

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

Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5

2090 Negative: 0
2091 Absent: 0

2094

2095

2096

2097

The Board granted this request, as it found from the evidence presented that, due to the unique circumstances of the subject property, strict application of the County Code would produce undue hardship not generally shared by other properties in the area, and authorizing this variance will neither cause a substantial detriment to adjacent property nor materially impair the purpose of the zoning regulations.

209820992100

Mr. Balfour - We've got 2 that we passed. You want to call those cases?

21012102

WILLIAM DEBENDER requests a variance from Sections 24-2103 A -147-2001 2104 95(i)(2)(b) and 24-95(i) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build a detached garage at 11416 Wood Brook Court (Rock 2105 Springs Estates) (Tax Parcel 13-2-G-14), zoned A-1, Agricultural 2106 2107 District (Brookland). The accessory structure requirement and accessory structure location requirement are 2108 not met. The applicant wishes to build a detached garage in the 2109 front yard with a height of 16.5 feet, where the Code allows 2110 accessory structures in the rear yard with a height of 15.0 feet. 2111

2112

2113 Mr. Balfour - Mr. Blankinship, did you have any word?

2114

Mr. Blankinship - I've spoken to him several times about the case, and no, he didn't say anything about missing the meeting.

21172118

2119

2120

2121

Upon a motion by Mr. Kirkland, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board of Zoning Appeals **deferred A-147-2001** application for a variance to to build a detached garage at 11416 Wood Brook Court (Rock Springs Estates) (Tax Parcel 13-2-G-14). The case was deferred for 30 days, at your request, from the November 15, 2001, until the December 13, 2001, meeting,

21222123

2124 Affirmative: Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5
2125 Negative: 0
2126 Absent: 0

2127

2128 Mr. Balfour - Next case.

2129

2132

2133

2134

2135

2130 **A -153-2001** 2131 **ANNE H. DECAMPS** requests a variance from Section 24-95(c)(1) of Chapter 24 of the County Code to build an addition at 9116 University Boulevard (University Heights) (Tax Parcel 101-10-C-B), zoned R-2, One-family Residence District (Tuckahoe). The minimum side yard setback and total side yard setback are not met. The applicant has 4.8 foot minimum side

| 2136 2137 2138 2139 | | yard setback and 19.2 feet total side yard setback, whe Code requires 7.8 feet minimum side yard setback and feet total side yard setback. The applicant requests a va of 3.0 feet minimum side yard setback and 4.2 feet total | l 23.4 iriance | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------|--|--|
| 2140 2141 2142 | Mr. Blankinship - | yard setback. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, we have had some convers | ations | | |
| 2143 2144 | back and forth with these applicants, and I'm not aware of any comment that they would not be in attendance. | | | | |
| 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 | Appeals deferred A 9116 University Bo was deferred for 3 | Mr. McKinney, seconded by Mr. Kirkland, the Board of A-153-2001 application for a variance to build an additioulevard (University Heights) (Tax Parcel 101-10-C-B). The O days, to allow you to have a representative present the r 15, 2001, until the December 13, 2001, meeting, | ion at e case | | |
| 2152 | Affirmative: | Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright | 5 | | |
| 2153 | Negative: | | 0 | | |
| 2154 2155 | Absent: | | 0 | | |
| 2156 2157 2158 2159 | | r. Nunnally, seconded by Mr. Wright, the Board approved April 26, 2001, Henrico County Board of Zoning Appeals | | | |
| 2160 2161 | Affirmative: | Balfour, Kirkland, McKinney, Nunnally, Wright 5 | | | |
| 2162 | Negative: | | 0 | | |
| 2163 | Absent: | | 0 | | |
| 2164 | | | | | |
| 2165 | <u> </u> | ther business, and on a motion by Mr. Wright, seconded | | | |
| 2166 | | e Board adjourned at 10:47 am, until December 13, 2001, | | | |
| 2167 | at 9:00 am. | | | | |
| 2168 | | | | | |
| 2169 | | | | | |
| 2170 | | Daniel Balfour, | | | |
| 2171 | | Chairman | | | |
| 2172 | | | | | |
| 2173 | | Benjamin Blankinship, AICP | | | |
| 2174 | | Secretary | | | |