

1 Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Planning Commission of the County of  
2 Henrico, Virginia, held in the Board Room of the County Administration Building in the  
3 Government Center at Parham and Hungary Springs Roads, Beginning at 9:00 a.m.  
4 Wednesday, May 28, 2003.

5  
6 Members Present: Mr. E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C., Chairperson (Varina)  
7 Mrs. Lisa D. Ware, Vice Chairperson (Tuckahoe)  
8 Mr. Ernest B. Vanarsdall, C.P.C. (Brookland)  
9 Mr. C. W. Archer, C.P.C. (Fairfield)  
10 Mr. Allen Taylor, P.E., C.P.C. (Three Chopt)  
11 Mr. Richard W. Glover (Brookland) Board of Supervisors  
12 Representative

13  
14 Others Present: Mr. John R. Marlles, AICP, Director of Planning,  
15 Secretary  
16 Mr. Randall R. Silber, Assistant Director of Planning  
17 Mr. David D. O'Kelly, Jr., Principal Planner  
18 Ms. Leslie A. News, CLA, County Planner  
19 Mr. James P. Strauss, CLA, County Planner  
20 Mr. E. J. (Ted) McGarry, III, County Planner  
21 Mr. Kevin D. Wilhite, C.P.C., AICP, County Planner  
22 Mr. Michael F. Kennedy, County Planner  
23 Ms. Christina L. Goggin, AICP, County Planner  
24 Mr. Michael P. Cooper, County Planner  
25 Mr. Todd Eure, Assistant Traffic Engineer  
26 Ms. Diana B. Carver, Recording Secretary  
27

28 **Mr. Richard W. Glover, the Board of Supervisors Representative, abstains on all**  
29 **cases unless otherwise noted.**

30  
31 Mr. Jernigan - Good morning ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Planning  
32 Commission and the Planning staff, I would like to welcome you all to our May 28, 2003  
33 Public Hearing for Plans of Development and Subdivisions.  
34

35 Mr. Vanarsdall - Excuse me. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the  
36 compliment.  
37

38 Mr. Jernigan - Today we have a pretty lengthy schedule. It looks like we have  
39 about four deferred, 13 expedited, and 10 we are going to try, which may have fluctuated  
40 in the last few minutes. For those of you who haven't been with us before, when each  
41 case comes up, I will ask if there is any opposition in the audience, and if there is, just  
42 raise your hand and you will have the appropriate time to speak. If you do speak, you  
43 will have to come to the podium. These hearings are audibly taped and you have to be at  
44 the microphone for us to pick you up. I see Mr. Glover, our Board of Supervisors  
45 member, has joined us and we would like to welcome you this morning, again. And with  
46 that, I will turn the meeting over to our Secretary, Mr. Marlles.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75

Mr. Marles - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. We have a full quorum today and, of course, we can conduct business. The first item on the agenda is request for deferrals and withdrawals and they will be presented by Mr. Ted McGarry.

Mr. Jernigan - Good morning, Mr. McGarry.

Mr. McGarry -Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commission, ladies and gentlemen. We have five items on our deferral and withdrawal list. The first one is on Page 3.

**SUBDIVISION WITH EXCEPTION (Deferred from the April 23, 2003, Meeting)**

Hanover Estates (April 2003 Plan)                      **Potts, Minter & Associates, P.C. for CGDS Development Company, LLC:** Request for approval of a conditional subdivision and exception pursuant to Section 19-4(c) of the Henrico County Code. The 27.7-acre site is located on the east line of Hanover Road at 445 and 505 Hanover Road approximately 1,000 feet north of Graves Road on parcels 831-723-4522 and 5867. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. County water and sewer. **(Varina) 21 Lots**

Mr. McGarry -The applicant requests deferral to your June 25, 2003 meeting.

Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition in the audience to the deferral of Hanover Estates Subdivision (April 2003 Plan)? With that, I make a motion to defer Hanover Estates (April 2003 Plan) to June 25, 2003.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Hanover Estates Subdivision (April 2003 Plan) to its meeting on June 25, 2003.

75 **SUBDIVISION (Deferred from the April 23, 2003, Meeting)**

76

Mankin Industrial Park (A Dedication of Oakley’s Lane Relocated) (April 2003 Plan) **Engineering Design Associates for Godsey Properties, Inc.:** The 60.696-acre site is located along the north line of Oakleys Lane at 4450 Oakley’s Lane approximately 600 feet west of Holly Avenue on parcel 817-721-5981. The zoning is M-1C, Light Industrial District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay) District. **(Varina)**

77

78 Mr. McGarry -The applicant is requesting deferral for two months to your July 23, 2003  
79 meeting.

80

81 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to the deferral of Mankin Industrial Park?  
82 With that I make a motion to defer Subdivision Mankin Industrial Park to the July 23,  
83 2003 meeting.

84

85 Mr. Taylor - Second.

86

87 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr. Taylor.  
88 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

89

90 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Subdivision Mankin  
91 Industrial Park (A Dedication of Oakley’s Lane Relocated) (April 2003 Plan) to its  
92 meeting on July 23, 2003.

93

94 **SUBDIVISION**

95

Greenbrooke (May 2003 Plan) **Youngblood, Tyler & Associates for Sadler Grove, LLC; William G. Swift c/o Main Street Properties; Oscar A. Crawford; Julius Houston Estate c/o Hortense Lee; Marie E. Burnette & et. Als.; Ellsworth Charles Pryor; Douglas H. Houston and Fidelity Properties, Ltd.:** The 42.76-acre site is located at the northwest intersection of Dublin Road and Belfast Road adjacent to Interstate 295 on parcels 744-765-2664, 0530, 4795, 8338, 5906; and 745-765-2822, 1418, 8941, and 743-764-8795. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional), C-1, Conservation District and C-1C, Conservation District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt) 72 Lots**

96

97 Mr. McGarry -The applicant requests deferral to the night meeting in June, which is June  
98 12, 2003.

99

100 Mr. Jernigan - In the audience, is there any opposition to the deferral of  
101 Greenbrooke (May 2003 Plan) to June 12, 2003? No opposition.

102 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move the deferral of Greenbrooke (May 2003  
103 Plan) to June 12, 2003 at the applicant's request.

104  
105 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

106  
107 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
108 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

109  
110 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred Subdivision  
111 Greenbrooke (May 2003 Plan) to its meeting on June 12, 2003.

112  
113 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the February 26, 2003, Meeting)**  
114

POD-68-02 Blackwood Retail Glen Eagles Shopping Center	<b>Balzer &amp; Associates, Inc. for Richfield Associates, LLC:</b> Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a 6,600 square foot building addition in an existing shopping center. The 0.90-acre site is located on the northwest corner of Ridgefield Parkway and Eagles View Drive in the Glen Eagles Shopping Center on part of parcel 740-500-0178. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). County water and sewer. <b>(Tuckahoe)</b>
---	---

115  
116 Mr. McGarry- The applicant is requesting deferral for four months to September  
117 24, 2003.

118  
119 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition in the audience to the deferral of POD-68-  
120 02, Blackwell Retail – Glen Eagles Shopping Center? No opposition.

121  
122 Mrs. Ware - Then I move that POD-68-02, Blackwood Retail – Glen Eagles  
123 Shopping Center be deferred to the September 24, 2003 meeting at the applicant's  
124 request.

125  
126 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

127  
128 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mrs. Ware and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
129 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

130  
131 At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission deferred POD-68-02,  
132 Blackwood Retail – Glen Eagles Shopping Center, to its meeting on September 24, 2003.

133

133 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the March 26, 2003, Meeting)**  
134

135 **POD-22-03 Engineering Design Associates for Hugh W. Owens:** Request  
136 Bethlehem Road for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter  
137 Office Building – 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a  
138 Bethlehem Road two-story, 6,450 square foot office building. The 2.58-acre site is  
located at 6501 Old Bethlehem Road on parcels 769-745-9774  
and 770-745-1768. The zoning is O-2C, Office District  
(Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**

135  
136 Mr. McGarry -The applicant is requesting deferral for two months to your July 23, 2003  
137 meeting.

138  
139 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to the deferral of POD-22-03, Bethlehem  
140 Road Office Building?

141  
142 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that POD-22-03, Bethlehem Road Office Building –  
143 Bethlehem Road, be deferred to July 23, 2003, at the applicant’s request.

144  
145 Mrs. Ware - Second.

146  
147 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and a second by Mrs. Ware.  
148 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

149  
150 At the applicant’s request, the Planning Commission deferred POD-22-03, Bethlehem  
151 Road Office Building – Bethlehem Road, to its meeting on July 23, 2003.

152  
153 Mr. Marlles - The next item on the Agenda is the Expedited Agenda. For the  
154 ladies and gentlemen in the audience, items on the Expedited Agenda are cases for which  
155 the staff is recommending approval. The Planning Commissioner from the District has  
156 no issues and there is no known citizen opposition. If there is citizen opposition, the case  
157 can be pulled off the Agenda and would be heard in its normal rotation.

158  
159 Mr. McGarry -We have a total of 14 eligible for the Expedited Agenda. The first one is  
160 on Page 1.

161  
162 **DEFERRED FROM THE MAY 15, 2003, REZONING MEETING**

163  
164 **C-9C-03 Skip Gelletly for EJD Associates, Inc.:** Request to conditionally  
165 rezone from B-3C Business District (Conditional) and O-2 Office District to RTHC  
166 Residential Townhouse District (Conditional) and B-3C Business District (Conditional),  
167 Parcels 809-729-7165 and part of Parcel 810-728-3075, containing 29.92 acres (RTHC –  
168 22.86 ac.; B-3C - 7.059 ac.), located at the southeast intersection of Laburnum Avenue  
169 and Creighton Road. A townhouse and commercial development is proposed. The  
170 applicant proffers a maximum density of no more than 137 units to be developed on the  
171 site (The unit density shall not exceed 5.99 units/acre (137/22.86 acres). The RTH

172 District allows a maximum density of nine (9) units per acre. The business use will be  
173 controlled by zoning ordinance regulations and proffered conditions. The Land Use Plan  
174 recommends Semi-Public. The site is also in the Airport Safety Overlay District.  
175

176 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Case C-9C-03? No opposition.  
177

178 Mr. Archer - Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I need to speak to the applicant  
179 for just one second, if I may. Mr. Gelletly, at our meeting last night, there was a  
180 proffered being discussed. Was it made?  
181

182 Mr. Gelletly - We have not made it yet this morning. We wanted to make sure  
183 that that was what the community was actually thinking when they left last night. They  
184 were going to think about it.  
185

186 Mr. Archer - They were going to leave it until the Board meeting?  
187

188 Mr. Gelletly - Yes.  
189

190 Mr. Archer - OK.  
191

192 Mr. Gelletly - Yes, and I was going to follow up with him to make sure that we are on  
193 the same wave length.  
194

195 Mr. Archer - That will be fine. Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman, with that I will  
196 move approval of Case C-9C-03 to the Board.  
197

198 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
199

200 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Archer and second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
201 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
202

203 **REASON:** Acting on a motion by Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall,  
204 the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (one abstention) to recommend that the Board of  
205 Supervisors **grant** the request because the project would include a logical mixture of  
206 business and residential zoning in this area and the proffered conditions would provide  
207 for a higher quality of development than would otherwise be possible.  
208

208 **LIGHTING PLAN**  
209

LP/POD-119-98 **Perretz & Young for Woodfin Heating, Inc.:** Request for approval of a lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code. The 2.34-acre site is located at the northeast corner of Dominion Boulevard and W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) on parcel 747-760-6472. The zoning is B-2C, Business District (Conditional). **(Three Chopt)**

210  
211 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to LP/POD-119-98, Great To Go #3? No  
212 opposition.

213  
214 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, there being no opposition, I move approval of  
215 LP/POD-119-98, Great To Go #3 - 4101 Dominion Boulevard, subject to the annotations  
216 on the plan and the standard conditions for lighting plans.

217  
218 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

219  
220 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
221 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

222  
223 The Planning Commission approved the lighting plan for LP/POD-119-98, Great To Go  
224 #3 – 4101 Dominion Boulevard, subject to the annotations on the plans and the standard  
225 conditions for lighting plans.

226  
227 **SUBDIVISION**

228 Williams Cove **G. Stuart Grattan for Maxine E. Johnson:** The 30.37-acre site  
(May 2003 Plan) is located approximately 1,500 feet south of Local Street at 8751  
Strath Road on parcel 817-680-5933. The zoning is A-1,  
Agricultural District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District).  
Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 6 Lots**

229  
230 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Williams Cove Subdivision (May 2003  
231 Plan)? No opposition. With that I will make a motion to approve Williams Cove  
232 Subdivision (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard  
233 conditions for subdivisions not served by public utilities, and the following conditional  
234 conditions Nos. 11, 12 and 13.

235  
236 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

237  
238 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr. Taylor.  
239 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion is passed.



240 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to Subdivision Williams Cove  
241 (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for  
242 subdivisions not served by public utilities and the following additional conditions:

- 243
- 244 11. Prior to requesting recordation, the developer shall furnish a letter from Dominion  
245 Virginia Power and Virginia Natural Gas Pipeline stating that this proposed  
246 development does not conflict with its facilities.
  - 247 12. Prior to requesting the final approval, a draft of the covenants and deed restrictions  
248 for the maintenance of the common area by a homeowners association shall be  
249 submitted to the Planning Office for review. Such covenants and restrictions shall  
250 be in form and substance satisfactory to the County Attorney and shall be recorded  
251 prior to recordation of the subdivision plat.
  - 252 13. Each pair of lots shall provide a single shared driveway connecting to Strath Road.

253  
254 **SUBDIVISION WITH EXCEPTION**  
255

Glendale Woods  
(May 2003 Plan)

**Engineering Design Associates for James River Lumber Co., Inc. and Hamlin Homes:** Request for approval of a conditional subdivision ~~and exception pursuant to Section 19.4 (c) of the Henrico County Code for one double frontage lot on Hob Nob Hill Road.~~ The 91.98-acre site is located at the southeast intersection of Charles City Road (State Route 156) and Warriner Road on parcel 852-687-8364. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District). Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 41 Lots**

256  
257 Mr. McGarry -The item on your Addendum is essentially that the exception is not  
258 required for this subdivision. The special exception is no longer required.

259  
260 Mr. Jernigan - In the audience, is there any opposition to the Subdivision  
261 Glendale Woods (May 2003 Plan)? No opposition? With that, I will move for approval  
262 of Glendale Woods Subdivision (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans,  
263 the standard conditions for subdivisions not served by Public Utilities and the following  
264 additional conditions, Nos. 11 and 12.

265  
266 Mrs. Ware - Second.

267  
268 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mrs. Ware.  
269 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

270  
271 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval for Subdivision Glendale Woods  
272 (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for  
273 subdivisions not served by public utilities and the following additional conditions:

274



- 275 11. Prior to requesting recordation, the developer shall furnish a letter from Dominion  
276 Virginia Power stating that this proposed development does not conflict with its  
277 facilities.  
278 12. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within  
279 the 25-foot-wide planting strip easement along Charles City and Hob Nob Hill  
280 Roads shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review and approval prior to  
281 recordation of the plat.  
282

283 **LANDSCAPE PLAN**  
284

LP/POD-86-02 **Jeff Loman for Carmax Auto Super Stores:** Request for  
Carmax – Richmond approval of a landscape plan, as required by Chapter 24,  
Expansion Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The  
3.8-acre site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection  
of Sadler and Old Sadler Roads on part of parcel 746-761-5525.  
The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional). **(Three  
Chopt)**

285  
286 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to LP/POD-86-02, Carmax – Richmond  
287 Expansion? No opposition.  
288

289 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of LP/POD-86-02, Carmax –  
290 Richmond Expansion, on the Expedited Agenda, subject to the annotations on the plan  
291 and the standard conditions for landscape plans.  
292

293 Mrs. Ware - Second.  
294

295 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mrs. Ware. All  
296 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
297

298 The Planning Commission approved the landscape plan for LP/POD-86-02, Carmax –  
299 Richmond Expansion, subject to the annotations on the plan and the standard conditions  
300 for landscape plans.  
301

301 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL**  
302

POD-72-99 **Balzer & Associates, Inc. for Liberty Property**  
Westerre IV – **Limited Partnership:** Request for approval of a  
Westerre Parkway transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section  
24-106 of the Henrico County Code from Westerre  
Land Development, LLC and Trammel Crow Company  
to Liberty Property Limited Partnership. The 4.82-acre  
site is located along the south line of Westerre Parkway,  
approximately 1,100 feet south of W. Broad Street (U.S.  
Route 250) on part of parcel 749-759-7710. The zoning  
is O-3C, Office District (Conditional). **(Three Chopt)**

303  
304 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to transfer of approval of POD-72-99,  
305 Westerre IV? No opposition.  
306

307 Mr. Taylor - I will move approval Transfer of Approval of POD-72-99,  
308 Westerre IV – Westerre Parkway, subject to continued compliance with the conditions of  
309 the original approval.  
310

311 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
312

313 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
314 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is passed.  
315

316 The Planning Commission approved Transfer of Approval of POD-72-99, Westerre IV –  
317 Westerre Parkway, subject to continued compliance with the conditions of the original  
318 approval.  
319

320 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT & LIGHTING PLAN**  
321

POD-34-03 **McKinney & Company for Short Pump Town**  
Parc Place @ Short Pump **Center, LLC and SBRD No. 4, LP:** Request for  
Town Center approval of a plan of development and lighting plan as  
required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico  
County Code to construct a one-story, 96,535 square  
foot shopping center. The 8.57-acre site is located  
approximately 800 feet north of W. Broad Street (U. S.  
Route 250) and 600 feet west of Pouncey Tract Road  
(State Route 271) on parcel 739-763-1874. The zoning  
is B-3C, Business District (Conditional) and WBSO  
(West Broad Street Overlay District). Private water and  
sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

322  
323 Mr. McGarry -On your Addendum you have a revised recommendation, added conditions  
324 and there is an additional handout in your packet showing architectural details.

325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369

Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to POD-34-03, Parc Place @ Short Pump Town Center? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD-34-03, Parc Place @ Short Pump Town Center, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type, and added conditions Nos. 9 Amended, 11B Amended, and Nos.23 through 34 and the comments in the addendum.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved Plan of Development and Lighting Plan for POD-34-03, Parc Place @ Short Pump Town Center, subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type, and the following additional conditions:

9. **AMENDED** – A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review and Planning Commission approval prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits.
- 11B. **AMENDED** – Prior to the approval of an electrical permit application and installation of the site lighting equipment, a plan including light spread and intensity diagrams, and fixture specifications and mounting heights details shall be revised as annotated on the staff plan and included with the construction plans for final signature.
23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and Division of Fire.
25. Employees shall be required to use the parking spaces provided at the rear of the building(s) as shown on the approved plans.
26. Outside storage shall not be permitted.
27. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-29C-98 shall be incorporated in this approval.
28. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
29. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.

- 370 30. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment  
371 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,  
372 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All  
373 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by the  
374 Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.  
375 31. The ground area covered by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate 25  
376 percent of the total site area.  
377 32. No merchandise shall be displayed or stored outside of the building(s) or on  
378 sidewalk(s).  
379 33. The Phase 2 building (identified as buildings A and B) shall be substantially  
380 similar in style and materials to the Phase 1 building as provided with this  
381 approval. Deviations in style or material shall be reviewed and approved by the  
382 Director of Planning.  
383 34. The retaining wall shall be constructed of brick, stone, split face block, concrete,  
384 similar material, with a high-quality exterior finish. Construction and finish  
385 details shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and included  
386 in the POD plans for signature.  
387

## 388 SUBDIVISION

389 Brookland Gardens **Goodfellow, Jalbert, Beard & Associates for Stephanie G.**  
(May 2003 Plan) **Holmes:** The 1.033-acre site is located at the southwest corner  
of Second and Ackley Avenues, approximately 800 feet east of  
CSX Railroad on parcel 773-754-0932. The zoning is R-3, One-  
Family Residence District. County water and sewer.  
**(Brookland) 3 Lots**

390  
391 Mr. McGarry -On your Addendum you have a revised recommendation for approval,  
392 subject to annotations to the plan, standard conditions for subdivisions served by Public  
393 Utilities and conditions listed on the Agenda, Nos. 12 and 13.  
394

395 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Subdivision Brookland Gardens (May  
396 2003 Plan)?  
397

398 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that Brookland Gardens (May 2003 Plan) be approved on  
399 the Expedited Agenda as indicated on the Addendum and standard conditions for  
400 subdivisions served by Public Utilities and the following conditions Nos. 12 and 13.  
401

402 Mrs. Ware - Second.

403 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and a second by Mrs. Ware.  
404 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion is passed.  
405

406 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval for Subdivision Brookland  
407 Gardens (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions  
408 for subdivisions served by Public Utilities and the following additional conditions:  
409

- 410 12. Each lot shall contain at least 11,000 square feet.  
411 13. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the  
412 construction plan by the Department of Public Works.  
413

414 **SUBDIVISION**  
415

New Market Place, **Engineering Design Associates for Elliott Properties II:**  
Section B The 2.32-acre site is located on the eastern line of New  
(May 2003 Plan) Market Road (U.S. Route 5) approximately 800 feet  
northwest of McLean Street on parcels 801-703-7934 and  
7169. The zoning is R-3C, One-Family Residence District  
(Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Varina) 5 Lots**

416  
417 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Subdivision New Market Place, Section  
418 B, (May 2003 Plan)? No opposition. With that, I will move for approval of Subdivision  
419 New Market Place, Section B, (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans,  
420 the standard conditions for subdivisions served by public utilities, and the following  
421 additional conditions Nos. 12 through 16.  
422

423 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
424

425 Mr. Jernigan - I have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
426 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion is passed.  
427

428 The Planning Commission approved Subdivision New Market Place, Section B, (May  
429 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for  
430 subdivisions served by public utilities and the following additional conditions:  
431

- 432 12. Each lot shall contain at least 11,000 square feet.  
433 13. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the  
434 construction plan by the Department of Public Works.  
435 14. Accessory buildings shall be located at least 35 feet from New Market Road.  
436 15. The landscape plan for the 25-foot planting strip easement along New Market Road  
437 shall be submitted to the Planning Office for review and Planning Commission  
438 approval prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first house.  
439 16. The proffers approved as part of zoning case C-78C-02 shall be incorporated in this  
440 approval.  
441

442 Mr. McGarry - Page 24 of your Agenda.  
443

444 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**  
445

POD-28-00 (Renewal) **Jordan Consulting Engineers for Brandywine**  
Twin Hickory Office **Operating Partnership L.P.:** Request for renewal of a  
Building – 11282 and 11290 plan of development as required by Chapter 24, Section  
Nuckols Road 24-106 of the Henrico County Code to construct a three-

story, 74,500 square foot office building. The 6.97-acre site is located on the northeast corner of Nuckols Road and Twin Hickory Road on parcels 747-773-1506 and 746-772-9574. The zoning is O-2C, Office District (Conditional). County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

446

447 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to POD-28-00 (Renewal), Twin Hickory  
448 Office Building? No opposition. Mr. Taylor.

449

450 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, I move approval of POD-28-00, Twin Hickory  
451 Office Building – 11282 and 11290 Nuckols Road, subject to the annotations on the plans,  
452 the standard conditions for developments of this type, and conditions Nos. 23-35.

453

454 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

455

456 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
457 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

458

459 The Planning Commission approved Plan of Development POD-28-00 (Renewal) Twin  
460 Hickory Office Building – 11282 and 11290 Nuckols Road, subject to the annotations on  
461 the plans, the standard conditions for developments of this type and the following  
462 additional conditions:

463

464 23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be  
465 granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any  
466 occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required  
467 information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty  
468 (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.

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

471 25. A standard concrete sidewalk shall be provided along the east side of Twin  
472 Hickory Road and the north side of Nuckols Road.

473 26. Employees shall be required to use the parking spaces provided at the rear of the  
474 building(s) as shown on the approved plans.

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

476 28. Outside storage shall not be permitted.

477 29. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be  
478 obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the  
479 construction plans.

480 30. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design  
481 shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the  
482 construction plans by the Department of Public Works.

483 31. The loading areas shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 24, Section 24-  
484 97(b) of the Henrico County Code.



- 485 32. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and  
 486 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the  
 487 issuance of a building permit.
- 488 33. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not  
 489 establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained  
 490 right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
- 491 34. Evidence of a joint ingress/egress and maintenance agreement must be submitted  
 492 to the Planning Office and approved prior to issuance of a certificate of  
 493 occupancy for this development.
- 494 35. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment  
 495 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,  
 496 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All  
 497 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by the  
 498 Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.  
 499

500 Mr. McGarry -Because of a miscommunication between staff and the developer, on Page  
 501 26, we had a subdivision that is eligible for the Expedited Agenda.  
 502

503 **SUBDIVISION**  
 504

The Ponds @ Dandridge  
 Farm (Includes a Revision of  
 Section A, Block F, Lots 5,  
 6, and 7)  
 (May 2003 Plan)

**Youngblood, Tyler & Associates, P.C. for Francis  
 Run Associates, LC:** The 8.974-acre site is located on  
 the west line of Francistown Road approximately 75 feet  
 north of Francis Marion Court on parcels 758-764-0333,  
 8282, 2245, 7838 and 759-764-1468. The zoning is R-  
 3AC, One-Family Residence District (Conditional) and  
 R-3C, One-Family Residence District (Conditional).  
 County water and sewer. **(Brookland)**  
**21 Lots**

505  
 506 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Subdivision The Ponds @ Dandridge  
 507 Farm, May 2003 Plan? No opposition.  
 508

509 Mr. Vanarsdall - I move that The Ponds @ Dandridge Farm (Includes a Revision of  
 510 Section A, Block F, Lots 5, 6 and 7) (May 2003 Plan), be approved on the Expedited  
 511 Agenda, subject to the standard conditions for subdivisions served by Public Utilities and  
 512 the following additional conditions: Nos. 12 through 19.  
 513

514 Mr. Taylor - Second.  
 515

516 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Vanarsdall and a second by Mr. Taylor.  
 517 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
 518

519 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval of subdivision The Ponds @  
 520 Dandridge Farm (Includes a Revision of Section A, Block F, Lots 5, 6, and 7) (May 2003  
 521 Plan) subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for subdivisions



522 served by public utilities and the following additional conditions:  
523

- 524 12. Each lot shall contain at least 9,500 square feet, exclusive of the flood plain areas.
- 525 13. The limits and elevation of the 100 year frequency flood shall be conspicuously  
526 noted on the plat and construction plans and labeled "Limits of 100 year  
527 floodplain." Dedicate floodplain as a "Variable Width Drainage & Utilities  
528 Easement."
- 529 14. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within  
530 the 20-foot-wide planting strip easement along Francistown Road shall be  
531 submitted to the Planning Office for review and approval prior to recordation of the  
532 plat.
- 533 15. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the  
534 construction plan by the Department of Public Works.
- 535 16. The proffers approved as part of zoning cases C-35C-99 and C-59C-02 shall be  
536 incorporated in this approval.
- 537 17. Prior to requesting the final approval, a draft of the covenants and deed restrictions  
538 for the maintenance of the common area by a homeowners association shall be  
539 submitted to the Planning Office for review. Such covenants and restrictions shall  
540 be in form and substance satisfactory to the County Attorney and shall be recorded  
541 prior to recordation of the subdivision plat.
- 542 18. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located  
543 within the buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be  
544 developed with engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in  
545 accordance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical  
546 guidelines established by a professional engineer. A detailed engineering report  
547 shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Building Official prior to the  
548 issuance of a building permit on the affected lot. A copy of the report and  
549 recommendations shall be furnished to the Directors of Planning and Public Works.
- 550 19. Guardrail shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic  
551 Engineer.  
552

552 **SUBDIVISION**

553

New Market Flats  
(May 2003 Plan)

**Richard L. Baird, Jr. for Eva Johnson Scillia and P. D. Sweet:** The 11.77-acre site is located on the west side of Turner Road, approximately 1,200 feet north of Camp Holly Drive on parcel 829-686-5562. The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Individual well and septic tank/drainfield. **(Varina) 9 Lots**

554

555 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Subdivision New Market Flats (May  
556 2003 Plan)? No opposition. With that I will move approval of Subdivision New Market  
557 Flats (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for  
558 subdivisions not served by Public Utilities and the following conditional conditions Nos.  
559 11 through 15.

560

561 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

562

563 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr.  
564 Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion is  
565 passed.

566

567 The Planning Commission granted conditional approval to subdivision New Market Flats  
568 (May 2003 Plan), subject to the annotations on the plans, the standard conditions for  
569 subdivisions not served by Public Utilities and the following additional conditions:

570

- 571 11. Each lot shall contain at least 43,560 square feet.
- 572 12. The plan must be redesigned to provide at least the 150 foot minimum lot width  
573 required and as regulated by Chapter 24, of the Henrico County Code.
- 574 13. The detailed plant list and specifications for the landscaping to be provided within  
575 the 25-foot-wide planting strip easement along Turner Road shall be submitted to  
576 the Planning Office for review and approval prior to recordation of the plat.
- 577 14. Any necessary offsite drainage easements must be obtained prior to approval of the  
578 construction plan by the Department of Public Works.
- 579 15. Any future building lot containing a BMP, sediment basin or trap and located  
580 within the buildable area for a principal structure or accessory structure, may be  
581 developed with engineered fill. All material shall be deposited and compacted in  
582 accordance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and geotechnical  
583 guidelines established by a professional engineer. A detailed engineering report  
584 shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Building Official prior to the  
585 issuance of a building permit on the affected lot. A copy of the report and  
586 recommendations shall be furnished to the Directors of Planning and Public Works.

587

587 **LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN**  
588

LP/POD-14-01  
Mayland and Parham Office  
Building – N. Parham Road

**Timmons Group for Mayland Investors, LLC:**  
Request for approval of a landscape and lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2 of the Henrico County Code. The 12.15-acre site is located approximately 60 feet from the northeast corner of the intersection at N. Parham Road and Mayland Drive, and fronting 211 feet on N. Parham Road and 1,234 feet on Mayland Drive on parcel 758-752-8267. The zoning is O-2, Office District. **(Three Chopt)**

589  
590 Mr. McGarry -On your Addendum you find that there is a revised plan which addresses  
591 the annotations on the original staff plan, including additional landscaping in the buffer  
592 along Mayland Drive, coordination of conflicts with lighting and trees, provision of  
593 foundations planting around the building, additional screening of the BMP, dumpster, and  
594 generator, and clarification of the lighting details. Staff recommends approval of the  
595 revised plans subject to the standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans.  
596

597 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to LP/POD-14-01? No opposition. Mr.  
598 Taylor.

599  
600 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I understand there were a few  
601 neighbors that were concerned about the final elements of the landscaping, and I would  
602 just like for Mrs. News to express if that is all clear.  
603

604 Ms. News - Yes, sir. The neighbors met with the engineer before the meeting.  
605 They live on Mayland Drive between Trimmer Drive and the area where five Leyland  
606 Cyprus are shown in the gap, and the engineers agreed to add 10 more Leyland Cyprus  
607 along the buffer, which satisfies their concerns and reduce a few of the Holly Shrubs, so  
608 there is no longer any opposition. Staff will just annotate that change.  
609

610 Mr. Taylor - All right. Thank you, Mrs. News. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will  
611 move approval of LP/POD-14-01, Mayland and Parham Office Building – N. Parham  
612 Road, on the Expedited Agenda, subject to the standard conditions for landscape and  
613 lighting plans.  
614

615 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

616  
617 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
618 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The ayes have it. The motion passes.  
619

620 The Planning Commission approved the landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-14-01,  
621 Mayland and Parham Office Building – N. Parham Road, subject to the standard  
622 conditions for landscape and lighting plans.

623  
624  
625  
626  
627

**SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL  
FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
Summerfield Woods (April 1998 Plan)	Fairfield	5	5	3	Recommendation Made at Meeting

628  
629

Mr. Wilhite - Good morning. The one subdivision for Planning Commission action is Summerfield Woods (April 1998 Plan), which is located in the Fairfield District, and is a five-lot subdivision. The applicant has indicated that there has been some financing problems in getting this started and she hopes to have it started within the next year. Staff has looked at it and in the last five years, and there don't seem to be any Ordinance amendments that impacts this subdivision negatively. Staff would recommend a one-year extension on it.

630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637

Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite. Mr. Archer.

638  
639

Mr. Archer - I move approval of the extension.

640  
641  
642

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

643  
644  
645  
646

Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Archer and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

647  
648  
649

The Planning Commission voted to approve a one-year extension for Summerfield Woods (April 1998 Plan), to May 26, 2004.

650  
651  
652  
653

**SUBDIVISION EXTENSIONS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL  
FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSE ONLY**

Subdivision	Magisterial District	Original No. of Lots	Remaining Lots	Previous Extensions	Year(s) Extended
Four Mile Run, (May 2001 Plan)	Varina	167	167	0	1 Year 05/26/04

654  
655  
656  
657

Mr. Wilhite - We just have one subdivision being extended administratively by the Director of Planning. This was Four Mile Run, (May 2001 Plan), located in the Varina District. There has been a revised plan submitted to the Planning Office, the changes to the internal road layout, and has elimination of the BMP to take advantage of

658 the Stream Protection Program. Staff has reviewed these changes with Mr. Jernigan and  
659 we will grant the extension based on that revised plan.

660  
661 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Wilhite.

662  
663 Mr. Marlles- Mr. Chairman, before going on with the Agenda, I did want to  
664 introduce the new staff member, who joined us last Wednesday. Samantha, will you stand  
665 up for a second? Samantha Brown has joined the Planning staff as a County Planner I.  
666 She is a graduate of the University of Maryland. She has worked in Asheville, N.C., so  
667 we are very pleased to have her. She will be working in the Comprehensive Planning  
668 Division.

669  
670 Mr. Jernigan - Samantha, it is a pleasure to have you with us.

671  
672 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, the next case is on Page 6 of your Agenda.

673  
674 **SUBDIVISION (Deferred from the April 23, 2003, Meeting)**

675  
Newstead Landing **Engineering Design Associates for Newstead**  
(A Resubdivision of **Landing L.C.:** The 52.7-acre site is located on the south  
Newstead Landing, Section line of Kingsland Road 140 feet east of Osborne  
A and a Portion of Landing (private road) on parcels 808-670-1962, 3363,  
Newstead Farms) 4865, 6169, 1028; 808-668-9806 and 809-668-6715.  
(September 2002 Plan) The zoning is A-1, Agricultural District. Private central  
water and central sewer system. **(Varina) 30 Lots**

676  
677 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Ted McGarry.

678  
679 Mr. Jernigan - In the audience is there any opposition to Subdivision Newstead  
680 Landing? OK. We have opposition. Mr. McGarry, you may proceed.

681  
682 Mr. McGarry -The Planning Office received a revised plan on May 13 and its review is  
683 complete. The plan proposes private wells on each lot and a private alternative septic  
684 system on each lot as permitted by the Henrico County Code. The Planning Office  
685 recommends a boulevard entrance at Kingsland Road to make acceptable the length of  
686 Newstead Landing Drive. The two main issues that are still outstanding have to do with  
687 filling in the flood plain and use of an experimental pre-engineered disposal system.  
688 Staff has amended the standard conditions and crafted special conditions to address the  
689 issues. Staff is still not comfortable with this plan because of public health issues.  
690 Because of the continued questions and alternative sewerage disposal system, staff  
691 recommends deferral. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

692  
693 Mr. Vanarsdall - You recommend deferral?

694  
695 Mr. McGarry -Yes, sir.

696

697 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. McGarry. Anyone else have questions? All right,  
698 Mr. Nelson, would you please come up.

699  
700 Mr. Nelson - My name is Bob Nelson and I represent the..  
701

702 Mr. Jernigan - Bob, I want to advise the 10-minute rule will be in effect. Would  
703 you like to reserve rebuttal time?  
704

705 Mr. Nelson - I don't think I need to reserve any time. I'd like to accept the  
706 deferral at this time.  
707

708 Mr. Jernigan - OK. Thank you. With that I will move for deferral of Subdivision  
709 Newstead Landing for 30 days at request of the Planning Commission.  
710

711 Mr. Vanarsdall - That will be June 25, Mr. Chairman. And I will second it.  
712

713 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr.  
714 Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
715

716 The Planning Commission deferred Subdivision Newstead Landing (A Resubdivision of  
717 Newstead Landing, Section A, and a Portion of Newstead Farms) (September 2002 Plan)  
718 to its meeting on June 25, 2003.  
719

## 720 **LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN & SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

721

LP/POD-48-00 Horsepen Road Townhouses- Phase 2	<b>McKinney &amp; Company for New Apartments LLC:</b> Request for approval of a landscape and lighting plan, and special exception for a private noncommercial recreation area, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24- 106 and 24-106.2, 24-24-12(b) and 24-29(a) of the Henrico County Code. The 11.20-acre site is located at 6708 Dartmouth on parcels 766-742-8033; 767-742- 1736; 767-741-2394 and 3268 and 766-741-9079. The zoning is R-5, General Family Residence District and R-5C, General Family Residence District (Conditional). ( <b>Three Chopt</b> )
--	--

722  
723 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Jim Strauss.

724 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-  
725 48-00? No opposition. Mr. Strauss, you may proceed.  
726

727 Mr. Strauss - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. The  
728 applicant has submitted both a landscape and a lighting plan and a special exception for  
729 Commission approval. The special exception is for a recreational area, and it is  
730 something of a housecleaning item, if you will. During property transaction and  
731 financing of the project, a parcel line was created for the portion of the property having

732 buildings, and the remaining portion of the northern part of the property, which has only  
733 recreational areas. This would consist of two volleyball courts, two tot lots, a pedestrian  
734 trail and a gazebo. And if you will look at the screen (referring to rendering), the  
735 property line runs about like that, leaving the recreational center south of the property  
736 line. As the recreational areas are now in a separate parcel, and as they are no longer an  
737 accessory use, to the main use, a special exception for a conditional use is required. The  
738 applicant can answer our questions with respect to the recreation areas, if you wish. Staff  
739 recommends approval of the landscape and lighting with the annotations as on the staff  
740 plan. I believe Mr. Dave Sharp is here this morning. He is representing the applicant,  
741 and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.  
742

743 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Strauss. Are there any questions for Mr. Strauss  
744 from the Commission? Thank you. Mr. Taylor.

745  
746 Mr. Taylor - Do you want to hear from the applicant?  
747

748 Mr. Jernigan - No. There is no opposition.  
749

750 Mr. Taylor - Then I move approval of LP/POD-48-00, Horsepen Road  
751 Townhouses – Phase 2, landscape and lighting plan, subject to the annotations on the plan  
752 and standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans.  
753

754 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
755

756 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
757 All those in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
758

759  
760 Mr. Taylor - I move approval of the Special Exception for LP/POD-48-00,  
761 Horsepen Road Townhouses – Phase 2, subject to the annotations on the plan and the  
762 standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans.  
763

764 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
765

766 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
767 All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.  
768

769 The Planning Commission approved landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-48-00,  
770 Horsepen Road Townhouses – Phase 2, subject to the annotations on the plan and the  
771 standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans.  
772

773 **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT (Deferred from the April 23, 2003, Meeting)**  
774

POD-30-03	<b>Carter Design for Short Pump Town Center, LLC and</b>
Uno's @ Short Pump Town	<b>Short Pump Investment Group, LLC: Request for</b>
Center (POD-6-01 Revised)	approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter



24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one-story, 6,722 square foot restaurant ~~in a regional shopping center~~. The 1.49-acre site is located 680 feet north of W. Broad Street (U.S. Route 250) and approximately 1,500 feet west of Lauderdale Drive on parcel 736-764-3817. The zoning is B-3C, Business District (Conditional) and WBSO (West Broad Street Overlay) District. Private water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

775

776 Mr. Marlles - Staff report will be given by Mr. Kevin Wilhite.

777

778 Mr. Jernigan - In the audience is there any opposition to POD-30-03, Uno's @  
779 Short Pump Town Center? No opposition. Mr. Wilhite, you may proceed.

780

781 Mr. Wilhite - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The site issues that were identified in  
782 the staff report have now been resolved. The entrance that was shown on the plan to the  
783 western access road will be eliminated at the Traffic Engineer's request. In its place, five  
784 additional parking spaces will be provided. The retaining wall that is shown within the  
785 10-ft. landscape buffer will be shifted all the way to the western property line. Due to the  
786 wording of the proffer with the Short Pump Town Center rezoning case, placement of the  
787 retaining wall within the landscape buffer does require specific approval. This placement  
788 of the retaining wall within the landscape buffer is due to a storm sewer line that is  
789 running just outside the buffer, making it very difficult to place the retaining wall there.

790

791 Condition No. 30 on Page 1 of your Addendum addresses the construction and  
792 appearance of the retaining wall and what staff is trying to achieve is consistency  
793 throughout the Short Pump Town Center development in terms of the other walls that  
794 will be on the site. We met with the applicant yesterday afternoon to discuss the  
795 architectural issues that were remaining. We did see some renderings, but we still have  
796 some work that had to be done before staff could recommend approval of the  
797 architectural plans. Staff can recommend approval of the site plan and we are in  
798 agreement with the applicant that the architectural plans will be deferred for 30-days,  
799 and, of course, your motion has to address the retaining wall in the buffer as well.

800

801 I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

802

803 Mr. Jernigan - Are there any questions for Mr. Wilhite from the Commission?

804

805 Mr. Taylor - The question, Mr. Chairman, that I have is we are only approving  
806 now...would you say that again, with the Special Exception.

807

808 Mr. Wilhite - Well, there is no Special Exception. It is just the placement of the  
809 retaining wall requires specific approval by the Planning Commission. We would  
810 recommend that that be a part of your motion. What is before you would be just approval

811 of the site plan with a request for a deferral of 30 days the architectural plans for the  
812 development.

813

814 Mr. Taylor - All right. Thank you. Then I move approval of POD-30-03, Uno's  
815 @ Short Pump Town Center, subject to standard conditions for development of this type  
816 and conditions Nos. 23 through 30, with a requirement to bring back the architectural  
817 plan in 30 days.

818

819 Mr. Archer - Second.

820

821 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Archer. All  
822 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

823

824 The Planning Commission approved POD-30-03, Uno's @ Short Pump Town Center  
825 (POD-6-01 Revised), subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type and  
826 the following additional conditions:

827

- 828 23. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public  
829 Utilities and Division of Fire.
- 830 24. Outside storage shall not be permitted
- 831 25. The proffers approved as a part of zoning case C-29C-98 shall be incorporated in  
832 this approval.
- 833 26. The developer shall install an adequate restaurant ventilating and exhaust system  
834 to minimize smoke, odors, and grease vapors. The plans and specifications shall  
835 be included with the building permit application for review and approval. If, in  
836 the opinion of the County, the type system provided is not effective, the  
837 Commission retains the rights to review and direct the type of system to be used.
- 838 27. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design  
839 shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the  
840 construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
- 841 28. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and  
842 contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the  
843 issuance of a building permit.
- 844 29. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment  
845 (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes,  
846 transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All  
847 equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by the  
848 Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.
- 849 30. The retaining wall shall be constructed of brick, stone, split-faced block, concrete,  
850 or similar material, with a high-quality exterior finish. Construction and finish  
851 details shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and included  
852 in the POD plans for signature.

853

854 **TRANSFER OF APPROVAL (Deferred from the April 23, 2003, Meeting)**

855

POD-87-85

**Commonwealth Commercial Partners, Inc. for**

Quioccasin Station Shopping Center – 8932 Quioccasin Road

~~Amanakin Farms, Inc.~~ **Manakin Farms – Quioccasin, LLC:** Request for approval of a transfer of approval, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code from QRS Limited Partnership to ~~Amanakin Farms, Inc.~~ **Manakin Farms – Quioccasin, LLC.** The 8.56-acre site is located approximately 200 feet west of Sterling Drive at 8932 Quioccasin Road, on parcel 752-745-3770. The zoning is B-2, Business District. County water and sewer. **(Tuckahoe)**

856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887

Mr. Marlles - Staff report will be given by Mr. Michael Cooper.

Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Transfer of Approval for POD-87-85?  
No opposition. Good morning, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Cooper - Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. As you may be aware, this case has been deferred for some time and during that time staff has met on site several times with the applicant to discuss the deficiencies. The applicant has begun working diligently to correct the problems and has agreed to correct all of the deficiencies by June 15 of this year. Additionally, the applicant has posted a bond to cover these deficiencies. Therefore, staff recommends approval of this Transfer of Approval. The applicant’s representative is here if you wish to ask any questions.

Mr. Jernigan - Are there any questions for Mr. Cooper from the Commission?  
Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Mrs. Ware.

Mrs. Ware - OK. Thank you, Mr. Cooper. I make a motion that we approve Transfer of Approval for POD-87-85, with the additional condition No. 1.

Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mrs. Ware and a second by Mr. Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved Transfer of Approval for POD-87-85, Quioccasin Station Shopping Center – 8932 Quioccasin Road, subject to the following condition:

1. The site deficiencies, as identified in the inspection report, dated May 13, 2003, shall be corrected by June 15, 2003.

#### **PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT**

POD-32-03  
United Christian Church –  
Anoka and Fordson Roads

**E. D. Lewis & Associates for Trustees of United Christian Church:** Request for approval of a plan of development, as required by Chapter 24, Section 24-106 of the Henrico County Code, to construct a one-story,

6,685 square foot fellowship hall and a new parking lot. The 5.781-acre site is located on the northeast corner of Anoka and Fordson Roads, approximately 430 feet south of Fordson Road on parcel 757-749-6731. The zoning is R-3, One-Family Residence District. County water and sewer. **(Three Chopt)**

888

889 Mr. Marlles - The staff report will be given by Mr. Cooper.

890

891 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to Plan of Development, POD-32-03,  
892 United Christian Church? No opposition. Mr. Cooper, you may proceed.

893

894 Mr. Cooper - OK. This plan, as Mr. Secretary stated, is for the construction of a  
895 new fellowship hall and additional parking at the site of an existing church. The exterior  
896 of the building would be comprised of brick and vinyl siding and would closely match  
897 the style of the existing church.

898

899 The church is located in a predominantly residential area. Therefore, staff had some  
900 concerns about the location of the proposed HVAC and mechanical equipment, and  
901 particularly the screening measures for such equipment. The HVAC and mechanical  
902 equipment will be located at the northernmost corner of the proposed building, closest to  
903 the parking lot. The applicant has proposed to screen the equipment with a solid vinyl  
904 fence. Staff feels that with some additional landscaping along the fence, the proposed  
905 screening will be adequate. The applicant has agreed to do so. With that, and with the  
906 applicant addressing all of the recommendations, staff can recommend approval of this  
907 plan. The applicant's representative and engineer are here today to answer any questions,  
908 and I am happy to answer any questions as well.

909

910 Mr. Vanarsdall - Mr. Cooper, the applicant has agreed to do more landscaping?

911

Mr. Cooper - Yes, sir.

912

913 Mr. Vanarsdall - But it is not on here, is it?

914

915 Mr. Cooper - No, this just came in at the end. There is no specific landscaping  
916 that they are proposing at this point. They just agreed to work with us during the  
917 landscaping phase to do so.

918

919 Mr. Taylor - It doesn't involve a requirement to submit a landscaping plan?

920

921 Mr. Cooper - Yes, they would be submitting a landscape plan.

922

923 Mr. Glover - Who is the applicant of this? The pastor of the church? I don't  
924 think he is going to tell you a story. I think he will landscape it if he says he will.

925

926 Mr. Jernigan - Are there any more questions for Mr. Cooper from the  
927 Commission? Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Mr. Taylor.

928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970

Mr. Taylor - Well, Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead and move approval of POD-32-03, United Christian Church – Anoka and Fordson Roads, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type and conditions Nos. 23 through 30, and the annotations on the plans. And we will trust the Reverend subject to the submission of landscaping plans.

Mr. Jernigan - I will second the motion. We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Jernigan. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

The Planning Commission approved Plan of Development, POD-32-03, United Christian Church, Anoka and Fordson Roads, subject to the standard conditions for developments of this type and the following additional conditions:

23. The easements for drainage and utilities as shown on approved plans shall be granted to the County in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to any occupancy permits being issued. The easement plats and any other required information shall be submitted to the County Real Property Agent at least sixty (60) days prior to requesting occupancy permits.
24. The developer shall provide fire hydrants as required by the Department of Public Utilities and Division of Fire.
25. Any necessary off-site drainage and/or water and sewer easements must be obtained in a form acceptable to the County Attorney prior to final approval of the construction plans.
26. Deviations from County standards for pavement, curb or curb and gutter design shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to final approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works.
27. Storm water retention, based on the 50-10 concept, shall be incorporated into the drainage plans.
28. Insurance Services Office (ISO) calculations must be included with the plans and contracts and must be approved by the Department of Public Utilities prior to the issuance of a building permit.
29. Approval of the construction plans by the Department of Public Works does not establish the curb and gutter elevations along the Henrico County maintained right-of-way. The elevations will be set by Henrico County.
30. The location of all existing and proposed utility and mechanical equipment (including HVAC units, electric meters, junction and accessory boxes, transformers, and generators) shall be identified on the landscape plans. All equipment shall be screened by such measures as determined appropriate by the Director of Planning or the Planning Commission at the time of plan approval.

**LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN**

LP/POD-25-02	<b>Carter Robertson for Don Cassada, BB&amp;T:</b>
BB&T - 4799 S. Laburnum Avenue	Request for approval of a landscape and lighting plan, as required by Chapter 24, Sections 24-106 and 24-106.2

of the Henrico County Code. The 1.39-acre site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of S. Laburnum Avenue and Finlay Street on parcels 815-715-9860, 816-715-1063 and part of 816-715-1082. The zoning is O-2C, Office District (Conditional) and ASO (Airport Safety Overlay District). (**Varina**)

971

972 Mr. Jernigan - Is there any opposition to LP/POD-25-02, BB&T – 4799 S.  
973 Laburnum Avenue? Ms. News. Good morning.

974

975 Ms. News - Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission.  
976 The applicant for this project has addressed all of staff's concerns with the plan in your  
977 packet. There was one remaining issue regarding the provision of shrubs along the  
978 northern property line to meet transitional buffer requirements, and which would also  
979 satisfy police recommendations for perimeter controls on the project. The applicant has  
980 agreed to provide 70 Dwarf Burford Hollies in this location. The applicant has submitted  
981 information showing the fence adjacent to the residential property to the east, which was  
982 a requirement of the proffers, which has been specifically requested and approved by the  
983 adjacent property owners. The applicant has also agreed to provide shields for the lights  
984 adjacent to the property line, to eliminate any glare on their property.

985

986 Staff recommends approval of the plan in your packet as annotated, subject to the  
987 standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans and the additional condition in your  
988 agenda.

989

990 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Ms. News. Are there any questions for Ms. News from  
991 the Commission? Thank you. With that I will move for approval of LP/POD-25-02,  
992 landscape and lighting plan for BB&T at 4799 S. Laburnum Avenue, subject to the  
993 annotations on the plan and the standard conditions for landscape and lighting plans, and  
994 the additional condition No. 6.

995

996 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.

997

998 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Jernigan and a second by Mr.  
999 Vanarsdall. All in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The motion passes.

1000

1001 The Planning Commission approved the landscape and lighting plan for LP/POD-25-02,  
1002 BB&T – 4799 S. Laburnum Avenue, subject to the annotations on the plan, the standard  
1003 conditions for landscape and lighting plans, and the following additional condition:

1004

1005 6. Lighting shall be reduced to no more than a security level following the close of  
1006 business operations.

1007

1008 Mr. Jernigan- All right, Mr. Secretary, I believe we have a Work Session.

1009



1010 Mr. Marlles - Yes, sir. We also have approval of Minutes from the April 23,  
1011 2003 meeting.

1012  
1013 Mr. Taylor - I move the minutes of the April 23, 2003 meeting be approved.  
1014

1015 Mr. Jernigan - First of all, are there any corrections to the minutes? No  
1016 corrections. All right, Mr. Taylor. I am sorry I interrupted you.

1017  
1018 Mr. Archer - I second it.  
1019

1020 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and a second by Mr. Archer. All  
1021 in favor say aye. All opposed say no. The minutes are approved.  
1022

1023 Mr. Marlles - Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we might take a five-minute break.  
1024 Staff is on its way down. I don't think they anticipated the meeting going quite this  
1025 quickly, but they will be down in a few minutes.  
1026

1027 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Secretary, I didn't anticipate this meeting going this quickly.  
1028

1029 Mr. Taylor - I think, Mr. Secretary, before we go on we should recognize that  
1030 we did agenda so quickly because of the expert work of the staff and Mr. Marlles and his  
1031 whole team working hard behind the scenes. Things go easy here, but each of us has the  
1032 individual hours that we devote to it, but they, in addition to the time that we spend here  
1033 at the meeting, have spent lots of hours in staff preparation and that makes this rapid pace  
1034 possible.  
1035

1036 Mr. Glover - Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to make a comment. The five months  
1037 that I have set on the Commission representing the Board, I have noticed that you always  
1038 have your landscaping, Nos. 9 and 11, on the Consent Agenda, which is nothing wrong  
1039 with that. But why are you taking up the public's time on that? Why not let the  
1040 Administration do it with, obviously, the entire Commission, unless the entire  
1041 Commission is going up to the Planning Office and looking at those sites, and not have  
1042 any questions, why wouldn't you just stop saying that you want to bring it back?  
1043 Because you never, in five months you haven't reviewed one yet by the full  
1044 Commission? Are you aware of that? Sometimes when you get in a habit of doing  
1045 something, you just keep doing it because it has always been done that way, but if you  
1046 are not going to review it by the full Commission, why take up the Commission's time  
1047 and the public's time to put it on the Expedited Agenda? Now, if you should say that it is  
1048 going to be reviewed by the Administration, that doesn't remove you from the picture.  
1049 The Administration would call you and tell you to come and look at it, work with it,  
1050 whatever you need to do. Now, if you are not satisfied with it, you can ask the staff to  
1051 put it on the agenda for the full Commission to hear it. In other words, you really are  
1052 taking a lot of time on the Expedited Agenda with items, especially on a POD. I just  
1053 throw it out for you to consider, because it did take you about 24 minutes today to go  
1054 through your Expedited Agenda, and a lot of them were landscaping plans. It is just a  
1055 thought.



1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101

Mr. Vanarsdall - Well, you are saying not to have it on the agenda at all anyway?

Mr. Glover - In other words, at the time of your POD, you approve the POD but you ask for the landscape and lighting plans to come back. And you ask that landscape and lighting plans be reviewed by the Administration, which is what they are doing right now, because you all are not hearing it as a full body, unless you as a Commission, each one of the members, are all of you going out and looking at this landscaping to be sure that this is what you agree with. Are you all going up to the County and looking at it, or are you coming and taking the staff's word that the landscaping is what you would like for it to be. I am not telling you to do it. I am just telling you that you are taking up a lot of time with doing nothing. That doesn't mean that you have to do it, but I just thought it was a waste of yours...

Mr. Vanarsdall - I think that is a good point.

Mr. Jernigan - Well, my particular case with the BB&T Bank. That was sitting right next to a neighborhood and we've had problems before on the fencing, which it ended up originally they were going to put a solid fence all the way through...

Mr. Glover - So that does not mean that you wouldn't still have the same input you had today. But I am not going to put the rest of the Commission on the spot, but I am going to ask the question and expect no answer. Did all the Commissioners go out and look at that and did all of the Commissioners review it with the staff or did you review it as you should have? All I am saying is that your review put it on the Expedited Agenda, because you had no opposition. You can do the same thing. I know back in the mid-1980s Mrs. Mary Wade was the Commissioner from Three Chopt. She was adamant about bringing that landscape plan back to the Commission for the full Commission to hear it. And I think from that it gave the developer the idea that the County and the Commission representing the County were very interested in landscaping properly for aesthetics and so forth. But, today, in five months, I haven't heard you hear one case of landscaping or lighting as a public hearing. You have put it on the Expedited Agenda. So, it tells me that you all are doing the job, but you are doing it from an Administrative standpoint and the Commission is not being involved with it. Now, give it some thought. Talk to your Director and to the other members.

Mr. Jernigan - I will give you an answer next month.

Mr. Glover - You don't have to give me an answer. You really don't. I am making an observation and passing it on to you. You have got some very, very, as Al said before I started speaking, you've got some outstanding landscaping planners. I can guarantee you that if any landscaping plan in the Brookland District has always been up to par if not beyond.

Mr. Archer - The staff does a good job.

1102 **THE COMMISSION TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT THIS TIME.**

1103  
1104 **Work Session:**  
1105 **Scott Road Small Area Land Use Study**  
1106

1107 Mr. Marllles - Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, this is a work  
1108 session on the Scott Road Small Area Land Use Study. This is a planning study that has  
1109 been going on for sometime. There have been community meetings held. Mr. Bittner  
1110 has been the project manager and staff person working on this particular study, and he  
1111 will present it to the Commission.  
1112

1113 Mr. Jernigan - You may proceed.  
1114

1115 Mr. Bittner - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hopefully, you all are at least  
1116 somewhat familiar with the Scott Road Study, and you should have a copy of the  
1117 recommended plan in front of you. If not, we have more copies with us today. I will not  
1118 spend a great deal of time describing the recommended plan, but if you have any  
1119 questions, please feel free to interrupt me at any time.  
1120

1121 The main concept of the recommended plan is to enhance this area's viability as a prime  
1122 economic development site. Because of its favorable location and access to the interstate,  
1123 it is felt this area can be home to a large scale well coordinated office-type development.  
1124 It is one of the last large sites left in the western area of Henrico County. It is felt this  
1125 would be an attractive site for a corporate headquarters type of project. The  
1126 recommended plan was originally drafted and shared with the Planning Commission last  
1127 year. The next step in the process was sharing it with the public. A web site was created  
1128 and a public meeting was held on April 28 of this year. Approximately 75 people  
1129 attended and they made several comments. After reviewing those comments, staff has  
1130 amended the original recommended plan to what you now have in front of you. These  
1131 amendments are marked with red stars on the slide and they include moving Concept  
1132 Road CR-1 further to the south, to create a larger expanse of developable land on the  
1133 Scott Cobb property, re-designating the North Park Library site at Parham and Franconia  
1134 Road to Government, to match its current land use, and re-designating the site at Parham  
1135 and St. Charles Roads to semi-public, to match its planned use. This site was originally  
1136 zoned for an assisted living facility, but is currently the subject of a church rezoning  
1137 request.  
1138

1139 Please note also the yellow star, where we are recommending an extension of Park  
1140 Central Drive so it intersects with CR-1. This is not currently shown on the printed map  
1141 you have in front of you. This recommended plan is ultimately intended to amend the  
1142 2010 Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the Major Thoroughfare Plan. I will now  
1143 outline what those amendments would be if this plan were to be approved in its present  
1144 form:  
1145

1146 In the area west of I-95, the 2010 Land Use Plan would see through three changes, a new  
1147 office designation on Brook Road in an area currently designated Commercial

1148 concentration; a new office service designation on Telegraph Road in the area currently  
1149 designated Urban Residential and Planned Industrial; and the Government designation on  
1150 Parham Road changed to urban residential to match the surrounding neighbors. The  
1151 major reason for these changes is to create a gateway type entrance from Brook Road into  
1152 the central study area parcels and to provide land use designations more consistent with  
1153 the primary economic development potential of the site.

1154

1155 In the area east of I-95, the Land Use Plan would see the following changes:

1156

1157 The existing office service designation would be reduced to correspond with the existing  
1158 Park Central and Windsor Business Park development. The office designation along I-95  
1159 would be expanded and replace areas currently designated Suburban Residential-1 in  
1160 Planned Industrial. The North Park Library site at Parham and Franconia would be  
1161 changed from Office to Government and the site at Parham and St. Charles would be  
1162 changed from Office to Semi-Public. Again, the main reasons for these changes are to  
1163 enhance the economic development potential of the area and make it more attractive as a  
1164 potential corporate headquarters site.

1165

1165 The Major Thoroughfare Plan would be amended as follows:  
1166

1167 The Scott Road Minor Collector would be removed in its entirety. In its place would be  
1168 added CR-1 and CR-2. Both of these roadways would be classified as Major Access  
1169 Roads and be colored green on the MTP map. The intent is to create a road network for  
1170 future development in this area. CR-2 would be the main entrance into this site. CR-1  
1171 would create a secondary or backdoor entrance from Brook Road. In addition, from this  
1172 point forward staff recommends that CR-1 be labeled Magellan Parkway and CR-2 be  
1173 labeled St. Charles Road, because both concept roads would be extensions of these  
1174 existing roadways.  
1175

1176 Staff has continued to receive public comments since the citizen meeting on April 28, and  
1177 we would like to share some of those with you. Some concern has been expressed about  
1178 the increased amount of office-designated property. Those who have expressed this feel  
1179 that the area has development potential for light industrial and distribution center type  
1180 facilities. One comment has specifically recommended an Office-Service designation for  
1181 the area between I-95 and Park Central South of the recommended Magellan Parkway.  
1182 Another comment has suggested realigning CR-2 further to the west so it does not bisect  
1183 property on Scott Road adjacent to Park Central. Direct access from either I-95 or I-295  
1184 has also been suggested as the possible front door entry into the property. Staff has  
1185 examined all of these comments and will continue to do so throughout this review  
1186 process. However, at this time, staff is not recommending any changes to the  
1187 recommended plan, other than what you see in front of you.  
1188

1189 The next step in this process would be scheduling a public hearing by the Planning  
1190 Commission. Staff is prepared to present this at your July 10 meeting if you decide that is  
1191 acceptable. After that would be a work session with the Board of Supervisors, and a  
1192 potential date for that would be August 12. The final step would be a public hearing by  
1193 the Board of Supervisors. Under this schedule, the process could be finished with  
1194 amendments made to the Land Use and Major Thoroughfare Plan by mid-September of  
1195 this year.  
1196

1197 That concludes my presentation and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.  
1198

1199 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Bittner. Are there any questions from the  
1200 Commission for Mr. Bittner?  
1201

1202 Mr. Glover - Yes, I want to ask one question concerning the ingress/egress and  
1203 so forth. On that 295 corner on the Cobb property, why is there a stub street off of 295  
1204 there? Are you aware of that?  
1205

1206 Mr. Bittner - No, sir. I was not aware of that. I don't know what its purpose is  
1207 or what it may lead to.  
1208

1209 Mr. Glover - I believe there is a street that appears to stub back into the  
1210 property, as if one day they may very well have wanted to egress at that point, not  
1211 necessarily an ingress.  
1212

1213 Mr. Bittner - Possibly, and as I said, that comment has been received and people  
1214 who made the comment pointed to, I believe it is the Arboretum, off of Powhite Parkway  
1215 as a similar type facility.  
1216

1217 Mr. Glover - I don't know about the Arboretum, but I know about this one. You  
1218 didn't look at it after it was questioned?  
1219

1220 Mr. Bittner - I was not aware of what stub street this is. We can go look at it.  
1221

1222 Mr. Glover - You didn't go look?  
1223

1224 Mr. Bittner - No, sir.  
1225

1226 Mr. Glover - OK.  
1227

1228 Mr. Jernigan - Are there any more questions for Mr. Bittner?  
1229

1230 Mr. Archer - Mr. Bittner, you know, we had a meeting the other day. Could you  
1231 expand just a little bit on, I think it is CR-1, for the benefit of the rest of the Commission  
1232 members, or I should say the Concept Road that we talked about that we have heard some  
1233 comments that it would bisect a piece of the property that was quite valuable.  
1234

1235 Mr. Bittner - I think you might be talking about CR-2.  
1236

1237 Mr. Archer - It could be that.  
1238

1239 Mr. Bittner - This is CR-2 here (referring to rendering). We have received a  
1240 comment and we've actually gotten a potential new alignment for it from a representative  
1241 out in this area, who suggests realigning it in sort of this fashion, moving it a little bit  
1242 further to the west, open up some properties to the east for development.  
1243

1244 Mr. Archer - Is that reasonable to do? We are not locked into this line that we  
1245 drew?  
1246

1247 Mr. Bittner - Well, I think it is reasonable. We are not locked into any specific  
1248 alignment. We would have to look at it, though, in light of the proposed development,  
1249 which in this case would be a beer distributorship, and we would have to look at it on the  
1250 impact of the overall proffer. But it is something that I think is a reasonable request. We  
1251 have just not looked at it in depth enough to make the final determination.  
1252

1253 Mr. Archer - So is it true then that technically, I suppose, we could move that  
1254 road a little bit in either direction if we had to, including the terminus point over on Scott  
1255 Road, where it would terminate.  
1256

1257 Mr. Bittner - Terminate on Scott Road?  
1258

1259 Mr. Archer - Not Scott Road, I am sorry. Where that other Concept Road runs.  
1260

1261 Mr. Bittner - Right. Yes. We have flexibility on the alignment of both roads.  
1262

1263 Mr. Glover - Is the Office right now a commodity in demand? Are we in a  
1264 position, I know that we had one large user looking at this piece of land at one point in  
1265 time, but to my knowledge is not a commodity that is being sought after at this point in  
1266 time because of the, I think Capital One is moving to West Creek and that is more space.  
1267 That is approximately two million square feet. Are we talking about something on a wish  
1268 list or are you thinking about something that would be practical here? Do you have a  
1269 user that is looking for this site?  
1270

1271 Mr. Bittner - We do not have a specific corporate office user. We have had  
1272 inquiries on the site. We had some other distributor type facilities that are looking at the  
1273 site. The main reason, I believe, for the Office, is that we feel this is one of the last  
1274 possible areas for that type of development in the west end of Henrico County.  
1275

1276 Mr. Glover - We had about 470 acres at Mill Road and 295 and we moved away  
1277 a similar type of development because the Office market, at this time, and maybe at  
1278 sometime in the future, but what would prevent, if this is not developed, what would  
1279 prevent coming back at some point in time, if you had a user, and ask for a rezoning  
1280 based on the property being sold? Any particular reason?  
1281

1282 Mr. Bittner - It would depend on the type of use that was being proposed. I am  
1283 not quite sure I followed you.  
1284

1285 Mr. Glover - Office user. Say they came in as a corporate office user, such as  
1286 Capital One is looking at. Is that correct?  
1287

1288 Mr. Bittner - They did look at this site. Yes, they ultimately wanted to do that.  
1289

1290 Mr. Glover - It was one of their strong sites and they decided against it. I think  
1291 there has been at least three major companies look at this site and move away from it, and  
1292 I am playing devil's advocate with you. I am not against it or for it. OK? Between  
1293 Brook Road, 95, and 295, and south of 295, we moved away from a very similar situation  
1294 because office would not develop in that area. I just wonder how much did you look into  
1295 the demand for Office, and, like I said, I don't have a problem with it. It is just that when  
1296 you zone something, people that live around it have an expectation. If you are truly  
1297 looking at the Cobb site, which is the major site there, is that correct?  
1298



1299 Mr. Bittner - Yes. The Scott Cobb property.  
1300  
1301 Mr. Glover - I would understand Office/Service more than I would raw Office,  
1302 but I am not against either one right now, but I will ask you questions later that might  
1303 help me.  
1304  
1305 Mr. Jernigan - Are there any other questions for Mr. Bittner? Thank you, Mr.  
1306 Bittner. All right. I think we have some people in the audience who would like to speak,  
1307 so citizens, if you want to come up, you will get two minutes a piece. If you would,  
1308 please give your name.  
1309  
1310 Mr. Thomas - Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Steve Thomas. I am  
1311 Senior Vice President with Vanasse Hangen Bustlin, Inc., VHB. We are a Henrico  
1312 County based business. We do planning and zoning and corporate relocation work here  
1313 in the County. We have 25 employees over at Innsbrook. We participated with Capital  
1314 One for, Mr. Glover remembers, with Capital One for this site, which the County was  
1315 very actively interested in pursuing a major corporate headquarters site here. We look at  
1316 sites like this. We believe there is a scarcity of sites in the market place for large users.  
1317 One of the reasons this site is not attractive is due to the access that it currently has if you  
1318 were trying to put 2-1/2 million square feet of office use here, as this zoning would  
1319 contemplate, or more. You would have a hard time getting the people in and out without  
1320 some direct access to the collector distributor in the vicinity of 295 to the north as well as  
1321 some access improvements to the Parham Road interchange itself. Getting people in and  
1322 out, there was originally a proposal that was advanced through the Secretary of  
1323 Transportation's office here in trying to attract Capital One here, that had a direct access  
1324 to the collector distributor off of 295, and we believe that was preliminarily with your  
1325 group Federal Highway Administration. Also, if you were trying to get people in and out  
1326 of this site, taking them over 95 and down onto Brook and to Route 1, and then down to  
1327 the Parham Road interchange, you correctly, I believe Mark talked about a backdoor  
1328 entry, and if you are a corporate headquarters user, you want a front-door entry, if you are  
1329 going to make a half a billion dollar investment in the site, you need an adequate front  
1330 door. So, I would implore the Commission to think about, if you are really trying to  
1331 attract economic development here, having diverse land uses, as Mr. Glover talked about,  
1332 and also having much better, more enhanced access. These are essentially major access  
1333 roads, but the real major access for corporate headquarters would be thinking of bigger  
1334 terms with 295 and also improvements to the Parham Road interchange. It will be very  
1335 difficult to move a corporate headquarters of this scale and to attract them. We've done  
1336 corporate headquarters work locations for Reebok, Microsystems, and companies I think  
1337 we'd love to have here in Henrico County, but without improved access, it is going to be  
1338 difficult. Thank you very much for your time this morning.  
1339  
1340 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Are there any questions for Mr. Thomas  
1341 from the Commission?  
1342  
1343 Mr. Archer - In the beginning of your remarks you mentioned larger user. What  
1344 type specifically did you have in mind?



1345

1346 Mr. Thomas - Today we do a lot of corporate facilities work, and it is not just  
1347 headquarters. Many times a corporate headquarters will have an office component for  
1348 their administration, but they might also have, you have this situation with the semi-  
1349 conductor uses, where you have a manufacturing component. I think there is R and D  
1350 components, pharmaceutical companies which have very much an office administration  
1351 headquarters, but they might have a back office, R and D facility, where you might have  
1352 a corporate headquarters where the big accounting, or an operations center, and I think  
1353 those kinds of uses should be contemplated, Mr. Archer.

1354

1355 Mr. Archer - OK.

1356

1357 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Thomas, looking at the sketch that you've got here and you are  
1358 recommending access from the 295 feeder road, would you be kind enough to point that  
1359 out or flush that out as to what would you, what that would be. Would that be a  
1360 perpendicular road from the north going into the site and then another access that would  
1361 go east, or would it be a bridge crossover?

1362

1363 Mr. Thomas - Is this the easiest way (referring to rendering).

1364

1365 Mr. Taylor - Well, you could do that. Where would be the point of entry that  
1366 you would seek to go to from the north?

1367

1368 Mr. Glover - I believe what he is asking is if the staff had taken a picture, which  
1369 they can do, it would show it. It is already there.

1370

1371 Mr. Thomas - And Mr. Glover may recall, and I know certainly that Mr. Hinson,  
1372 because he headed the County's efforts to attract Capital One here. I have back in the  
1373 office, and I didn't bring them this morning, I didn't know we would get quite to the  
1374 interstate access, but the County actually, and Mr. Foster, I believe, reviewed that from  
1375 Traffic. There was a direct right in and right out to the collector distributor right of the  
1376 sort of central portion of this property, and it came down and connected to correctly, as  
1377 you have drawn it, CR-2. Again, the alignment doesn't really matter for a corporate  
1378 headquarters, whether it goes on one side or the other. They came all the way down to  
1379 Parham in this location (referring to rendering), so it was a right in and a right out in this  
1380 location, and then you came down into here to Parham. Then to go home, if you were  
1381 trying to attract people from the west...thank you very much, Mark. That was the  
1382 original idea.

1383

1384 Mr. Taylor - Now where is the point of connection?

1385

1386 Mr. Thomas - To the south. CR-1 and CR-2.

1387

1388 Mr. Glover - It would take a position that the developer applied for. In other  
1389 words, there is no set alignment at this point. It is just a matter of an ingress/egress and  
1390 off of that ingress/egress, Mr. Taylor, then you would decide how the disbursement of  
1391 traffic would be at that point, once you got into the site.

1391  
1392 Mr. Taylor - But it would be possible to direct it through – directly to CR-2.  
1393  
1394 Mr. Glover - It would be possible depending upon what the Traffic Engineer  
1395 said.  
1396  
1397 Mr. Thomas - I think when we looked at it, we connected it to Parham Road  
1398 because that is really; if you think of a major corporate headquarters in Henrico,  
1399 particularly, you are going to attract people from the West End to come from 64, 295 and  
1400 then north to this location, then you're going to attract people from both East and West  
1401 from 295, and then you are going to attract people from the North, from 95 heading  
1402 South, and also from 95 South coming up. This is the beauty of this site as a corporate  
1403 site in that it attracts labor force from multiple locations within the County.  
1404  
1405 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Thomas, what was the name of your firm again?  
1406  
1407 Mr. Thomas - Vanase Hangen Bustlin, Inc., or VHB. I would be happy to give  
1408 you a card if that would help.  
1409  
1410 Mr. Jernigan - OK.  
1411  
1412 Mr. Jernigan - Were there anymore questions for Mr. Thomas?  
1413  
1414 Mr. Taylor - I just wanted to clarify where that entrance would go, and I think  
1415 Mr. Thomas, in his comments, or at least gave me the indication, that would come  
1416 perpendicular to the feeder road along 295, and might directly connect to CR-1 at the  
1417 point of its intersection with CR-2, which would really have a four-point cross over there.  
1418 I am not sure if that is clear to everybody, but do we have that on some kind of a bigger  
1419 plan that preceded today's study?  
1420  
1421 Mr. Glover - I think again it is the concept. There is no line that can be drawn if  
1422 a concept is Federal Government, I believe did approve back when 295 was built  
1423 originally. Is that correct? Did the Federal Government approve the stub street there?  
1424  
1425 Mr. Bittner - I don't know. I would have to research this.  
1426  
1427 Mr. Glover - But it is a concept, Mr. Taylor. It is not a firm line that is drawn  
1428 there.  
1429  
1430 Mr. Taylor - I understand that, Mr. Glover, and it seems to me that if were to  
1431 arrange that intersection between CR-1 and CR-2, it would really lead to the considerable  
1432 development attractiveness of that site.  
1433  
1434 Mr. Glover - It would if you were dealing with a plan of development, but if you  
1435 are dealing with a Land Use Plan you deal with concepts. You don't deal with lines that  
1436 are firm.

1437  
1438 Mr. Taylor - Thank you, sir.  
1439  
1440 Mr. Jernigan - All right. Would anybody else like to speak? Good morning, sir.  
1441  
1442 Mr. Redmond - My name is Dave Redmond. I am an attorney and I am  
1443 representing the Cobb Farm tract. The tract is currently owned by the Carolyn Pennison  
1444 Estate and a trust under revocable trust, two owners. First of all, I'd like to thank Mark  
1445 for dropping the Concept Road. That was one of our main objections Concept Road 1  
1446 was swinging through the most developable of the tract. We might like to see it further  
1447 south or a little closer realignment, but that was helpful. I appreciate that change.  
1448  
1449 From the standpoint of use, we feel that Cobb Farm is already shown as an Office/Service  
1450 under the current 2010 Plan, and it is fine to be aligned with the Scott tract to whatever  
1451 designation is ultimately determined. I think from a larger user standpoint those two  
1452 parcels will go hand in glove. We don't have any joint ventures or anything at this  
1453 particular point, but, again, Capital One sort of brought us into discussions together, and  
1454 it be wonderful to have another opportunity to do something like that. Having said that, I  
1455 think Mr. Glover made the point that Office in and of itself may not, in fact, the reason  
1456 and most logical and expected use, but I would only say that if Office is selected, I don't  
1457 want that to preclude other types of mixed use development. For example, even on  
1458 Capital One they were talking about some retail and some hotels and all, too, and I  
1459 wouldn't want that to preclude any kind of combination of light industrial development,  
1460 as well. We understand that it is a Land Use Plan. Sometimes Land Use Plans almost  
1461 become zoning, and if that was the case, I would not be sure what I would say to you  
1462 other than I think that the Scotts and the Cobb Farm ought to go together in this process.  
1463 I also think it is important, as Mr. Glover mentioned, too, not to overlook including the  
1464 traffic pattern of 295 entrance, because that was obviously significant and would  
1465 certainly have a great impact on density in the ability to develop that property. If you  
1466 have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.  
1467  
1468 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Redmond. Are there any questions for Mr.  
1469 Redmond from the Commission?  
1470  
1471 Mr. Glover - What is the acreage of this Cobb property.  
1472  
1473 Mr. Redmond - Cobb Farm is about 76 acres. It goes and has a little bit of swamp  
1474 in the back corner, about 76 acres. We will get over 200 when you add the Scott to it. I  
1475 think there is a 128 or so.  
1476  
1477 Mr. Glover - All of that Scott and Cobb north of that Concept Road CR-1?  
1478  
1479 Mr. Redmond - Pretty much, yes, except for those tracts that are broken off.  
1480  
1481 Mr. Glover - Where Scott Road is actually the dividing line.  
1482

1483 Mr. Redmond - Yes, Scott Road is the dividing line, but then also the parcels to the  
1484 West, individualized parcels, I do not believe are a part of Scott.  
1485  
1486 Mr. Glover - That is not a part of Scott?  
1487  
1488 Mr. Redmond - Jeff Cook is representing the Scott family, so he can comment on  
1489 that.  
1490  
1491 Mr. Glover - Oh, that's all right. That gives me an idea.  
1492  
1493 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Redmond. Are there any more questions for Mr.  
1494 Redmond? Thank you, sir. Good morning.  
1495  
1496 Mr. Cooke - Good morning. My name is Jeff Cooke. I am with Thalhimier  
1497 Commercial Real Estate and have represented various property owners in this area for  
1498 several years, primarily around the assembly for the proposed Capital One site. At that  
1499 time, we had seven different property owners, totaling about 245 acres, primarily north of  
1500 the existing right of way with Scott Road, and we have remained very interested in this.  
1501 The folks have hung together and are interested in eventually selling the property,  
1502 somewhat reluctantly. They have lived there a long time, but they know progress is  
1503 heading that way, and naturally they'd like to see the highest and best use that will allow  
1504 the most benefit when it is sold. We are very interested in this process. I am glad to see  
1505 the County considering changing it from its current land use, because most of the things  
1506 we were thinking go against that land use, so it good to see that our main concern which  
1507 was shared with Mr. Bittner and others is that we don't want to be limited to pure Office,  
1508 and right now Office would be delightful if we do another assembly like Capital One and  
1509 sell it for pure Office, that would be great. But we are a little concerned as we go  
1510 forward in the market place that that may be too limiting. We have had some inquiries  
1511 from folks who were credible and who I think would do the type of development the  
1512 County would like to see for more of a mixed use. I would like to get that out on the  
1513 table. Right now the Office market in the County is a little soft. Unfortunately, in my  
1514 opinion, Capital One chose to go to another County. I wish they had stayed in Henrico,  
1515 but they are at the moment moving some of their operations there, which has softened our  
1516 market up a bit, but that is not a permanent situation. However, the trend as we see it,  
1517 and we do quite a bit of office leasing in the County is more toward the Western part of  
1518 the County, more toward the Innsbrook – Broad Street Corridor, which spills over into  
1519 West Creek, which as you know has approximately 2,000 acres that can be used, and the  
1520 advent of 288 also connects Chesterfield County to that area. The North 95 Corridor is  
1521 right now having tremendous growth all the way up to the Hanover County line. We are  
1522 very pleased with that growth, but it has been more of a mixed use. It has not been pure  
1523 Office as we have seen it, so we'd like to see some mechanism for some flexibility in this  
1524 Plan that would allow for a variety of uses. So, those are our comments, and I also agree  
1525 with the concept of getting perhaps penciled in or sketched in on the plan the right in and  
1526 right out off of 295. I think that would be extremely helpful and not necessarily for a  
1527 corporate headquarters. I think other development would definitely benefit from that and  
1528 give tremendous access to the property.

1529  
1530 Mr. Glover - I think, Mr. Cook, that you know to get the Federal Government to  
1531 agree to something that isn't already there is, you know, we talk about the Federal  
1532 Government, but I don't think I have ever seen it, touched it or felt it. I don't know  
1533 where it is.  
1534  
1535 Mr. Cooke - I have never said it would be easy to do that.  
1536  
1537 Mr. Glover - But, if the Federal Government in their original, C. B. Robinson  
1538 worked with that 295 and the cross over there to Figgie's property and all, there appears  
1539 to be, and I refer back to the previous attorney for the Scott property estate talking about  
1540 the ingress/egress there. What is the present Land Use now? I don't have a Land Use  
1541 Plan as it stands today. What is the present Land Use recommendation?  
1542  
1543 Mr. Cooke - Mark, you might want to comment on that. I am not sure.  
1544  
1545 Mr. Bittner - The current Land Use Plan is on the left-side here, and that is for  
1546 the area east of 95.  
1547  
1548 Mr. Glover - That is certainly clear to me. What is it? Tell me what the Land  
1549 Use Plan for that – for all that acreage north of Scott Road.  
1550  
1551 Mr. Bittner - It is SR-1, Suburban Residential-1 and O/S, Office Service.  
1552  
1553 Mr. Glover - What part is O/S and what part is SR-1?  
1554  
1555 Mr. Bittner - I am not sure what the dividing line is. I think this is the Cobb  
1556 property, which is O/S, and this is the Scott property, which is SR-1.  
1557  
1558 Mr. Glover - OK. I see. In Office Service, OS-1. Is that correct?  
1559  
1560 Mr. Bittner - Yes.  
1561 Mr. Glover - Can you build 100% Office?  
1562  
1563 Mr. Bittner - Yes, if you want to.  
1564 Mr. Glover - But, in other words, a corporate headquarters could go there and  
1565 build a corporate headquarters or regional headquarters or a buyer could buy it and begin  
1566 developing strictly office if they wanted to. In O/S-1, can't you have 20% retail, which  
1567 allows motels and hotels?  
1568  
1569 Mr. Bittner - Yes.  
1570  
1571 Mr. Glover - What is it that Office would do that O/S-1 would not? What is  
1572 undesirable, let's say Villa Park, out here where St. Joseph's Villa is, about 175 acres,  
1573 equal to this site. That is an O/S-1. Is that objective, what is there?  
1574

1575 Mr. Bittner - For this site, no. I think something like Villa Park could be a good  
1576 development.  
1577  
1578 Mr. Glover - Well, that is O/S-1.  
1579  
1580 Mr. Bittner - Yes, sir.  
1581  
1582 Mr. Glover - How about the Time Life site right across from J. Sargeant  
1583 Reynolds? Is that acceptable?  
1584  
1585 Mr. Bittner - North Park. Is that what you are referring to? I think that is very  
1586 similar to Park Central which we see out here right now.  
1587  
1588 Mr. Glover - Would that be acceptable on this site?  
1589  
1590 Mr. Bittner - I don't know. I think that has less of an office component and a  
1591 little bit more of the distribution component.  
1592  
1593 Mr. Glover - Can you tell me, in looking at it and driving through it, unless you  
1594 go inside of it, do you know the difference?  
1595  
1596 Mr. Bittner - The exact difference? No.  
1597  
1598 Mr. Glover - So it would be acceptable and that is O/S-1. That was the object of  
1599 O/S-1 was to give you the quality of office, while at the same time allowing the  
1600 flexibility that Mr. Cook was talking about. Again, I am playing devil's advocate with  
1601 you to say here you have flexibility, and you still have to rezone it. What is the zoning of  
1602 all of that property now?  
1603  
1604 Mr. Bittner - Most of the undeveloped land is A-1.  
1605  
1606 Mr. Glover - So the word "no" could enter the picture at any given time on a  
1607 zoning case, couldn't it?  
1608  
1609 Mr. Bittner - Yes, it could.  
1610  
1611 Mr. Glover - OK. Thank you.  
1612  
1613 Mr. Jernigan - Are there any more questions for Mr. Cook from the Commission?  
1614  
1615 Mr. Archer - Mr. Cooke, in your letter to me in which you referred to a  
1616 conversation that I had with Mr. Clarke Jones, we talked quite a bit about how Office  
1617 uses view today as opposed to the way it might have been viewed at the time of the Land  
1618 Use Plan was written. And you indicate that there was a lot of office vacancies.  
1619



1620 Mr. Cooke - At the present time, yes. The current trend is a softening in the  
1621 market, which has to do with the national economy as well as the local economy, and we  
1622 don't expect that to always be the case as at the present time. For example, three years  
1623 ago, as we measured space and interviewed all of the landlords of any building of over  
1624 10,000 sq. ft. on a quarterly basis, so we try to keep up with it. For example, in the  
1625 northwest section of the County, the vacancy rate was about 3-1/2 to 4%, and including  
1626 space that is available for sublease now, it is over 15%, so it has tripled in a three year  
1627 period, and we think that will take a while to work off. How long that is I am not sure.  
1628 But it is certainly years. It is not something that is going to work off very quickly  
1629 because we are not seeing corporate expansion in the mid-level. We are all thrilled with  
1630 Philip Morris coming into town and with the Prudential Security and those are wonderful,  
1631 large things. What I said, we are not seeing the mid-level, the 30 to 50,000 sq. ft. offices  
1632 that are typical for Henrico County or typical for the Richmond Metro area.  
1633

1634 Mr. Archer - Is it because some of the sites that are available now are unsuitable  
1635 or just not what corporations want to be in?  
1636

1637 Mr. Cooke - I think companies want to expand at present. Now, the 95 North  
1638 Corridor is not known as a pure office site. If you look at all of the development that has  
1639 occurred in the last few years, it is more of a mixed use. It is more of an Office/Service  
1640 or flex type buildings. Windsor Business Park would be an example. Very attractive  
1641 buildings, almost all office and not very much in the way of distribution in there. One  
1642 thing, with these single-story buildings, when the Office/Service or flex building concept  
1643 arrived in the 1970s, they were mostly distribution or work space, and maybe 15 or 20%  
1644 office and the rest manufacturing or distribution. That has really reversed itself. It is  
1645 very efficient for folks' offices, so a lot of these buildings now are pure office, on a single  
1646 floor plan. That is why in most of your applications, you will probably see they have a  
1647 lot more parking, because back in the old day they'd maybe have two spaces per 1,000  
1648 and now you need five for these buildings to work, and maybe more. So, they are less  
1649 expensive than a multi-story office building for tenants to be in them. So, that is not a  
1650 trend. And we see that continuing. That section of the market place has a little bit lower  
1651 vacancy than pure office right now, although developers are still reluctant to put up  
1652 buildings right now.  
1653

1654 Mr. Archer - Well, you know, that conversation probably emanated from a  
1655 comment that I made, and, of course, I don't know what I am talking about, but it  
1656 appears that if you look at the way office workers are as opposed to the way they were 10  
1657 years ago, there are a lot of people who don't go into the office anymore. People work  
1658 from home. They work from their cars. And I am just wondering if we look at the way  
1659 things are trending, do we see us going back to the time when people put on shirts and  
1660 ties again and go back and sit in the office all day, or are we going in the other direction  
1661 where people work from wherever they are, given our ability to communicate 24 hours a  
1662 day from any point, anywhere in the world.  
1663

1664 Mr. Cooke - You are exactly right, and I think that some of the national  
1665 publications that I read and conventions we go to where we hear the global situation, yes,



1666 I think, overall, there will be less office space, because, like you say, people telecommute  
1667 and they do other things. Companies in our current economy have to cut costs, and the  
1668 main way you cut costs in any business is have fewer employees. So, that is the trend,  
1669 fewer employees. And another trend that we have seen is the density of an office  
1670 building. The Capital One Building and the First Union-Wachovia Buildings, for their  
1671 operations centers, I've seen them have as low as 150 sq. ft. per person, where 15 years  
1672 ago the average was probably 300 sq. ft. So, yes, it is getting denser and trying not to  
1673 expand, and that is what is effecting us right now.  
1674

1675 Mr. Archer - And I just throw that out simply as a means of just making us  
1676 aware of the fact that trends are changing in terms of how offices are used, and 10 or 15  
1677 years ago you had to go to the office to get your messages, or either call the office. Not  
1678 any more. I guess you all heard my phone ring a few minutes ago. I forgot to put it on  
1679 vibrate, but we are constantly in communication with each other, technology is changing  
1680 in that direction and certainly not going the other way, and it makes you wonder about  
1681 space will be built and then it sits. You remember how long the Figgie property sat  
1682 before it was sold, and it was probably because it was configured in such a way that it  
1683 didn't fit a lot of users. And, eventually, when Pittston took, I think they had to do some  
1684 things with it, but the building was designed in such a way that it was a very personal  
1685 building, and I don't want to see us fall into that trap of doing that again.  
1686

1687 Mr. Cooke - Well, I think as the economy in the United States, we are always  
1688 going to need places to house businesses. The form, like you say, of that housing and  
1689 how that business functions is changing and we are not sure.  
1690

1691 Mr. Archer - We really don't know where it is going.  
1692

1693 Mr. Cooke - That is why flexibility is the key. We absolutely believe this is one  
1694 of the premier sites in the Metropolitan area, and absolutely should have high  
1695 development standards, and we are in favor of that.  
1696

1697 Mr. Archer - Thank you, sir.  
1698

1699 Mr. Jernigan - OK. Next gentleman. Good morning.  
1700

1701 Mr. Deloye - Good morning. My name is Kevin Deloye and I am also from  
1702 VHB, and I represent a confidential client who is actively in discussion with property  
1703 owners along the alignment of CR-2, but we have been taking an interest in the study  
1704 area plan so far and we are the ones that have submitted to Mr. Bittner and staff a  
1705 suggested realignment, although we understand CR-2 is, in fact, just a concept line on  
1706 paper. An alternative alignment for CR-2 that would suggest its location openly a little  
1707 bit to the West, primarily to allow for better development along that roadway in the  
1708 future. The current alignment in the proposed Land Use Plan provides for approximately  
1709 20 acres on the eastern side of CR-2 between it and Park Central, and the depth of their  
1710 land is very, very shallow and is not acceptable to any quality development on the eastern  
1711 side of CR-2 the way that it is drawn, so we have suggested this alignment or something

1712 like it to push it to the left, and provide an even distribution of land more along 50-50 on  
1713 either side of it within the Land Use Plan to allow for development flexibility. The  
1714 current client that we are looking at is interested in, like I said, in approximately 25 and  
1715 possibly up to 30 acres along CR-2 and the alignment as proposed in the current study  
1716 would preclude a development of that type along CR-2. Thank you.  
1717

1718 Mr. Jernigan - Mr. Deloye, before you go, I know you can't say who your client  
1719 is, but would you be looking at Office or Office/Service?  
1720

1721 Mr. Deloye - It would be a business that would be more in tune with  
1722 Office/Service.  
1723

1724 Mr. Jernigan - OK. Are there any questions for Mr. Deloye?  
1725

1726 Mr. Taylor - I just had one for Mr. Deloye, and Mr. Deloye, what I'd enjoy is if  
1727 you, give your thoughts about the intersection into the 295 feeder road. Would that be a  
1728 condition of your development or something that you would think would work with that  
1729 realignment?  
1730

1731 Mr. Deloye - As far as our client is concerned?  
1732

1733 Mr. Taylor - Yes.  
1734

1735 Mr. Deloye - Over the long term, yes. It would certainly be a benefit to the type  
1736 of user that we are representing. Although it is improvement that would necessitate a  
1737 lengthy design and approval process and there would also have to be additional users that  
1738 would benefit from such an improvement, so a collector distributor road taps, like the one  
1739 that Mr. Thomas indicated earlier, would be something that would not come to fruition  
1740 inside of 10 years. You are looking at something in a 10-15 year range, if you had the  
1741 types of users, like a Capital One or others looking at this piece of property. That is a  
1742 long-term improvement, but it is something that, by all means, I was part of the Capital  
1743 One evaluation team, that this property would benefit from.  
1744

1745 Mr. Taylor - In your alignment that you have on the screen now would be  
1746 facilitated or conjunctive with that?  
1747

1748 Mr. Deloye - The graphic that you saw earlier, with the collector distributor road  
1749 interchange, was intended that this road or Park Central Drive during the Capital One  
1750 planning process, would continue directly up to 295, and we had a bunch of different  
1751 alignments during the Capital One process, simply because we had nearly two dozen  
1752 different master plans for this property for Capital One. They never got to the point of  
1753 settling on one, so we had all kinds of different ones.  
1754

1755 Mr. Taylor - Thank you, sir.  
1756

1757 Mr. Jernigan - Thank you, Mr. Deloye. Is there anybody else who would like to  
1758 speak? OK. We thank you for your input.  
1759  
1760 Mr. Marles - You reviewed the schedule. What is the next step that staff is  
1761 recommending in the process?  
1762  
1763 Mr. Bittner - We are prepared to take this to a public hearing and the Planning  
1764 Commission, if the Commission is prepared.  
1765  
1766 Mr. Vanarsdall - July 10<sup>th</sup>?  
1767  
1768 Mr. Bittner - Yes, sir, that was the date that was suggested.  
1769  
1770 Mr. Archer - What would we do at the public hearing, Mr. Bittner, I mean in  
1771 terms of what would we be adopting?  
1772  
1773 Mr. Bittner - You would be making a recommendation similar to say on a  
1774 rezoning case, and this case, if you were to recommend approval of this, you'd be  
1775 recommending those changes to the Land Use Plan and the Major Thoroughfare Plan that  
1776 I outlined.  
1777  
1778 Mr. Archer - Then to the Board to have it for final.  
1779  
1780 Mr. Bittner - Yes.  
1781 Mr. Archer - OK.  
1782  
1783 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Bittner, the one thing that I would express some concerns  
1784 about is if the comments of Mr. Deloye and Mr. Cook are to be included, would it be  
1785 prudent to put the intersector on that feeder road of 295 into our plans and work through  
1786 that concept or be at least one of the alternatives, because I see, I hear from their  
1787 comments that that is a key ingredient of the successful development of this area.  
1788  
1789 Mr. Bittner - I don't know that staff is prepared to make that change. We are  
1790 certainly willing to look at it and I think it can make a lot of sense, but if we are going to  
1791 do that, perhaps we should not yet schedule a public hearing and get some more facts and  
1792 data on 295 and what could or could not happen.  
1793  
1794 Mr. Taylor - To the best of your knowledge, who has the intelligence in terms  
1795 of a body of studies, that would show that intersector on 295 based on say, previous  
1796 work? Would that be Mr. Deloye, who...  
1797  
1798 Mr. Bittner - Probably our Economic Development Office would have some in  
1799 their dealings with Capital One.  
1800  
1801 Mr. Taylor - Would it help the staff if he were to share that with us? Would he  
1802 be willing to do that? Have you asked him?

1803  
1804 Mr. Bittner - No. We have not. It wouldn't hurt. We'd certainly be willing to  
1805 take a look at it. I just don't think we're prepared to make any decision on what the plan  
1806 might ultimately be.  
1807  
1808 Mr. Taylor - I realize that, but it seems to me that the intersector on that feeder  
1809 road is a key ingredient as Mr. Deloye and I think Mr. Cook described in transportation  
1810 access in that entire acreage, and to me, just looking at the proximity of the I-295 feeder  
1811 road and accepting many of their comments about the specificity of that approach, I can  
1812 see that as something that, certainly as an alternative, to developing at this site. That  
1813 would be one of the alternatives. It would be feeding in from the north directly from the  
1814 I-295 service road as one alternative.  
1815  
1816 Mr. Jernigan - I think Mr. Taylor is right and I'd like to see that incorporated  
1817 myself, and I think what we ought to do at this point is, I don't think that we should  
1818 schedule a public hearing now. I think staff needs more time to sit back. Mark, what do  
1819 you think, 60 to 90 days to incorporate?  
1820  
1821 Mr. Bittner - Sixty days I think.  
1822  
1823 Mr. Jernigan - We just won't set a public hearing at this point, and I think, Mr.  
1824 Secretary, can we just come back for another work session, and then at that point, we will  
1825 reschedule a public hearing for the Planning Commission.  
1826 Mr. Taylor - Mr. Chairman, one thing I am not sure of, and perhaps I am at a  
1827 phase and staying there, the intelligence that has been gathered by the private sector  
1828 looking at this site, would it be an opportunity if some of that information were made  
1829 available to Mr. Bittner?  
1830  
1831 Mr. Jernigan - Well, I think the gentlemen that spoke today will be more than  
1832 willing to reincorporate their feelings with Mr. Bittner and work together on that.  
1833  
1834 Mr. Taylor - I think that would help staff considerably in taking advantage of  
1835 the precursor work here, and showing at least what their thoughts were for this type of  
1836 development, and my thought is if we review that critically, it might give us some ideas  
1837 about what we might do and I would hope that they might have some idea even of the  
1838 economics there.  
1839  
1840 Mr. Jernigan - Well, we will just reschedule a public hearing at a later date and  
1841 we will have another work session.  
1842  
1843 Mr. Bittner - Can we perhaps do a work session before the evening meeting in  
1844 August? August 14, 2003.  
1845  
1846 Mr. Jernigan - OK. August 14, 2003 will be the work session. And we will set a  
1847 public hearing at that date for the Commission.  
1848

1849 Mr. Glover - What time, Mr. Secretary, or Mr. Chairman?  
1850  
1851 Mr. Marlles - I would suggest we do it prior to the regular meeting because we  
1852 don't know what our agenda is going to be, how heavy the agenda is, but let's do a dinner  
1853 meeting at 5:30 p.m.  
1854  
1855 Mr. Jernigan - So we will say 5:30 p.m.  
1856  
1857 Mr. Marlles - Yes, 5:30 p.m.  
1858  
1859 Mr. Jernigan - It is 5:30 on August 14.  
1860  
1861 The Planning Commission rescheduled the work session for the Scott Road Small Area  
1862 Land Use Study to be discussed again at the August 14, 2003, Rezoning Meeting at 5:40  
1863 p.m.  
1864  
1865 Mr. Jernigan - Okay, are we ready to adjourn?  
1866  
1867 Mr. Taylor - I move we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.  
1868  
1869 Mr. Vanarsdall - Second.  
1870  
1871 Mr. Jernigan - We have a motion by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall.  
1872 All in favor say aye...all opposed say nay. The motion passes.  
1873  
1874 On a motion by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Vanarsdall, the Planning Commission  
1875 adjourned its May 28, 2003, meeting at 11:04 a.m.  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880 \_\_\_\_\_  
1881 \_\_\_\_\_ E. Ray Jernigan, C.P.C., Chairperson  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885 \_\_\_\_\_  
1886 John R. Marlles, AICP Secretary  
1887  
1888